

Submittal Report

Financial Project: 417540-6-32-01 Submittal Type: PLANS
Submittal Phase: PHASE III Submittal Staff Type: CONSULTANT
Received Date: 9/22/2025 Response Due Date: 11/14/2025
Grace Period: 0 District: FIRST
Status: CLOSED Create Date: 9/18/2025
Create User Id: KNAKNCI Last Update: 1/28/2026
Last Update User Id: KNAKNCI

Description:

Submittal of PHIII Plans Review.

This shall serve as a transmittal letter for the Phase III plans Review. Please provide Phase III comments for this project. This project is located in Collier County.

****UPDATE**** Please note that 417540-5 will be submitted in ERC in early October, 2025 and to focus on the connection of the -5 to this project.

The following documentation has been included with the submittal:

- (1) Roadway Plans
- (1-1) Roadway Plans (Coreborings)
- (1-2) Roadway Plans (Verified Utilities)
- (2) S&PM Plans
- (3) Lighting
- (4) Estimate-Quantities
- (5) Proj. Edit Check
- (6) KMZ (Existing)
- (7) KMZ (Proposed)
- (8) CADD

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\PhaseIII

Threads:

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Agnimitra Sengupta	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Alan Eldridge	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amy Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Anthony Brown	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
76	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Anthony Brown	10/16/2025	1		
	On plan sheet 12, the existing travel lane typical/design deviates from the material's Pavement Survey and Evaluation Report recommendation of 2.0" of SP 12.5 and 1.5" of FC-12.5 by adding an additional 1.5" lift of SP Structural Course Traffic Level E. Please remove the 1.5" lift of SP Structural Course Traffic Level E as to not increase the grade of roadway.			
Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1		
	We provided an additional 1.5" of Type SP (Traffic E) due to the poor condition of the pavement and insufficient SN based on the projected ESAL and was documented in the approved pavement design. We have provided a profile for the additional 1.5" which connects to the roundabout profiles. We prefer to keep the additional pavement thickness to avoid regrading the roundabout.			
Anthony Brown	10/30/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Atiq Alvi	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Belinda Thomas	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Blake Stallworth	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Brent Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Casey Schley	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Cassie Lee	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Chris Coughlin	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	24
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
52	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 1 / Key Sheet	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1		
	a) Begin Project milepost varies from that in PSEE. Please review. Recommend coordinating with FDOT Project Manager if Begin Project milepost in PSEE needs to be revised.			
	b) Standard Plans Index D528-001 is to be included in the plans in accordance with FDM 910.2.8.1. Please coordinate with the District Specifications & Central Office to obtain a clean copy of the Developmental Standard Plan.			
Tammy Kreisle	10/28/2025	1		
	a) The MP in PSEE will be changed to match the plans (MP 39.654). Per coordination with the Project Manager, since this project is Moving Florida Forward the official description in PSEE cannot be modified as it matches all MFF related items. We have confirmed with the PM that it is ok if the project description on the key sheets does not match the one in PSEE.			
	b) We had a meeting with Central Office and D1 Specs to obtain approval to use D528-001 and expect it will be included in the Phase IIIR plans.			
Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
53	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 2 / Signature Sheet (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Standard Plans Index D528-001 is to be included in the plans in accordance with FDM 910.2.8.1. Please coordinate with the District Specifications & Central Office to obtain a clean copy of the Developmental Standard Plan.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	Subsequent to the Phase III submittal, we had a meeting with Central Office and D1 Specifications to obtain approval to use the Developmental Standard and expect to include it in the Phase IIIIR plans.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
54	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 12 / Typical Section (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	a) Proposed milling & resurfacing design will raise the profile grade of the roadway 1-1/2". Please discuss with District Materials, as adding the additional additional asphalt to satisfy structural number requirements for such a short segment may not be the most cost-effective approach.			
	b) Is the Shoulder Pavement Detail intended to apply to all Typical Sections with shoulder construction? Please review & clarify or confirm.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	a) The length of the roadway south of the roundabout was much longer when the pavement design was prepared and was shortened when the roundabout was re-designed. The south side roundabout grading and profiles include the adjacent pavement being 1.5" higher and would prefer to keep it as is at this point in the design.			
	b) Yes, the detail is intended to apply to all shoulder pavement. We will change the dimensions to varies so that it applies for multiple conditions.			
	Chris Coughlin	11/3/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
55	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 16 / Typical Section (5)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Provided this is a high speed facility, can the back slopes within the Clear Zone be flattened to 1:4? Please review. See others.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	The 1:3 backslopes are needed for the drainage design (does not work at 1:4 due to the ditch depth) to function, fit within the existing right of way, and is within the criteria required in FDM Table 215.2.3.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
56	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 17 / Typical Section (6)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	U-Turn Bulbout Partial: Consider dimensioning the 1/4" lip indicated on Typical Section Details.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	We will change the label to a dimension on the U-Turn Bulbout partial section.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
57	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 19 / Typical Section (8)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	On other Typical, the dimensioned median width is inclusive of the offset to the travel lanes. Is there a reason this Typical differs? Please review			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	No reason, we will change the median dimension to include the offset to the travel lanes.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
58	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 21 / Typical Section (10)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	a) Limit of Construction linework is missing on the left side. Please review.			
	b) Right Drop-Down Detail: Limits of Construction is not labeled on the drop-down on the right side. Please review.			
	c) Left Drop-Down Detail: Sidewalk cross slope is not defined. Please review. Suggest defining.			
	d) Do traffic volumes on New Market Rd & Westclox St necessitate Traffic Level E asphalt, or was the Traffic Level chosen to simplify pavement design mixes? Please review & clarify.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	a) We will add the missing limits of construction dimension line.			
	b) We change the vertical dimension line to dashed and add the limits of construction label.			
	c) We will add the sidewalk slope.			
	d) The traffic level was kept the same on the side street as SR 29 to simplify the pavement design and the construction since the side street lengths are relatively short.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
59	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 22 / Typical Section (11)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Westclox St: Varying dimensions are provided on either side of the typical, within the 8' shoulder limits. Please review & clarify what these dimensioned areas are intended to represent.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	Both of those varying dimensions will be removed.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
60	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 25 / Typical Section Details (2)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Please confirm the profile grade is sufficient enough to not result in ponding where the Shared Use Path & sidewalk abut. See others.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/29/2025	1	
	We will change the slope of the shared use path to slope down to the outside/ away from the sidewalk to eliminate the potential for water pooling.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
61	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 44 / Roadway Plan (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	a) Please confirm the Begin Widening location identified is actually where widening begins. Symbology indicates it is further downstream.			
	b) Consider defining the radius of the median nose near Sta. 2095+50. See others throughout, which are not defined.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	a) We will move the begin widening label to Sta. 2095+72.02.			
	b) The radius at the median nose near Sta. 2095+50 and others are labeled on the intersection detail sheets.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
62	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 46 / Roadway Plan (3)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Station equations are not provided where the profile transitions from the NB & SB Roundabout profiles to the mainline profile. Unable to confirm			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	We will add station equations for the roundabout baselines and baseline of survey on Roadway Plan (3) and the Roundabout Profiles.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
63	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 56 / Roadway Plan (13)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Provided the pavement design varies between the paved shoulders & U-Turn Bulbouts, was not using shoulder symbology for bulbouts considered?			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	We will remove the shoulder cross hatching from the U-Turn bulbouts.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
64	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 62 / Roadway Plan (19)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	The existing steel gates appear to be placed along the R/W line. Please confirm they will not be impacted by proposed turnout construction.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	It does not appear that the two steel gates located on the west side of SR 29 will be impacted by the turnout construction.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
65	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 96 / Roadway Profile Roundabout (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Roadway Plan only calls for milling & resurfacing along the NB & SB PGL's up until Sta. 102+00 & 202+00, respectively. Please review, as new profiles are called for within these limits. Is overbuild anticipated, establishing a new PGL, or is it to follow the existing?			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	We are placing an additional 1.5" of SP above the existing surface due to the poor pavement condition. We provided a profile that parallels existing within the milling/resurfacing limits. We will modify the beginning of the profile to reflect the pavement feathering.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
66	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 98 / Roadway Profile Roundabout (3)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Consider flagging & labeling the Begin Construction / Begin Milling & Resurfacing locations as done on other profiles.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	We will add the "Begin Construction", "Begin/Milling & Resurfacing", and "Begin New Construction" labels to both profile windows.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
67	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Shared Use Path Profile (2)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Typical Section does not indicate which direction exemplifies positive & negative cross slopes for the Shared Use Paths. Please review. Consider indicating.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	We will add "(+)" and "(-)" to the shared use path cross slopes on the typical sections to correspond with the cross slope transition labeling on the profiles.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
68	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 128 / Intersection Detail (13)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	a) Please confirm the flat elevations around the directional median island will not result in ponding.			
	b) Please confirm the flat spot near the end of the NB traffic separator nose will not result in ponding.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/29/2025	1	
	a) We will revise the spot elevations on the south side of the directional median opening at Sta. 2113+50 to eliminate the flat area.			
	b) We will increase the nose spot elevation to eliminate the flat spot for the median opening at Sta. 2171+00.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
69	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 224 / Driveway Sections (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	a) Some of the driveways sections occur at side street connections. Consider providing side street name for those that do.			
	b) Sta. 2116+37.70: The proposed driveway profile does not appear to match existing at the Existing R/W line. Please review.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	a) There are several significant driveways that are not side streets as there is no side street right of way. The street names are private roads.			
	b) We will check to insure that the DTM is correct and modify the profile as needed.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
70	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 227 / Driveway Sections (4)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Sta. 2205+73.08: Please confirm there is sufficient cover over the side drain beneath the O'Quinn Rd turnout.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/30/2025	1	
	We reviewed cover over the side drain pipe under O'Quinn Road and will modify the proposed pipe from an 18" round pipe to an equivalent 14"x 23" elliptical pipe to meet the minimum pipe cover requirement from the Drainage Manual.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
71	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 231 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (1)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Note 2: Please clarify how lane closure restrictions were established. Was a Lane Closure Analysis performed? Lane Closure Worksheet calculations are to be provided with the submittal in accordance with the District 1 Maintenance of Traffic Review Policy. Please provide.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/28/2025	1	
	A lane closure analysis was prepared and are attached with this comment. It was inadvertently omitted from the submittal.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
72	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 235 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (5)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	A portion of the proposed diversion / temporary roadway does but up against existing roadway pavement. What profile is the temporary roadway to follow? Please review & clarify intent. See other locations.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/30/2025	1	
	The Diversions will match existing elevations and cross slope where they abut the existing asphalt, and will follow a projection of the existing cross slope from the existing edge of pavement where there is a gap. We can provide spot elevations at these locations.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
73	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 278 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (48)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	TTCP Notes indicate the posted speed along SR 29 is being reduced to 45 MPH. What is the posted speed along SR 29 approaching the Westclox Rd intersection? Temporary curve geometry indicates it needs to be 30 MPH or less to avoid superelevation. Please review. Is it intended to be posted at 25 MPH in this location?			
	Ken Muzyk	10/30/2025	1	
	These curves are tied to proposed geometry and will match the advisory speed of the completed roundabout, 25 mph. These curves will not be super elevated. We will add speed limit signs at the roundabout for these phases and update the phasing notes regarding the speed limit.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
74	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 284 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (54)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	1	
	Proposed median directional island is depicted within the temporary travel way, as well as within the work zone. Please review & clarify intent. See other locations, as well.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/30/2025	1	
	The intent is to show the initial setup for the directional median openings to be operational until the channelizing island is constructed at which time the channelizing devices will be relocated to parallel the island. Typically, more of the inside pavement is constructed than shown in the Phasing and the actual setup when shifting to Phase III may vary accordingly. This is the same way we have depicted the construction of the directional median openings on other reconstruction projects successfully.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
75	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	10/16/2025	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			
	Ken Muzyk	10/29/2025	1	
	Thank you for your thoughtful review Chris.			
	Chris Coughlin	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	15

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
12	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		L-6	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	No light poles appear to be proposed within the roundabout.			
	John Ramon	11/11/2025	1	
	No light poles are proposed in the center of the roundabout; only light poles around the outside and along each leg are needed to meet FDOT lighting criteria.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
13	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		L-6	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	The CRA would like to store newer poles that are currently located in the Triangle area/Roundabout (Pole #7, Pole \$8, and Pole #11).			
	John Ramon	11/11/2025	1	
	Poles 7, 8, and 11 are all proposed light poles located on the southeast and southwest quadrants of the roundabout. Would you please clarify which existing poles the CRA would like to store? A pay item note will be added for the designated poles to be claimed for storage.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	The CRA confirms that the 3 blue streetlight poles to be salvaged and stored are #7, #8 and #11. They are located at the "Triangle Area" (SR29/New Market Road and Westclox Road)			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
14	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			LANDSCAPING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	A landscape plan was not included. The CRA currently manages the Triangle area as part of the MSTU Beautification area. Will the maintenance revert back to the County since no beautification is being installed?			
	Tammy Kreisle	11/6/2025	1	
	A landscape plan is not included in the current project scope. As no new beautification elements are being installed, maintenance responsibilities for the area will revert to the County upon project completion. However, the County or CRA may pursue future beautification through a Beautification Grant, JPA, or local agency permit if desired. FDOT will be providing minimal landscaping for any proposed roundabout without irrigation. The landscaping would be quantity 4 Sabal Palms with Argentine Bahia Sod (un-irrigated) to meet min. requirements per FDM 213.9. After completion of landscaping contract establishment period the local agency (Collier County) may propose additional landscaping (per noted options for local agency partnership).			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
15	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-5, 2096	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Prefer county maintained stop signs to stay on existing 2.5" x 2.5" galvanized metal square tubular sign post. (typical)			
	Tucker Ammerman	11/12/2025	1	
	This request is being coordinated with FDOT.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
16	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		4, 2100	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Consider adding a WB right turn lane on New Market Rd.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/29/2025	1	
	The traffic model and Roundabout ICE analysis do not support the need for a WB right turn lane. The SR 29 Bypass is intended to largely intercept current WB traffic.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/30/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
17	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		45, 2099 & 2102	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	

These "S" movements are supposed to be the mirror image, to help pedestrians see approaching traffic as they walk toward the crossing.

Ken Muzyk 10/22/2025 1

The "S" movements in the north/south roundabout approach medians appear to be drawn similar to what is shown in FDM Exhibit 213-3. Can you explain the comment further, perhaps with a markup?

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 10/30/2025 1

Staggered crosswalks improve pedestrian safety by forcing them to cross in stages, which exposes them to traffic one direction at a time and requires them to face oncoming vehicles. This design, also called Z-crossings, uses a median to split the crosswalk, creating a pedestrian refuge island that reduces the overall time spent in the roadway. We are OK with straight crossings as shown in the FDM Exhibit 213-3. However, if you are using a Z crossing as shown on the plans you need to make sure that the pedestrians are facing oncoming traffic and not have their back to oncoming traffic when traversing the median.

Ken Muzyk 10/30/2025 1

Thank you for the clarification. We are providing the angled offset pedestrian crossings for this multilane roundabout with pedestrian hybrid beacons in conformance with FDM Section 213.8.3 (attached). See the discussion at the bottom of the first page of the attachment for an explanation of the "Z-Crossing" configuration.

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 10/30/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
18	COMMENT RESOLVED		1	OTHER
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Erosion Control Plan/Details missing			
	Tammy Kreisle	10/13/2025	1	
	Erosion control plans are no longer included in plans. Instead an SRCC is produced that is delivered to the contractor as an unsigned pdf.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/30/2025	1	
	Collier County would like to review the SRCC please, to ensure adjacent County property is not affected.			
	Tammy Kreisle	11/4/2025	1	
	See attached.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	Please provide erosion control and environmental requirements general notes, silt fence details (or FDOT index), floating turbidity barrier details (or FDOT index), inlet protection barrier details (or FDOT index), and show their locations on the FDOT SRCC plans.			
	Christopher Speese	12/2/2025	1	
	Peter Hayden provided the following response to indicate this comment has been addressed: "We have received your responses. As you discussed with Michael, comment 18 has been addressed on the plans." I am closing this comment out as this has been resolved.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
19	COMMENT RESOLVED		5, 2130	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Demonstrate adequate stormwater capacity downstream			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report. The downstream receiving nodes of CD-2 are analyzed as 601-03B OFF and TW 601 in the table. The downstream receiving node of CD-3 is analyzed as TW 602 in the table.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	The County has noted that Appendix 10.4 is missing from the drainage report submitted. Please submit an updated drainage report to the County and clearly identify the relevant page numbers and tables for review. In addition, specify the exact page and sheet numbers required to verify model stage and discharge values in the drainage report, and ensure these are cross referenced with the drainage profiles and grades shown in the construction plans. All information must be clearly specified and noted in the response to allow reviewers to easily locate the corresponding details in both the drainage report and the construction plans.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
	A revised Drainage Report with Appendix 10.4 will be provided to support the response to this comment. A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table (PDF page 895) that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report. For stage the downstream receiving nodes of CD-2 are analyzed as 601-03B OFF and TW 601 in the table. The downstream receiving node of CD-3 is analyzed as TW 602 in the table. For discharge the downstream receiving node of CD-2 is analyzed as TW 601 DS and the downstream receiving node of CD-3 is analyzed as TW 602 DS.			

Christopher Speese 1/28/2026 1

Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
20	COMMENT RESOLVED		6, 2175	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Please confirm and show downstream has capacity for CD			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report. The downstream receiving node of CD-5 is analyzed as 603-03OFF in the table.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	The County has noted that Appendix 10.4 is missing from the drainage report submitted. Please submit an updated drainage report to the County and clearly identify the relevant page numbers and tables for review. In addition, specify the exact page and sheet numbers required to verify model stage and discharge values in the drainage report, and ensure these are cross referenced with the drainage profiles and grades shown in the construction plans. All information must be clearly specified and noted in the response to allow reviewers to easily locate the corresponding details in both the drainage report and the construction plans.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
	A revised Drainage Report with Appendix 10.4 will be provided to support the response to this comment. A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table (PDF page 895) that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report. The downstream receiving nodes of CD-5 are analyzed as 603-03OFF and TW 604-01 in the table. For discharge the downstream receiving node of CD-5 is analyzed as TW 604-01 DS.			
	Christopher Speese	1/28/2026	1	
	Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
21	COMMENT RESOLVED		170, 2176	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	verify maximum allowable discharge 0.15 cfs/acre, Verify existing channel can manage outfall volume			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	Per Florida Statute 335.02 (4) the State Highway System is exempted from County regulations applying to existing or future transportation facilities. The Collier County ordinance for maximum allowable discharge is not applicable to this project. The outfall ditch node is modeled as node 605-05 OFF and the design stage is 35.18' which is approximately 2.5' below the warning stage demonstrating that the channel to the upstream side of CD-5 can manage the outfall volume.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	Please provide the specific page numbers and sheet numbers needed to verify the model stage and discharge values in the drainage report. These references should be and clearly noted and specified in the response coupled with the drainage profiles and grades shown in the construction plans to confirm that the existing channel can adequately manage runoff associated with the proposed improvements.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
	With revisions incorporated into the StormWise modeling per SFWMD RAI comments, the stage in node 605-05 OFF is now 35.30' (Report PDF page 865). Node 605-05 OFF is represented as the remnant offsite ditch behind the Shared Use Path depicted on the right side of the Cross Section (Plans PDF page 191). The top of bank of the existing remnant channel appears to be approximately 38.00' as depicted in the cross section.			
	Christopher Speese	1/28/2026	1	
	Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
22	COMMENT RESOLVED		171	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	how will the 1:2 embankment side slope be stabilized?			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	1:2 embankment side slopes will be stabilized with plastic erosion mat and sod.			

CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
Provide detail or FDOT index and product specification for plastic erosion mat. Provide specific sheet numbers of detail or index annotation to verify response.			
Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
Plastic erosion mat is covered by FDOT Standard Specification 521 and a reference to plastic erosion mat utilization will be added to the Typical Sections (Plans PDF pages 12-26), where appropriate, to specify its use on slopes 1:2 or steeped.			
Christopher Speese	1/28/2026	1	
Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
23	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		173	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	How are side slopes stabilized?			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	All side slopes will be stabilized with sod.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/14/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
24	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		173, P-700	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	0.15 cfs/acre max allowable discharge			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	Per Florida Statute 335.02 (4) the State Highway System is excepted from County regulations applying to existing or future transportation facilities. The Collier County ordinance for maximum allowable discharge is not applicable to this project.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/14/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
25	COMMENT RESOLVED		173, 2234	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	Confirm downstream conveyance have adequate capacity			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	A comparative pre- and post-development discharge table that demonstrates the downstream conveyance has adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Table 4 of the drainage report. For the discharge from combined Basin 606/607 the pre- and post-development discharge was analyzed at the existing CD under SR 82. In the pre condition the CD receives 47.50 cfs of discharge and in the post condition the CD receives 41.13 cfs of discharge.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	Provide specific page numbers and sheet numbers to verify model stage and discharge in drainage report coupled with drainage profiles and grades in the construction plans has adequate capacity. All information must be clearly specified and noted in the response to allow reviewers to easily locate the corresponding details in both the drainage report and the construction plans.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
	A comparative pre- and post-development discharge table that demonstrates the downstream conveyance has adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Table 4 of the drainage report (PDF page 25). For the discharge from combined Basin 606/607 the pre- and post-development discharge was analyzed at the existing CD under SR 82 and the allowable peak discharge rate was obtained from existing ERP No. 11-03908-P. In the pre condition the CD receives 47.50 cfs of discharge and in the post condition the CD receives 41.13 cfs of discharge. The post discharge rate can also be obtained in the StormWise modeling results for TW 607 in Appendix 10.4 (PDF page 868).			
	Christopher Speese	1/28/2026	1	
	Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
26	COMMENT RESOLVED		175, 2133	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	10/9/2025	1	
	max allowable discharge of 0.15 cfs/acre, Demonstrate this flow will not adversely affect conveyance			
	Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1	
	Per Florida Statute 335.02 (4) the State Highway System is excepted from County regulations applying to existing or future transportation facilities. The Collier County ordinance for maximum allowable discharge is not applicable to this project. A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	11/20/2025	1	
	The County has noted that Appendix 10.4 is missing from the drainage report provided. Please submit an updated drainage report, include the specific page numbers, and sheet numbers necessary to verify model stage and discharge values. These references should be clearly noted and specified in the response with the drainage profiles and grades in the construction plans to demonstrate that the proposed flow will not adversely affect conveyance. All information must be clearly specified and noted in the response to allow reviewers to easily locate the corresponding details in both the drainage report and the construction plans.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/24/2025	1	
	A revised Drainage Report with Appendix 10.4 will be provided to support the response to this comment. A comparative pre- and post-development stage and discharge table (PDF page 895) that demonstrates that downstream waterbodies and project outfall locations have adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has been provided in Appendix 10.4 of the drainage report. Additionally, a comparative pre- and post-development discharge table that demonstrates the downstream conveyance has adequate capacity to accommodate the 25-yr/72-hr storm event has also been provided in Table 4 of the drainage report (PDF page 25). The StormWise modeling results to support the values in the tables can be located in the Drainage Report on PDF pages 862-888.			
	Christopher Speese	1/28/2026	1	
	Per direction from my supervisor, Sean Pugh, this comment is considered resolved at Phase 3. Collier County will have the opportunity to review and discuss any remaining concerns during the current 3R phase and the upcoming Phase 4. FDOT remains committed to continued coordination with Collier County on the SR 29 projects (Financial Project IDs 417540-5 and 417540-6) to ensure successful outcomes.			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Forestt	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
1	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Contamination Technical Memorandum	CONTAMINATION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Christopher Forestt	9/23/2025	1	
	There are known and potential contamination-related impacts to construction of this project.			
	Please review the attached Contamination Technical Memorandum and add the requested Potential Contamination Markings and NPDES note to plans.			
	Some of the markings may overlap with the FDPI 417540-5-52-01 project. It is the Design Team's prerogative as to how the markings are best incorporated.			
	Please respond to the comment with the plan sheets that will reflect the contamination information.			
	Thank you.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	We will add the note to the general notes sheet. Can we await the results of the Level II testing to avoid creating the Potential Contamination Marking sheets and then removing them later if no contamination is found?			
	Christopher Forestt	10/23/2025	1	
	That is an acceptable approach.			
	It should be noted that there will likely be at least some final markings needed on a project such as this with many potential sources.			
	Also, based on previous discussions with the PM, it was suggested that these concerns needed to be identified early; so, the memorandum was generated in this manner.			
	Thank you, Ken.			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Speese	IN-HOUSE PROJECT MANAGER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

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

Clifton Johnson	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Daniel Buidens	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Darryl Richard	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
DAVE HAY	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	4

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
33	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 17	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVE HAY	10/15/2025	1	
	In the U Turn Bulb-out area the paved shoulders get 2" of structural asphalt plus 3/4" of open graded friction course while the adjoining Bulb-out gets 2.5". If I correctly remember the structural numbers for structural asphalt is 0.40/inch and zero for open graded friction course. Therefore the Bulb-out structural number would be 0.20 more than the shoulder and was wondering why that would be done?			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	The U-Turn pavement thickness was increased by 0.5" to offset the lip from the FC-5 (that is only on the paved shoulder) from 3/4" to 1/4". It is not a structural/strength item, drop off only. The 1/4" lip leaves enough room for the water to drain from the bottom of the FC-5 across the U-Turn pavement.			
	DAVE HAY	10/29/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
34	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 45	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVE HAY	10/15/2025	1	
	Typical Section # 3 ends at station 109+28.79 which is on Sheet 46 and only shows 10' wide concrete for the Shared Use Path. However this page shows the Shared Use Path being asphalt starting 208+53.14. Would be helpful if there was a Detail on Typical Section # 3 showing the asphalt Shared Use Path starting at that station.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	Subsequent to the Phase III submittal, the concrete sidewalk within the roundabout is being changed to a shared use path which coincidentally will resolve the comment.			
	DAVE HAY	10/29/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
35	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 46 etc.	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVE HAY	10/15/2025	1	
	At structure S-126 and others it appears that a 10 x 10 concrete pad is to be used in the Shared Use Path. Is that the intent and if so a Detail showing it would be helpful.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	We will modify the text in the legend for concrete sidewalk. Yes, 10'x10' was intended with a thickened edge to mount the guiderail.			
	DAVE HAY	10/29/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
36	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 62	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
DAVE HAY	10/15/2025	1		
The structure at about station 2218+00 Lt. is not numbered. Per sheet 145 it should be S-602.				
Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1		
We will add the drainage structure number.				
DAVE HAY	10/29/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Desiree Davis	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Earl Taylor	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
32	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ACCESS MANAGEMENT
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Earl Taylor	10/15/2025	1		
Please show the 9" deflection behind the low pro barrier wall.				
Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1		
We will add the 9" dimension behind the low profile barrier on the various typical sections.				
Earl Taylor	10/23/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Edward Stevens	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elizabeth Sofsky	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
37	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			TRANSIT
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Elizabeth Sofsky	10/15/2025	1		
Roadway Plans, Sheet 25-26 – Previous comment: "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	10/29/2025	1		
We will change the slope of the shared use path to slope down to the outside/ away from the sidewalk to eliminate the potential for water pooling.				
Elizabeth Sofsky	11/12/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Eric Reese	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Garfield Howell	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	2
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
77	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Garfield Howell	10/17/2025	1		Traffic design has no signing and pavement marking comment at this time.
Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1		Thank you!
Garfield Howell	11/14/2025	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
78	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Garfield Howell	10/17/2025	1		Traffic design has no lighting comment at this time.
John Ramon	11/11/2025	1		Thank you.
Garfield Howell	11/14/2025	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
GENA BATMAN	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	INACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
3	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ESTIMATES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
GENA BATMAN	9/26/2025	1		Phase 52 Construction Cost is \$40,745,109.26 PDC based on Trns*Port quantities. See attached file.
Tammy Kreisle	10/8/2025	1		Thank you!
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
J.J. Wren	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jason Mobsby	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeanna Dean	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey Jacquin	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey James	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey M Jones	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jhamaul Hanner	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jimmy Vilce	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Kubicki	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Parker	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Ramon	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kaitlin Phillips	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Karina Della Sera	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Katharine Causey	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kayla Sapp	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Keith Robbins	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ken Muzyk	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
KENNETH YINGER	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	8

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
39	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1		
All previous comments for the documentation have been addressed. However, P S-125A still corresponds to the S-123 control structure for Pond 601A. Please review.				
Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1		
Link "P S-125A" in the StormWise model will be revised to be named "P 601 Control Str." We will verify the control structure information matches what is provided for S-123 in the plans.				
KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
40	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1		
SWF sheets: Please review sod limits on all ponds. The typical sections for the pond show the sod to terminate at the SHW / control elevation. Per SFWMD Rule the sod should extend 2' below the control. Please review.				
Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1		
We will review the sod limits depicted on the pond typical sections and revise them to meet the SFWMD rule that sod should extend 2' below the control elevation.				
KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
41	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF 601A:			
	a. DHW is listed at 34.25', but the top of skimmer is only listed at elevation 34.0'.			
	b. The outfall pipe does not provide the meet the minimum clearance to be precast. Can the pipe FL be adjusted.			
	c. Please note that the structure is shown to have a sump elevation, which is likely needed for stability. Please add a note for the proposed sump elevation structure and consider adding grout to the FL.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. Noted, we will review the DHW elevation and consider raising the skimmer to match.			
	b. The grate elevation will be raised to provide the minimum clearance to be a precast structure.			
	c. The sump is utilized to provide stability, however, grouting to the FL was not anticipated as discussion in Section 3.10 of the Drainage Manual regarding maintenance considerations notes that a four-foot sump in outfall structures is preferred.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
42	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF 602B:			
	a. DHW is listed at 33.74', but the top of skimmer is only listed at elevation 33.15'.			
	b. A 4-grate inlet is proposed. However, the proposed weirs on the grate seat would appear to not allow the grate to rest on anything. Please review and update.			
	c. Weir 2 width is listed as 40", but the short wall for a Type H is only 36". Please review.			
	d. The skimmer index is only applicable to Type C, D, or E inlets. Additional detail is needed for bracing / attachment of the skimmer if a Type H inlet is to be used.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. Noted, we will review the DHW elevation and consider raising the skimmer to match			
	b. Noted, we reviewed the weir openings and will reconfigure them to allow for a structural section on the DBI to hold the grate seat in place.			
	c. Weir 2 will be reviewed as part of the control structure design and will be modified to fit into the short wall for a DBI H. Initial calculations suggest Weir 2 may not be required with the design.			
	d. Additional detailing for the skimmer on the Type H structure will be provided in the plans. The intent is to utilize the a similar attachment design and layout as is shown in SPI 425-070.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
43	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF 603/604B:			
	a. DHW is listed at 34.88', but the top of skimmer is only listed at elevation 34.80'.			
	b. A 4-grate inlet is proposed. However, the proposed weir is almost the length of the type H. How will the grates be supported.			
	c. The skimmer index is only applicable to Type C, D, or E inlets. Additional detail is needed for bracing / attachment of the skimmer if a Type H inlet is to be used.			
	d. Does a sump elevation need to be provided for the control structure?			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. Noted, we will review the DHW elevation and consider raising the skimmer to match.			
	b. Noted, we reviewed the weir openings and will reconfigure them to allow for a structural section on the DBI to hold the grate seat in place.			
	c. Additional detailing for the skimmer on the Type H structure will be provided in the plans. The intent is to utilize the a similar attachment design and layout as is shown in SPI 425-070.			
	d. A sump elevation can be provided in the "Sump El." column on the the Structure Data Table.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
44	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF 605A:			
	a. DHW is listed at 37.11', but the top of skimmer is only listed at elevation 36.80'.			
	b. No skimmer shown in the isometric view.			
	c. A 4-grate inlet is proposed. However, the proposed weir is almost the length of the type H. How will the grates be supported?			
	d. The skimmer index is only applicable to Type C, D, or E inlets. Additional detail is needed for bracing / attachment of the skimmer if a Type H inlet is to be used.			
	e. Does a sump elevation need to be provided for the control structure?			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. Noted, we will review the DHW elevation and consider raising the skimmer to match.			
	b. Noted. The skimmer will be added to the isometric view.			
	c. Noted, we reviewed the weir openings and will reconfigure them to allow for a structural section on the DBI to hold the grate seat in place.			
	d. Additional detailing for the skimmer on the Type H structure will be provided in the plans. The intent is to utilize the a similar attachment design and layout as is shown in SPI 425-070.			
	e. A sump elevation can be provided in the "Sump El." column on the the Structure Data Table.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
45	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF 606A:			
	a. DHW is listed at 39.0', but the top of skimmer is only listed at elevation 38.80'.			
	b. No skimmer shown in any of the views.			
	c. The skimmer index is only applicable to Type C, D, or E inlets. Additional detail is needed for bracing / attachment of the skimmer if a Type H inlet is to be used.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. Noted, we will review the DHW elevation and consider raising the skimmer to match.			
	b. Noted. The skimmer will be added to the views.			
	c. Additional detailing for the skimmer on the Type H structure will be provided in the plans. We intend to provide detailing for the post mounting portion and also to detail that this skimmer will not be attached to the Type H inlet but will instead be embedded into the side slope.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
46	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	10/16/2025	1	
	SWF Attenuation Facility:			
	a. The skimmer is noted on the table, but not shown on the isometric view. However, if this is an attenuation only pond is a skimmer required?			
	b. Please specify the number of grates, 2-grates, 4 grates? Ensure weir configuration is consistent with the proposed grates.			
	c. The skimmer index is only applicable to Type C, D, or E inlets. Additional detail is needed for bracing / attachment of the skimmer if a Type H inlet is to be used.			
	Alan Eldridge	11/12/2025	1	
	a. The intent of the design is to include a skimmer in the attenuation pond as it is adjacent to the roadside and vulnerable to trash. The isometric view will be revised to include the skimmer.			
	b. The control structure table on the Attenuation Pond detail sheet will be revised to note "H - 4 grate", similar to the detail sheets for the other ponds. We will review the weir openings and will reconfigure them to allow for a structural section on the DBI to hold the grate seat in place.			
	c. Additional detailing for the skimmer on the Type H structure will be provided in the plans. The intent is to utilize the a similar attachment design and layout as is shown in SPI 425-070.			
	KENNETH YINGER	11/23/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Keri Nelson	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
27	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ACCESS MANAGEMENT
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Keri Nelson	10/13/2025	1		No Comment
Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1		Thank you for your review.
Keri Nelson	10/27/2025	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kimberly Warren	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kisan Patel	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kristin Caruso	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kyle Purvis	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Lawrence Zagardo	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Peronto	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Roberts	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marlene Hebert	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marshall Douberley	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
4	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Phase 2 Markups	TRAFFIC CONTROL
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Marshall Douberley	10/3/2025	1		Please see attached Phase 2 Redline Markups
Scott Judson	11/13/2025	1		<p>General Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We will verify all movements with AutoTURN - The -5 contract days are controlling, and the projects are to be let together. Our phasing is coordinated with the -5 project. - We will remove TCP general note 6 regarding the work zone PCMS and review the feasibility of note 9 regarding the drop off conditions. - The central roundabout island, truck apron and median islands on each leg are to be completed in phase III. The crosswalks will be staged with temporary pedestrian ways so the shared use paths along the project can be opened during phase III. The last two sheets of the TTCP showing this crosswalk staging were missing from the submittal. - The lighting sheets within the TCP are for temporary lighting, which is required for roundabout construction per FDM 240.2.2.15 <p>Phase I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -We would prefer to keep the barrels on far side of driveways to match the limits of temporary striping. We will verify if large vehicles are expected at each connection and provide additional space if justified. -We would prefer to keep at least one road closed sign on either end of each diversion per standard plan 102-608. <p>Phase IA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -We will add temp pedestrian ways to the TTCP typical in relevant phases. There are no existing sidewalks on SR 29 north of the New Market Intersection, and no existing crosswalks at this intersection. -We will note widths for temp lanes on Westclox St. in Phases IA and IB. - Labels for proposed sidewalk tying to existing can be found in the roadway plans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -We will add a stop sign and lane arrows to Heritage Blvd in PIA, and evaluate stop signs for other connections based on the existing and proposed final condition. -We will note the turn lane widths at sta. 2170 in Phase IA. -Phases IA, IB, II and IIA, the New Market Road intersection will have temporary signalization rather than stop signs. <p>Phase II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Please see primary roadway typical sections for shared use path dimensions. -We will label the 9" offset from back of low profile barrier to the edge of temporary asphalt.
Marshall Douberley	11/13/2025	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew A. Miller	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MD Rahman	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
30	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
MD Rahman	10/14/2025	1		Please provide a lane closure analysis.
Scott Judson	11/12/2025	1		A lane closure analysis was prepared and is attached to comment No 71. It was inadvertently omitted from the submittal.
MD Rahman	11/13/2025	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Megan Arp	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Meghan Croft	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

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

Melissa Slater	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Micah Smith	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michael Rima	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michelle Barker	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	7
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
5	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	Summary of Utility is missing from the EQR. Please add items for next submittal.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	There are no pay items included or planned for utility work. All utility work will be performed via utility work schedules and not included within the FDOT construction plans. Please advise if we misunderstood the comment.			
	Michelle Barker	10/28/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
6	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 48	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	This pay item (0515 2231) requires district approval. I do not see any special approvals in PSEE.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	We will change the pay item to 515-2-211 which is the standard 42" height Type railing.			
	Michelle Barker	10/27/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
7	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 71	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	Load 695 series pay items in Category 0200- Roadway in Transport for TMS per BOE. Please update Transport.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	We will move the traffic monitoring site pay item and quantities to Category 0200 - Roadway in Transport.			
	Michelle Barker	10/27/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
8	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 95	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	Transport has a total quantity of 1.460 for pay item 0711 16 101. Please verify.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/30/2025	1	
	Pay Item 0711-16-101 Transport total quantity will be revised to 1.466 GM to match Phase III EQR.			
	Michelle Barker	11/3/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
9	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Mark ups	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	Please see additional comment on uploaded document.			
	Ken Muzyk	10/22/2025	1	
	Thank you for your review.			
	Michelle Barker	10/27/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
10	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Key sheets	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	PSEE has "North" of New Market, but key sheet states "South." This is listed on all key sheets for all components. Please verify.			
	Tammy Kreisle	10/22/2025	1	
	The MP in PSEE will be changed to match the plans (MP 39.654) however per coordination with the Project Manager, since this project is Moving Florida Forward the official description in PSEE cannot be modified as it matches all MFF related items. We have confirmed with the PM that it is ok if the project description on the key sheets does not match the one in PSEE. Thank you for your review.			
	Michelle Barker	10/28/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
11	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 33	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	10/8/2025	1	
	Please make sure information is included for multi-column posts on guide sign worksheets .			
	Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1	
	Multi-column post information will be provided on the guide sign worksheets.			
	Michelle Barker	11/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michelle Rutishauser	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
47	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Rutishauser	10/16/2025	1	
	Note that a Construction Advertisement Re-evaluation is required. Please coordinate with myself and Jeff James in EMO to schedule a re-evaluation methodology meeting. The re-evaluation process can take 6-9 months to complete, with the expectation to be completed prior to the project's Production Date. Thank you.			
	Tammy Kreisle	11/4/2025	1	
	Coordination is underway.			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nathan Poole	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	4
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
48	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Temporary Signalization (All TTCP Phases)	SIGNALIZATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nathan Poole	10/16/2025	1		
	With the skew of the side street approaches during each of the TTCP Phases with the temporary signal, it is recommended that the signal operations for each TTCP Phase be revised to SOP 9 (split side street). With this recommended change, the Min Green, Extension, Max I, Detector Cross Switch, and Dual Entry rows should be populated as necessary to ensure the required parameters are programmed by the Contractor. In addition, it is recommended that the eastbound approach leads, and the westbound approach lags with the split operations. The signal head configuration for the side street approaches would need to be updated as well.			
Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1		
	All TTCP Phases will be updated to SOP 9 as requested with eastbound leading and westbound lagging.			
Nathan Poole	11/12/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
49	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheets 255 and 261	SIGNALIZATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nathan Poole	10/16/2025	1		
	With the proposed overlap in this phasing, please include a chart detailing the required parameters for the proposed overlap. I've attached an example to this comment.			
Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1		
	Overlap phasing details will be included as necessary for Phase IA and IB TTCP.			
Nathan Poole	11/12/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
50	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet S-6	SIGNALIZATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nathan Poole	10/16/2025	1		
	With the new CCTV camera site, please include a CCTV Camera Site Installation Detail, a Typical Wiring Diagram, and a Typical CCTV Camera Cabinet Detail. In addition, please ensure the strain pole schedule is detailed in the plans as required by the Index 641-010 SPI and FDM Section 942.7.			
Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1		
	CCTV camera information and strain pole schedule will be provided on detail sheet.			
Nathan Poole	11/12/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
51	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet S-6	SIGNALIZATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nathan Poole	10/16/2025	1		
	The wireless communications device being relocated (pay item 684-6-4) is a point-to-point wireless communications device that requires line of sight with a receiving wireless communications device. Please confirm that line of sight is being obtained with the new device location.			
Tucker Ammerman	11/10/2025	1		
	Proposed location of wireless communication system will be in line with current location to ensure line of sight is maintained with the other device at Lake Trafford Road signal.			
Nathan Poole	11/12/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments

Nicole Marino	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nicole Monies	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
2	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nicole Monies	9/23/2025	1		
a) SFWMD permit application has been submitted and coordination is ongoing.				
b) It was deemed no USACE is needed. The non-WOTUS memo has been provided to FDOT to support this determination.				
c) If there have been any changes that will affect environmental permitting, please coordinate with the Permits Office Nicole.Monies@dot.state.fl.us Activities included but not limited to: keyhole & sidewalk additions or widening, additional impacts to the SWMS (ditches), expanding the limits of construction, or impacting wetlands that were previously unaffected, ect.				
Tammy Kreisle	10/8/2025	1		
Any changes that impact environmental permitting activities will be coordinated with Nicole Monies.				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nikki Gilmer	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Patrick Bateman	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Paul Simmons	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ramasamy Venkatesan	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	2

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
28	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Ramasamy Venkatesan	10/14/2025	1		
Pond 605 A has only two shallow borings. May need more borings if this pond is considered further.				
Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1		
Noted. We will review the collected pond boring data and discuss if any additional information is recommended with the geotechnical engineer.				
Ramasamy Venkatesan	11/6/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
29	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Ramasamy Venkatesan	10/14/2025	1		
Suggest showing the soil borings in the pond/stormwater facilities cross sections				
Alan Eldridge	11/4/2025	1		
Soil borings will be depicts on the pond cross sections where applicable.				
Ramasamy Venkatesan	11/6/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
RENJAN JOSEPH	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Richard Matthews	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0

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

Ryan Molloy	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Samantha Ervin	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Ellis	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Judson	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Sean Pugh	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Sergio Figueroa	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Shiva Moonian	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Stu Myers	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tammy Kreisle	CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Todd Boehmer	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tucker Ammerman	LEAD DESIGNER	11/14/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
VIVIANNE PENA RODRIGUEZ	REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wayne Shelton	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wendy Sands	LEAD REVIEWER	10/17/2025	ACTIVE	0