

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
16.00	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.201	100	100.1		Given the odd naming convention for three parts (1, 2, 9) should it be clarified that Part 3 to 8 are not used?	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. Added to end of paragraph that "Parts 3 through 8 are reserved for future use."	
39.00	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		100	100 - 1st paragraph		1-FDM 100: Introduction: In the first paragraph (Purpose) recommend to add "other" projects (for consistency with FDM 103) to read: ".....for all new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and other projects on the State Highway System.....".	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.10	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		100	100 - Design Speed		Design Speed: For Low Speed, it should clarify: Design Speeds of 45 mph to greater than 35 mph (since Very Low Speed is defined to be 35 mph and less).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.20	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		100	100 Procedure		Production Date: Revise from FDM 301.2.5 to FDM 901.2.5.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.30	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		100	100 Shoulder Break		Delete the shoulder values of 0.05, 0.06 to read: ".....where the full-width shoulder slope "breaks" to a front slope of 1:X." (since shoulder widths vary).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.40	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.202	100	100		In the definition of Turnpike Projects, capitalize Turnpike.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edit made in FDM 102 Glossary.	
21.00	Alexander Yl	alex.yl@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.007	103	103.1	Form 122-A	This form is being submitted with electronic signed and seal by the Responsible Professional Engineer. It is missing the electronic signature note and company information as per FDM 130.3. Since the form is electronically signed, the dates and the names can be removed from the signature lines. The electronic signature contains both the name of the person signing and the date it was signed.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: This form is not required to be submitted with electronic sign and seal.	
21.10	Alexander Yl	alex.yl@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.178	103	103.1	Form 126-A	Add "Project Design Variation Memorandum and Formal Design Variations"	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: This is already covered on Form 126-A.	
26.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.007	103	103.1	FORM 122-A	CONSIDER PLACING A BLANK LINE ADJACENT TO "OTHER" FOR INPUT INTO WHAT "OTHER" IS.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Change made	
26.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.007	103	103.1	FORM 122-B	CONSIDER INCLUDING OTHER CHECK BOX SIMILAR TO REVISION OF FORM 122-A	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Change made	
26.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.178	103	103.1	FORM 126-C	LANE REPURPOSING FORM ONLY INCLUDES EXISTING POSTED SPEED, PROPOSED POSTED SPEED, DESIGN SPEED, AND TARGET SPEED. CONSIDERING INCLUDING EXISTING DESIGN SPEED, AND PROPOSED DESIGN SPEED.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: No change made. The proposed design speed should be equal to the Target speed. There is a place provided for existing design speed.	
37.00	Judy Solaun-Gonzalez	judy.solaun@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.007	103	103	122A, 122B, form 240, etc	Some forms are now including a check box for "other" type of project in addition to "RRR" or "New Construction". This was added to some forms but not to others. Example 122A has it but 122B does not.	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Forms will be updated.	
63.0	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.178	103	103	Form 126-B	For the From: Field Signature Designee – Change "District Lane Elimination Coordinator" to "District Lane Repurposing Coordinator".	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: Change made.	
37.10	Judy Solaun-Gonzalez	judy.solaun@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.327	104	104.3 and 104.4		It seems like there are no differences between the level of design and construction activities between CAP levels 3 and 4. Should there be differences for these two (Cap level 3 and 4) in terms of activities and if not, can we consolidate into CAP levels 1 2 and 3?	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: No changes are proposed for this chapter in 2023. This new edit can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
26.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.028	110	110.5		REVISED FUNCTIONAL AREAS INCLUDE "TURNPIKE CONCEPTS"	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DC: No change made - language as stated in comment.	
26.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		110	110.5.2.2		IN D6, PROJECTS REPLACING EXPANSION JOINTS ON BRIDGES HAVE REQUIRED ASBESTOS SURVEY AND/OR ABATEMENT. CONSIDER INCLUDING EXPANSION JOINT REPLACEMENT TO LIST.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: This is a new edit that can be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
37.20	Judy Solaun-Gonzalez	judy.solaun@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.028	110	110.5		The functional areas listed include "traffic plans" . In my opinion, it should state "Traffic design" or "Signing and Pavement Markings and traffic Signals". "Program management" should also be listed as a functional area to be coordinated with.	DeWayne Carver		Y	DDC: Add to DDE/DCPME Face to Face Agenda.	Y
53.0	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	F.326	110	110.4.1		I see no redline changes in the posted document.	Dave Amato	Yes		The red line revisions are shown in FDM 110.4.1 as follows: "Coordinate with Product Evaluation if the Sole Sourcing affects a product category included on the Approved Product List (APL.)"	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
55.30	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson@dot.state.fl.us	District 3		110	F.326	FDM 110.4.1	FDM 110.4.1 – Do not see any redlines for this section. It is noted in the summary of revisions that some clarification was provided for this section. Is the lack of redlines an oversight?	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: Redlines have been uploaded.	
26.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.183	111	111.7		SECTION DISCUSSED PROCESS OF INPUTTING AND LOCKING DDD MODULE FOR CONVENTIONAL PROJECTS. NOTE FDM 901.4.6 REFERS NON-CONVENTIONAL PROJECTS TO 111.7. CONSIDER INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS/GUIDANCE FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL PROJECTS.	Andrew Gormley	Yes	Y	No change. Conventional and non-conventional do not apply within this context. The language in the FDM states the submittal of project documentation is required for all projects	
37.30	Judy Solaun-Gonzalez	judy.solaun@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.001	111	111.3		Remove extra space before 1) and Roadway	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Formatting will be revised.	
53.1	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	F.325	112	112.2		Redline changes are not shown.	Dave Amato	Yes		Agreed. The red line revisions are shown in FDM 112.2.	
2.00	L. Wetherell	leslie.wetherell@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.223	114	114		1: Additional changes to FDM 114 were made that are different than the 22-01 bulletin. Consider revising revision summary to reflect that "...the bulletin 22-01 changes were incorporated with additional clarification...". Consider making certain items MUST/SHALL conditions, such as resurfacing the roadway, ADA, with the remaining items as SHOULD conditions.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. There was a QC error in the file which has been resolved. Thanks for the catch!	
5.00	Scott Peterson	scott.peterson@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		114	114.1.1		Suggest splitting this list into 2 sections: "must include" things like #4, 5, 7, & 8 and "should consider" things like #'s 2, 3 & 9.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		DDC: Additional FDM 114 edits are on hold.	
26.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		114	114.2.2		AS WE MOVE TO MODEL CENTRIC PLANS, WE WILL BEING MOVING AWAY FROM LEVEL 1 AND 2 AND NEED MORE ROBUST SURVEY. HAS DEPARTMENT LOOKED AT MODIFYING SURVEY GUIDELINES AS WE CHANGE OUR PLAN DELIVERY FOR ALL PROJECTS?	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
26.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		114	114.3.2.6		SECTION IDENTIFIES NEED TO DOCUMENT DECISIONS AND DESIGN PROCESS. HOWEVER, THIS DOES NOT SEEM TO BE REQUIRED AS DOCUMENTATION FOR FINAL DELIVERABLES IN 111.7. CONSIDER SPECIFYING NEED TO UPLOAD DOCUMENTS IN 111.7.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.50	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		114	114.1.4		In the first paragraph, add "(section 7.8.5)" for the FPDM; afterwards add: "Also, refer to Work Program Instructions (Chapter 27)".	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
49.0	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.011	114	114	Entire Chapter	Proposed Edits provided by e-mail to Gevin McDaniel 7/27/22 3:52 PM	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: Edits to FDM 114 are on hold.	
49.1	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.011	114	114.2.1		If R/W acquisition is involved will schedule be extended on budget provided. It is very difficult to define R/W needs and acquire R/W within two years	DeWayne Carver	Yes		DDC: Edits to FDM 114 are on hold.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
10.0	Steve McCarty	steve.mccarty@atkinsglobal.com	Atkins		115	115.2		<p>Consider adding a requirement for EORs to reference a specific standard plan index in every plan note and plan callout for items of work.</p> <p>FDM 115.2 currently requires that "The Engineer of Record (EOR) must determine the appropriate application of Standard Plans for each project" but doesn't include specifics of how the EOR is to reference these design elements in the plans.</p> <p>The most concerning current trend in this vein is that some designs are merely indicating 'see index 102-600' in the Temporary Traffic Control Plan notes. While construction personnel may utilize 102-600 series indexes to address MOT issues that arise on projects, they should not be tasked with choosing TTCP design elements from day-one of the project. Additionally, the EOR doesn't know if the TTCP is functional unless they have tested specific 102-600 indexes with the required work. If they have tested specific 102-600 indexes with the required work, then it should be easy enough to reference the appropriate indexes to be used and in which scenarios to use them.</p> <p>Some EORs include a specific index reference in every plan note and plan callout for items of work. (good). Other EORs rarely reference specific indexes and react negatively to plan review comments to add them (bad). This leaves it open as to which index is to be used. Granted, if a callout is for guardrail, one would hope that Consider adding anticipated usage comments. I.e. Use of this item beyond the requirements of Specification 108-2.1.2 is seldom required and generally limited to structures with questionable foundation in close proximity, but outside the limits specified in 108-2.1.2</p>	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. These are new proposed FDM edits submitted after the June 30 deadline. These will be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
54.0	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.017	117	117.2		<p>Consider adding clarification that the quantity is 1 per project not 1 per location.</p>	DeWayne Carver			Agreed. Edits made. This language is associated with bridge widening projects where piles are driven in close proximity to existing bridge piles with short piles or shallow foundations (not very common)	Y
54.1	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	New Item	117	117.4		<p>Consider adding usage notes. Consider modifying the second sentence to : Groundwater monitoring for this purpose is not common and typically associated with significant dewatering operations in areas of karst conditions where limestone and artesian springs are present. Concurrence to utilize this pay item must be obtained from the District Geotechnical Engineer. Also, add a statement to Paragraph 2 that the quantity should be one per project vs. one per each location.</p>	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is a new edit. It can be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
15.10	James E. Beverly	JamesE.Beverly@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	P1.001	120	120.2.3.3 Typical Section Sheet		<p>Recommend revising "electronic toll point" to "toll site" as this term is defined in the GTR.</p>	Paul Hiers	Yes		Agreed. Edits made.	
16.50	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3	Bullet 5	<p>Is Toll Equip building, gantry and foundation outlines intended as a separate bullet, or is it meant to clarify bullet 4 for what to show at the "electronic toll point"?</p>	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. Bullet 4 deleted. Information provided in FDM 913.	
16.60	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3	Bullet 6	<p>"New or widened bridges": what about an existing bridge (neither "new" nor "widened") that requires a traffic railing retrofit upgrade?</p>	Paul Hiers		Y	No change. Bridge sections are necessary to show the typical section elements (lane/shoulder width, total width) are appropriate and consistent with connecting roadway.	Y
16.70	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	n/a	120	120.3.2.(2). (a)		<p>Understand this is not revised for 2023, but the text looks wrong...the "and full submittal" appears to be errant on (a), but is intended as shown on (b).</p>	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Updated for consistency with FDM 121.	
26.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3		<p>CONSIDER INCLUDING TYPICAL SECTION FOR MINOR EXISTING BRIDGE MODIFICATIONS.</p>	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. Bridge sections are necessary to show the typical section elements (lane/shoulder width, total width) are appropriate and consistent with connecting roadway. If the minor improvement changes these typical section elements due to widening, then a typical should be included. These are plans details and not typical sections.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
36.3	Craig Bostic	cbostic@bcce	BCC Engineering		120	FDM 120 Design Submittals and FDM 113.3.2 Reconstruction Projects with Anticipated Right of Way Requirements)	Figure 120.1.1 List of Requests and Contacts - Sheet 1 of 2 - Item C Geotechnical	Item C lists, "Phase III review if unsuitable soils exist.". Subsoil removal may impact ROW needs and ROW determination is required at Phase II and to complete at Phase III (see FDM 113.3.2 Reconstruction Projects with Anticipated Right of Way Requirements)	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: Item not a proposed edit. Will be considered for 2024 FDM.	
53.2	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3 Typical Section Sheet		If widened and new bridges are added, existing bridges should be included as well.	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. Bridge sections are necessary to show the typical section elements (lane/shoulder width, total width) are appropriate and consistent with connecting roadway. They should only be included when the typical section elements are changed. DDC: Discuss at DDE/DCPME meeting. This could potentially be a much larger number of bridges -- does that matter? yes - each typ sect costs money to produce. More to the point they are not needed. PH: No change. Bridge sections are necessary to show the typical section elements (lane/shoulder width, total width) are appropriate and consistent with connecting roadway. If the minor improvement changes these typical section elements due to widening, then a typical should be included. These are plans details and not typical sections.	
54.2	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas	District 7	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3		Consider, New, Widened or re-striped bridges.	DeWayne Carver				Y
54.3	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas	District 7	New	120	120.2.3.3		Consider Changing Current Year to Traffic Count Baseline Year (or something more concise). We receive conflicting comments to update this year each time the Typical Section is updated.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is new edit that will be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
58	Gabor Chiorean	gabor.chiorean@dot.state.fl.us			120	120.2.3.3		120.2.3.3 Typical Section Sheet -> Typical Section (2) [Redline Page 143 of 356] Update to include facility owner and size. Suggested re-write in Blue - "(2) Show and label owner and utility size for major underground utilities, such as Florida Gas Transmission (FGT) only when the utility is a primary design constraint. Dimension location to the center of utility from the Centerline or Baseline of Construction."	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change.	
64.3	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.276	120	120.2.3.3		FDM 120.2.3.3 (2) addition "Show and label major underground utilities, such as Florida Gas transmission (FGT) only when the utility is a primary design constraint. Dimension location to center of utility from the Centerline or Baseline of Construction.", this is no longer needed since the FDM 913.2 is deleting this requirement. See FDM 913.2.2 mark up (F.294).	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. Showing major utilities that present a design constraint is required. Edites were made to FDM 120 and FDM 913 for clarity and consistency.	
56.00	Seth Gay	seth.gay@dot.s	District 3	P1.012	120	120.2.3.3		New or widened bridges have been added to the list for new typical sections. We typically ask for existing bridges as well so we can verify the shoulder widths.	Dave Amato Paul Hiers	Yes		No Change. They should only be included when the typical section elements are changed. The lane and shoulder widths of existing structures is known. (existing bridge plans, bridge inspection reports). A typical section that shows nothing but existing conditions is not warranted or desirable. Note - 2 hours per typical @ \$175 per hour is \$350 for something that is identified during scoping and not needed in this package.	
16.80	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.269	121	121.3.1.(6)		"Steel truss pedestrian bridges satisfying FDM 266.4": consider rewording....technically a steel ped bridge "satisfies FDM 266.4" even if one of the 5 bullet criteria are not met by providing full details in the contract plans.....reword this bullet to clarify whether the ped bridge is Cat 1 vs Cat 2 based on the criteria in 266.4	DeWayne and Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Text has been updated.	
13.20	Alfredo Rodriguez	alfredo.rodrigu	Turnpike		122	122.5		If the adoption of the 2018 AASHTO Green book is applicable why is the 2011 version referenced in section 122.5?	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed.The year has been chaged to 2018 for the AASHTO Green Book: A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets.	
16.13	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.026	122	122.7.4	Table 122.7.1	A line was added for Design Variation for Noise Walls on bridges and walls, but no X was provided in the table to designated signature requirements.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. This has been corrected.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
21.20	Alexander Yi	alex.yi@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.026	122	122.7.4		According to FDM Table 122.7.1, Lateral Offset Variations for Category 2 Structures require approval from the State Structures Design Engineer. FDM 122.7.4 does not list Lateral Offset Variations for Category 2 Structures under State Structures Design Engineer as a required signature.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y		
29.00	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.026	122	122.7.4	Table 122.7.1	Table 122.7.1 added a new row for DV for noise walls on bridges and retaining walls; however the column for the State Structures Design Engineer Approval has an "X" when open the document from some computers and has no "X" from other computers. Is there compatibility issue?	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Table 122.7.1 does not actually require the indicated approval. No change made.	
36.0	Craig Bostic	cbostic@bcceng.com	BCC Engineering		122	122.7.4	Table 122.7.1	Signature Requirements (Cont.) - page 122	Jeffrey Cicerello	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: There was an error in the original redline posting, It has been corrected to show the X.	
60.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		122	122.5.9.2		A written evaluation of the vertical clearance deficiency and recommendation by the State Office of Maintenance is required and should be attached to all Vertical Clearance Variations and Exceptions. Confirm if this statement is accurate. Is state office of maintenance performing an evaluation and recommendation for all vertical clearance variations? Does this include ancillary structures?	Karina Fuentes	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: This was corrected after redlines were released. Good catch.	
64.4	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.026	122	122.7.4	Table 122.7.1	No one is marked on who should approve the Noise walls on bridges and retaining walls	DeWayne Carver	Yes		DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
55.00	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson@dot.state.fl.us	District 3	F.188	122	FDM 122.5		FDM 2023 will adopt the 2018 AASHTO Green Book. There is at least one place in the proposed 2023 FDM that references the 2011 AASHTO Greenbook (FDM 122.5).	Dave Amato Jacque Morris	Yes		Agreed. DDC: This was an error in the redline. Now shows approval by the State Structures Design Engineer.	
55.10	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson@dot.state.fl.us	District 3		122	FDM 122.4 (6)(a)(i)		FDM 122.4 (6)(a)(i) - Consider providing some parameters for crash history evaluation with respect to "current date of analysis." "Current date of analysis" lends itself to a wide range of interpretation.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. Will verify all references to AASHTO Green Book are updated to reflect the 2018 release.	
55.20	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson@dot.state.fl.us	District 3		122	FDM Form 122-B (Design Variation Memo)		Consider revising FDOT Form 122-B (Design Variation Memo) to comply with FDM 130.3.1 with respect to digital signing and sealing of other documents. o Appropriate signature block on first page of the document per FDM 130.3.1.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		DDC: This will be considered for 2024 FDM	
53.3	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	F.319 & 320 & 32	123	123	Engineering Design Estir	There are no redlines in this entire chapter.	Dave Amato	Yes		DDC: This will be considered for the 2024 FDM	
37.40	Judy Solaun-Gonzalez	judy.solaun@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.020	124	124.2.1		Calculations is not listed in the example provided for the staffing plans. Only plans components are included. Shouldn't we add "calculations" in that list?	Rob Quigley	Yes	Y	Agreed. The red line revisions are shown in FDM 123	
39.60	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		124	124.4.5		QA/QC Management Plan (Digital Review Process): It appears that the section number should be 124.4.4 (previous section is 124.4.3).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	DDC: The example shown is just an example plan. Other elements can certainly be included. No change made.	
54.4	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P1.020	124	124.2.1		Consider adding , unless otherwise approved by the Department PM. as to "equal qualification (i.e. may not need a 30 year exp. staff if a 30 year staff was performing something a 10 year staff could have done.)	DeWayne Carver			Agreed. DDC: Revised chapter as indicated.	
56.10	Seth Gay	seth.gay@dot.state.fl.us	District 3	P1.020	124	124.2.1		Do we have authority to dictate qualifications of "replacement staff" to a consultant? Have we ever made a statement like this in our PPM or FDM in the past? Is that not something more suited for a Scope of Services if it is determined that it is appropriate?	Paul Hiers			DDC: Add to DDE/DCPME Face to Face Agenda.	Y
39.70	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		126	126.2		Section 126.2 (requirements): Under analyses of impacts, should add: "Impacts to the existing roadway pavement to remain in use." (unless it has been absolutely determined that the remaining pavement can handle the projected traffic).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	DDC: Discuss at DDE/DCPME Face to Face. FDOT has general authority to plan, construct, operate, and maintain the state highway system. Where is the indication that FDOT lacks the required authority in question?	Y
47.00	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		126	126.2		(requirements): In the first paragraph, clarify what if the governing criteria should be FDOT criteria; accordingly,	Karina Fuentes	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
53.4	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	F.323	128	128.3	FDOT Responsibilities	No redlines in document.	Dave Amato	Yes		Agreed. The red line revisions are shown in FDM 128	
44.00	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		131	131	2	Add 11x17 may be required.		Yes		DDC: New Edit - will be considered for FDM 2024. Bogus F. numbers have been deleted.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
53.5	Kathy Thomas	kathy.thomas@dot.state.fl.us	District 2	F.324	131	131.2		No redlines included.	Dave Amato	Yes		Agreed. The red line revisions are shown in FDM 131	
7.00	Kevin Stewart	Kevin.Stewart@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.242	151	151.2.1.1		"For naming the component pdf file(s), use the original file name with a "-REV##" suffix after the file type." I believe FDOT means to say place the REV## after the file name. File type is the .pdf, so the instructions as is would be .pdfREV1	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits made to clarify.	
11.00	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		151	151	1. 151.2 Post Let Revisions	The Construction PM needs to be made aware of post-let revisions prior to step (6) within this defined process. By the time a post-let revision is identified, the project should already have an assigned CEI who is actively preparing for work to begin and must develop a work order or supplemental agreement package for inclusion into the contract. Additionally, on multiple recent projects, post-let revisions have interfered with the ability to process Cost Savings Initiatives in a timely manner due to overlap of work scopes. Coordination with the Construction PM earlier in the drafting process may assist in alleviating these issues. It should be clarified in step (2) that the EOR "delivers it (the draft revision package) to the Design PM and Construction PM." It is also recommended for Step (3) to explicitly identify the ERC distribution list to include the Construction PM. It is also recommended to provide exceptions to a full ERC review period for limited complexity revisions.	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. The text provides a general flow to inform the EOR of their responsibilities. Each district will further refine this workflow.	
22.00	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		In proposed Section 151.2 Post-Let Revisions, the introductory paragraph indicates, "... including any necessary reviews (typically conducted using ERC)." However, the subsequent steps seem to only allow reviews using ERC. Construction progress can be impacted by anything that slows down the revision process. I would recommend continuing the e-mail distribution of both reviews and final plans, in order to expedite the process. (submitted for Rob Cables)	Paul Hiers	Yes		Agreed. Text modified to make use of ERC optional. Districts typically use ERC, but when revisions are minor they distribute for comment via email.	
22.10	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		The 2022 version (attached), makes reference to FDM 130 (Signing and Sealing Documents). The proposed version eliminates this reference. As an FYI, the 2022 Section 132 (PS&E Submittal Package Revisions) also makes reference to FDM 130. I would recommend keeping this reference in the proposed 2023 version of Section 151. (submitted for Rob Cables)	Paul Hiers	Yes		Agreed. Reference to 130 added.	
22.20	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		Section 151.2, clearly differentiates the Design PM and the Construction PM. This is additional clarification that was not in the 2022 version. However, Section 151.3 of the proposed version uses the term "Department's Project Manager." I would recommend being consistent with the nomenclature used earlier in the proposed section by changing this to "Design Project Manager." (Submitted for Rob Cables)	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. Language was intentional. With design build the PM could be from design or construction.	
22.30	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		Section 151.2.1.2 (BIM Files) discusses the requirement to have a Signature Sheet. However, there is nothing showing what is required on this sheet. This is where reference to FDM 130 would be helpful, as FDM 130 then references FDM 303 for the Signature Sheet requirements. (Submitted for Rob Cables)	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. FDM 913 provides information for revised Signature Sheets.	
22.40	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		151	151, 240		We have been seeing an increasing number of Alternate Traffic Control Plans. As you know, the Contractor is required to provide signed and sealed plans that comply with the FDM. One source of confusion during the ATCP process, is how to number the plan sheets. Some ATCP's replace the entire original Traffic Control Plan. While others only replace portions or phases. Revising sheet per sheet does not always work well. I would recommend including a section in this chapter of the FDM to address how to handle ATCP's.	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. This is a good suggestion and will be considered for 2024 FDM.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
22.50	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		I would prefer that the Design PM and/or EOR send the Plan Revisions via Email/File Transfer to the Construction Project Team like we do right now. If its just in PSEE then the Construction PM would need to download and File Transfer to the CCEI Project Team. However, I would like to incorporate that the Construction Engineer be copied when Plan Revisions are processed so we are also in the loop. (Submitted for Christian Rojas)	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. CEI, as department representative, will be provided access to PSEE. It is important that the revisions package be captured in PSEE. District may post to PSEE and concurrently send to construction via email.	
22.60	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151		Comment from Nick Klein- Is there a minimum time frame to be specified for response of comments so that the revisions are not delayed?	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. This is outlined in CPAM.	
23.00	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.242	151	151.2(5)		Recommend Design PM uploading into PSEE AND sending the revision package via email to the Construction PM. This will speed up the revision process while maintaining the electronic record on PSEE.	Paul Hiers	Yes		No change. CEI, as department representative, will be provided access to PSEE. It is important that the revisions package be captured in PSEE. District may post to PSEE and concurrently send to construction via email.	
23.10	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		151	151		Consider including the District CADD Manager as a notification in PSEE when the revision package is uploaded so that they can upload into Vault.	Paul Hiers	Yes		Agreed. Edits made to clarify.	
26.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.218	151	151.2		UNDERSTANDING THAT POST-LET REVISIONS MAY IMPACT CONSTRUCTION TIME/SCHEDULE, IS IT PRACTICAL TO INCLUDE AN ERC REVIEW OF POST-LET REVISIONS? MAKE THIS OPTIONAL BY DISTRICT REQUIREMENT.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	Agreed. Text modified to make use of ERC optional. Districts typically use ERC, but when revisions are minor they distribute for comment via email.	
34.14	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.242	151	151.2		WE HAVE NOTICED IN OUR DISTRICT THAT CONSTRUCTION TEAM DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE PS&E MODULE. IN ORDER FOR ALL TO VIEW DOCUMENTS, PSEE SETTINGS SHOULD BE CHANGED STATEWIDE.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. Giving access to FDOT Construction PM and CEI lead to PSEE module is new process. Some districts have been doing this for many months.	
34.15	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.242	151	151.2		CONSIDER UPDATING CADD FILES TO DISTRICT CADD MANAGER AT PROJECT COMPLETION.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits made to clarify.	
44.10	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@	Central Office		151	151.2.1		When does the EOR check for conflict with the utilities with the changes?	Paul Hier	Yes		When making changes to the model, or design files. Bogus F. numbers have been deleted.	
48.0	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.242	151	FDM 151.2		Post-let revisions are often needed with urgency, especially with current market demands and shortages. ERC review to process revisions may result in delays and added costs. Consider leaving this to the discretion of the District (DDE or specific discipline designee) or Design PM (with input from technical advisors) based on the circumstances of the need for revision.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No Change. Text modified to make use of ERC optional. Districts typically use ERC, but when revisions are minor they distribute for comment via email.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
11.10	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		152	152	Section 152 Shop Drawing Submittals	It is unclear if submittals by the Contractor's EOR for Cost Savings Initiatives qualify under the designation of "When the... Contractor's Engineer of Record is required by the Contract Plans and Specifications to perform a portion of the design of the project." A section clearly defining the original design EOR's scope of review on CSI submittals by a contractor may help alleviate disputes during construction. There tend to be disputes regarding matters of professional opinion between designers, and it may be beneficial to limit the scope of review similarly to what is described in Section 152.6: "(1) The Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record is prequalified with the Department as such to design and prepare the submittal. (2) The Shop Drawings are correctly signed and sealed by the Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record. (3) The Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record understands the intent of the design and utilizes the correct specified criteria. (4) The configuration set forth in the submittal is consistent with that of the Contract Documents. (5) The Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record's methods, assumptions and approach to the design are in keeping with accepted engineering practices. (5) The Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record's methods, assumptions and approach to the design are in keeping with accepted engineering practices. (6) The Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record's design does not contain any gross inadequacies. CONSIDER ADDING FOOTNOTE FOR APPLICATION OF MEDIAN WIDTH ON RRR'S. TYPICALLY IF YOU HAVE LANE WIDTH VARIATION YOU ALSO NEED MEDIAN WIDTH. IS INTENT TO DO BOTH VARIATIONS, OR CAN WE HAVE FOOTNOTE INDICATING IF YOU HAVE MULTIPLE DEFICENCIES (LANE WIDTH, SEPARATOR WIDTH, MEDIAN WIDTH), YOU ONLY NEED TO DO ONE VARIATION?	DeWayne Carver	Yes			
26.12	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		201	201.3.1	TABLE 210.3.1		DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	DDC: This is a new edit that will be considered for FDM 2024.	
44.20	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@	Central Office		201	201.1	5	Add Utility Impact		Yes		DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM. DDC: New Edit - will be considered for FDM 2024. Bogus F. numbers have been deleted.	
54.5	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	New	201	201.3 (and anywhere else this may apply)		Clarify Current Year vs. Data Collection Year	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No Change. May be covered in other documents referenced in 201.3, but edits here will require multi-office coordination. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
55.70	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson	District 3		201	FDM 201	Table 201.5.1	FDM Table 201.5.1 – Will the change mentioned in the last DDE meeting regarding SIS minimum design speed in a C4 context class be implemented in the 2023 FDM?	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: Yes, this will be incorporated.	
90.01	Jenna Bowman	jenna.bowman@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.362	201	201.5.1	Table 201.5.1	Revised SIS minimum design speeds for C6, C5, C4, C3 and C2T.	DeWayne Carver			Agreed. Change made in FDM 201. Assigned as F.362	Y
5.10	Scott Peterson	scott.peterson@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		210	210.4.6		6 Consider re-wording sentence to "Otherwise, use of profiled thermoplastic for flexible pavements must be approved by the..."	Gevin	Yes		DDC: Changes are being reviewed through a draft roadway bulletin.	
11.50	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		210	210	Section 210.4.3 Limits of Friction Course on Paved Shoulders, 211.3.2 Median Crossovers	Please consider referencing Section 4.3, and Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 of the FDOT Flexible Pavement Design Manual to clarify the placement limits of OGFC on median crossovers and accel/decel lanes. This is a commonly overlooked issue since the implementation of this requirement in the FDOT FPDM and the FDM does not address the issue within the arterials section.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This new edit can be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
13.00	Alfredo Rodriguez	alfredo.rodrigu	Turnpike		210	210.10.2.1		This section removes the 2011 (year) from the AASHTO Green book reference but does not provide the version to be used. The updates in FDM 211 do show the 2018 (year) edition as being adopted.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. This sentence is providing some history on the change in object height. The object height changed from 6 inches to 2 feet in the 2001 AASHTO Green Book. The year of the AASHTO Green Book has been changed to 2001 in this section.	
13.10	Alfredo Rodriguez	alfredo.rodrigu	Turnpike		210	210.11.3		This section removes the 2011 (year) from the AASHTO Green book reference but does not provide the version to be used. The updates in FDM 211 do show the 2018 (year) edition as being adopted.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. This sentence is providing some history on the change in passing sight distance values. The passing sight distance values changed in the 2011 AASHTO Green Book. The year of the AASHTO Green Book will remain 2011 in this section.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
26.13	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.061	210	210.4.6		CONSIDER DISCUSSING PLACEMENT OF AVT'S ON EMERGENCY SHOULDER USE FACILITIES. PER REQUIREMENTS, SHOULDER WIDTHS GREATER THAN 5-FT ARE NOT PLACED ON STRIPES.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.12	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.2.4.1		Opening sentence: Should indicate that existing pavement and shoulder cross slope should be verified ".....by one or both of the following", since the vehicle mounted scanner does not measure all of the cross slope such as on shoulders, parking lanes, etc.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.13	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.2.3		Inside Shoulders: Recommend to show the lower range value as 0.015 (when inside shoulder slopes in same direction as roadway). See markup for reference.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.14	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.2.4.1	210.2.3	Note (5): Re-evaluate or possibly reword this criterion as it affects the practicality of the scope of work (possible reconstruction of a portion of the roadway, etc.).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.15	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.065	210	210.2.5		Section 210.2.5 (item F.065): Recommend to maintain the title of this section to Roadway Transitions. Note: Where the number of lanes remains constant should not be considered a taper.	David Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: This title was changed to be consistent with FDM 212.6. This section describes 3 types of tapers: Merging, Shifting, and Shoulder tapers. With shifting tapers the number of lanes remains constant.	
39.16	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.4		Section 210.4 (Shoulders): It makes reference to FDM 223.2.2, however, with certain conditions this section allows paved shoulder widths of >/=5-ft., which contradicts the last sentence.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.80	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.2		Section 210.2 (Lanes): Second paragraph, first sentence should read: "Two-way left turn lanes (flush median) may be used on 2-lane and 4-lane typical sections.....". Note: The TWLTL is described as a flush median and should not be a part of the basic number of lanes for the facility.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
39.90	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.2	210.2.1	(Minimum Travel and Auxiliary Lane Widths): It appears that the combination of Design Speed and Context Classification is outside of the intended design range for some of the lane widths in the C4, C5, and C6.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.00	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.4		Section 210.4 (Shoulders): It makes reference to FDM 223.2.2, however, with certain conditions this section allows paved shoulder widths of >/=5-ft., which contradicts the last sentence.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.10	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.4		In the third paragraph, it appears that the extension of the screed should be a "maximum" of 5-ft.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: Language reads as intended. This is not a section being edited for 2023.	
40.20	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.4	210.4.1	Note (5): Suggest to add language as per FDM 223.2.2.1 regarding the width of marked shoulders.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.30	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.5.1		Section 210.5.1 (high-speed curbed roadways): For the 55 mph design speed, consider adding language for "shoulder rocking" as well as for Design Variations that would be needed. Note: For the 55 mph design speed, the maximum algebraic difference without a vertical curve is 0.50% (vertical curves would not be practical). As such, the profile grade is limited to 0.25%, which would require a Design Variation (and increase the demand for drainage). Alternately, with the use of "shoulder rocking" (varying the shoulder from 0.03 to 0.06) could provide the 0.3% longitudinal grade on the curb & gutter, but would require a Design Variation for shoulder cross slope.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.40	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.8.1		Section 210.8.1 (deflections in alignment): Clarify that this criterion is applicable to the deflection of the through lanes and not just the main alignment (lanes are not always parallel to the alignment).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.50	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.10.3		Item (2)(base clearance): Suggest to revise the second sentence as follows: "All roadways with less than a 3-ft. clearance will require a reduction in the laboratory resilient modulus.....". Note: Replaced "design" with "laboratory" and replaced "these exceptions" with "all roadways with.....".	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
40.60	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		210	210.10.3		Add the following: "Roadways not meeting the minimum clearance of 2-ft. and 3-ft. (clearance not to be less than 1-ft.) will require a Design Variation. It must be supported by sound technical analyses (applicable reduction in the resilient modulus, constructability of the stabilized subgrade, etc.).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y		
60.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.140	210	210.2.4.2		Confirm if language similar to the limited access facility should be added for hydroplaning. Are we to perform at the direction of the district drainage engineer or should we include requirements for high speed arterials?	Jennifer Green and DeWayne		Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM. DDC: Checking with Jennifer	
64.0	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.047	210	210.4.6		Chapter directs to Standard Plan Index 546-020, but there is no Index 546-020. The current index is 546-010.	Ben Gerrell	Yes		No change. Standard Plans Index 546-020 is a new Index for Ground in Rumble Strips on Arterials and Collectors. It is part of the Roadway Design Bulletin for Audible and Vibratory Treatments for Arterials and Collectors.	
55.60	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson	District 3		210	FDM 210.2		FDM 210.2 - Consider revising DS criteria to include 45 mph for the TWLTL to reflect current AASHTO criteria.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This will be considered for the 2024 FDM	
7.10	Kevin Stewart	Kevin.Stewart@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.001	211	211.4.2.2		Fix second paragraph, "Provide a profiles" to "Provide a profile".	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. FDM 211.4.2.2 was moved to FDM 915.3.5.1 and the language was revised.	
11.60	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		211	211	211.16 Maintenance Access	"The maximum continuous length of a guardrail or barrier wall run along the outside of the roadway is 2,500 feet between end terminals. An access opening must be provided when long guardrail or barrier wall runs are broken up. Coordinate with the District Maintenance Engineer and District ITS Design Engineer on the final access location points to meet the needs of maintenance and operations. The preferred typical detail for roadside guardrail access openings is depicted in the Standard Plans Instructions (SPI) for Index 536- 001." It is recommended to consider providing an exception for guardrail adjacent to the ROW where longitudinal water hazards or other hazards exist on offsite-properties. There are numerous canals in the South Florida region which run parallel with roadway corridors. Some maintaining agencies for these canals require access at certain intervals, but others request no access opening be provided as they perform aerial/boat maintenance operations only. For example – US-27 throughout Broward and Palm Beach County currently under construction.	DeWayne Carver	Yes			
13.30	Alfredo Rodriguez	alfredo.rodri	Turnpike	P2.002	211	211.4.2.2		Rephrase the begin sentence of the second paragraph to "Provide profiles" instead of "Provide a profiles"	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. FDM 211.4.2.2 was moved to FDM 915.3.5.1 and the language was revised.	Y
14.00	Francis DeLaRosa	francis.delarosa@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.113	211	211.4.1	Table 211.4.1	Consider changing the row size to accommodate entire word for Turnpike or use Arial Narrow font and smaller text size such as 8pt. Alternately spell out Turnpike horizontal rather than vertical.	DeWayne	Yes	Y	Agreed. Row height was adjusted. Further formatting may be needed before final publication, but word "Turnpike" will not be wrapped as shown in the redline.	
15.00	Erin Yao	erin.yao@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.140	211	211.2.3	Table 211.2.4	In the table, the word data at the bottom of the 3 lane column is clipped.	DeWayne	Yes	Y	Agreed. Row height has ben adjusted.	
16.15	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.113	211	211.4		Update FDM 260.3 and the bridge typical section diagrams to reflect the new shoulder widths shown in Table 211.4.1	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	No change. Note number 3 was added to Figure 260.1.1 to accommodate the new Turnpike Shoulder width requirements in Table 211.4.1. Additional edits to this figure will be made in 2024 FDM. Changes need to be more fully vetted than can be done for 2023.	
16.16	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.113	211	211.4.1	Table 211.4.1	Does note (1) apply to any number of lanes? Note 1 does not have a restriction on the number of lanes, yet the table does...reconcile.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	No change. Note (1) applies to any number of lanes. Restrictions on the number of lanes is not necessary. This note would still apply to 3 or more lanes. If consideration is given to reducing the the inside or outside paved shoulder width on a project with 3 or more lanes this note could help determine which minimum shoulder width should be maintained.	
24.00	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.003	211	211.16		Remove the maximum continuous length of guardrail terminal or barrier wall run requirement. Each roadway has a unique set of conditions to determine maximum length. Change the wording to coordinate with the DME and DITSDE on the maximum continuous length.	DeWayne Carver			DDC: This language was vetted with CO and District Maintenance and Design. However, it can be revisited in light of proposed edits to P2.003, above, at the DDE Face to Face Meeting	Y
26.14	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.135	211	211.1.1		CONSIDER ADDING SENTENCE THAT VARIATION IS NOT REQUIRED.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: Sentence was considered but not used. There may be other elements that still require a variation.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
26.15	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.135	211	211.1.1		WHAT REPORT NAME IS DOCUMENTATION THAT IS LOADED TO DDD MODULE.	DeWayne Carver		Y	DDC: Discuss at DDE-DCPME meeting	Y
26.16	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		211	211.4.4		CONSIDER AVT TREATMENT ON EMERGENCY SHOULDER USE (ESU) FACILITIES	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
28.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		211	211.4.6		CONSIDER CRITERIA FOR AVT'S ON ESU'S.	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
28.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.145	211	211.9.1		CONSIDER IDENTIFYING CRITERIA FOR OTHER SITUATIONS NOT COVERED UNDER "NEW CONSTRUCTION"	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
28.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.149	211	211.13		CONSIDER GUIDANCE ON PREFERRED RAMP TYPE DURING TTCP. WILL A TAPER TYPE TERMINAL BE ALLOWED TEMPORARILY DURING CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT DDE APPROVAL?	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
28.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.149	211	211.13	FIGURE 211.13.2	LABEL THAT 12-FT IS WHERE DECELERATION BEGINS. DEFINE L AS DECELERATION LENGTH	DeWayne	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits have been made.	
28.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.149	211	211.13	FIGURE 211.13.3	LABEL THAT 12-FT IS WHERE DECELERATION BEGINS. DEFINE L AS DECELERATION LENGTH	DeWayne	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits have been made.	
28.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.149	211	211.13	FIGURE 211.13.4	DEFINE L AS DECELERATION LENGTH	DeWayne	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits have been made.	
28.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.006	211	211.17		FOR CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, CONSIDER MODIFYING "DESIGN DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED WITH THE PRELIMINARY GEOMETRY AND GRADE SUBMITTAL" TO "DESIGN DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED WITH THE PRELIMINARY GEOMETRY AND GRADE SUBMITTAL (15% LINE AND GRADE OR 30%)."	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	No change. The time frame for this submittal is provided in FDM 901. It is submitted at approximately mid-point between Notice to Proceed (NTP) and Phase I Plans submittal at the discretion of the district.	
35.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.135	211	211.1.1		INCLUDE FILE NAMING CONVENTION IN THE TABLE FOR DDD MODULE.	Karina Fuentes		Y	DDC: Purpose of comment is unclear. Add to DDE-DCPME Agenda	Y
38.00	Adriana Kirwan	adriana.kirwan@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.002	211	FDM 211.4.2.2.		First sentence in the section removed the "i" in the word "in" (...shoulder rocking "in" either...).	DeWayne	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: FDM 211.4.2.2 does not exist; proposed edit not seen in FDM 211.4.2.1. No changes made.	
40.12	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.001	211	211.4.2.1		(Shoulder Rocking, item P2.001): This is applicable to FDM 210 (Arterials and Collectors). Make the appropriate reference to indicate this (suggest adding to title for 211.4.2.1.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	No change. This is a new edit for FDM 210. It will be considered for the 2024 FDM to ensure this topic receives sufficient attention and vetting. Additional requirements may be needed for Arterials and Collectors to address profile grade and context classification.	
40.13	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.001	211	211.4.2.1		Section 211.4.2.1 (shoulder rocking, item P2.001): There is no mention of a Design Variation for shoulder cross slope (proposed cross slope range of 0.03 to 0.06). Please include language.	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	No change. A Design Variation would not be needed for shoulder rocking as long as the requirements in this section are met.	
40.14	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.142	211	211.4.3		Section 211.4.3 (item P2.142)(Figure 211.4.3, Flush Shoulder Pavement): Modify the detail to show the friction course extended 8" onto the paved shoulder, as per the opening sentence of this section. Show a minimum structural course of 2-1/4" on the shoulder to allow for 1-1/2" below the friction course.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: This is a new edit that can be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
40.15	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		211	211.4.3		Section 211.4.3: Remove "existing" for the cross slope values.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.70	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.110	211	211.2	211.2.1	211.2.1: In note (4) the asterisk should be the same size as in the Figure. Also, the note (5) (added figure for symmetrical 4-lane section) is missing.	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: There is no note 5. Note 5 not needed.	
40.80	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		211	211.7.1		(deflections in alignment): Clarify that this criterion is applicable to the deflection of the through lanes and not just the main alignment (lanes are not always parallel to the alignment).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.90	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.113	211	211.4	211.4.1	shoulders)(item P2.113): Open shoulders (no barrier) where the paved width is the same as the full width: Erosion could occur at the outside edge of paved shoulder, especially if the front slope is >1:6. See also Managed Lanes and note (2). Consider increasing total width 1-ft.	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
45.00	Eduardo Hernandez	eduardo.hernandez@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.006	211	211.17		Recommend to define the "qualitative evaluation" better. See suggested language below: Resurfacing Projects – Perform a qualitative evaluation for approach slabs throughout the limits of the project to ensure they are providing a smooth transition to the bridge. The qualitative evaluation should include a review of the latest Pavement Condition Survey (PCS) data, measuring profile differences using survey data and/or any other means of identifying approach slab deficiencies. When deficiencies are identified, summarize the potential underlying causes, and provide a recommendation for correcting the deficiencies.	DeWayne	Yes	Y	No change. The language in this section was modified in the F2F DRDE meeting to meet the needs of all Districts.	
47.10	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.068	211	211.1		The summary of changes list indicates that this criterion applies to reconstruction and resurfacing projects. Verify that this is correct; it appears that reconstruction projects should be to current standards. If it is the intent, should revise the language by adding: "On reconstruction projects, every effort should be made to use current criteria and standards".	Ben Gerrell	Yes	Y	Agreed. Added "On reconstruction projects, every effort should be made to use current criteria and standards" to the end of this paragraph. This sentence is specific in the text to conditions where metric criteria were used initially.	
63.1	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.142	211	211.4.3		Consider allowing extending the friction course across the shoulder to simplify construction	DeWayne Carver			BJG: Is this suggestion for the first sentence in this section or is it for Figure 211.4.3? Figure 211.4.3 is typically used for paved shoulders 10 feet or more in width. There should not be a construction issue in this case.	Y
63.2	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.145	211	211.9.1		this impact is huge when flat rural roadways are converted to urban sections.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change.	
28.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		212	212.9	Table 212.9.2	CONSIDER ADDING GUIDANCE ON EXISTING RETURN RADIUS THAT HAVE MINOR MODIFICATIONS ON RRR PROJECTS TO MEET/EXCEED EXISTING TURN MOVEMENTS.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
40.16	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		212	212.8.2		Intersections (Section 212.8.2): The profile grades of each of the roadways should abide by the maximum algebraic difference (without a vertical curve), assuming a free-flow condition through the intersection. The example (Figure 212.8.2) that is shown would be alright for a design speed of 25-30 mph. This should be clarified in this section.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
35.16	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		213	213.11		suggest to modify sentence to say "Provide a minimum 1.5 horizontal foot-candles on the roadway surface within the circulatory roadway and at least 200 feet in advance of the splitter islands."	Karina Fuentes	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
42.00	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.094	213	213		Consider changing title of Modern Roundabouts to "Roundabouts"	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: The term modern roundabout is consistent with NCHRP Report 672 and is the proper term.	
42.10	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		213	213.1.1		Section 213.1.1: It states that the minimum cross slope of the circulatory roadway is 1% minimum. With construction tolerance, the cross slope could end up flatter than 1%. Recommend a 1.5% minimum.	DeWayne and Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. BJJ: Is this for FDM 213.3.7? No changes were made in this section. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
42.20	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.094	213	213.3.8	213.3.2	For the circulatory roadway, the material below should be Type B Stabilization, LBR 40. Show extended 4" beyond the back of the type RA curb. Draw the expansion joint, similar to the left side. Under the label Circulatory Roadway, add "(Flexible Pavement Shown)". Show the front of the type RA curb sloped into the pavement, as per Standard Plans.	Dave Amato	Yes	Y	No change. DSA: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
5.20	Scott Peterson	scott.peterson@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.198	214	214.2		For "available RW" bullet - delete portion " R/W may be limited in C2T – C6 Context Classifications". It doesn't add any value to the bullet.	Gina Bonyani.	Yes		Agreed. Language removed from FDM 214.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
11.70	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		215	215	215.3.2 Canal Hazards	"Shield the canal hazard with an approved roadside barrier when the required minimum lateral offset cannot be met using the following criteria: • Locate the barrier as far from the traveled way as practical and outside of the clear zone where possible." There has been confusion in the past over the application of this requirement. FDM 215.4.6.1 has been clarified to provide exceptions for offsets greater than 12' at canal hazards, which helps with interpretation. However, Standard Plan 536-001 typically depicts a max 1:10 slope approach to any guardrail. Therefore, designers have been unsure if they need to add a excessive amount of embankment to maintain a 1:10 slope all the way to a guardrail shielding a water hazard. This has typically restricted the design team, and they have been inclined to violate the guidance of either 215.3.2 or Standard Plan 536-001 to avoid excessive costs of embankment to provide an elongated 1:10 slope and maximize distance, or to provide a 12' offset maximum with a flush shoulder guardrail design. Is there a option for only the last 10' to 12' of approach to the guardrail providing a 1:10 slope? For example: Figure 215.3.1 only shows an unshielded condition, however, it is not clear if the same configuration is acceptable for a shielded condition.	Derwood Sheppard			DDC: This issue needs to be addressed outside of the 2023 FDM Review Process. Referred to Derwood Sheppard.	
17.00	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.271	215	215.4.6.1		For the back to back barriers, consider adding a sketch for clarity.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	No Change. GJM: Disagree. The language is extremely clear as written. However, this may be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
17.10	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.271	215	215.4.6.1		The list of attachments includes "bullet rails" which seem more "continuous" than sign supports or pedestals. The question will arise...if bullet rails are an attachment of concern, then what about the steel tube retrofit (Std 460-490)? Please clarify.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	No change. GJM:The intent of this sentence is to convey that these items are not a concern. The bullet railing is detailed in the Standard Plans. Any risk associated with the ZOI has been accepted by the Department and FHWA. The steel tube retrofit has been designed specifically for vehicular impact and tested accordingly per MASH.	
28.12	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.270	215	215.4.6.1		CONSIDER REMOVING SECOND SENTENCE TO AVOID CONFUSION. JUST INDICATE ITEMS THAT ARE CONSIDERED DISCONTINUOUS.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	GJM: The list is intentionally not exhaustive. The language is intended to provide the EOR a few examples of these types of items. There could be The EOR must make sound engineering decisions.	
28.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.103	215	215.2	TABLE 215.2.2	IDENTIFY WHAT 1.5-FT MEASUREMENT IS FOR BRIDGE PIERS AND ABUTMENTS ON RRR PROJECTS.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	BJG: Consider adding "form Face of Curb" after 1.5 feet to be consistent with other lateral offsets for Bridge Piers and Abutments.	Y
28.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.103	215	215.2	TABLE 215.2.2	ANY CONSIDERATON FOR REDUCED WIDTHS FOR RRR PROJECTS, CURBED, FOR 45MPH OR LESS?	Derwood Sheppard		Y	GJM: Will discusse at DDE-DCPME Meeting.	Y
29.10	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.271	215	215.4.6.1	Figure 215.4.7	Figure 215.4.7, the very top left corner shows the single-slope traffic railing setback distances. The label for Index 512-428 is incorrect; it should be 521-428 for a 42" single-slope traffic railing.	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y	Agreed. Figure has been updated	
35.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.103	215	215.2.4	215.2.2	LATERAL OFFSET TO BRIDGE PIERS AND ABUTMENTS- CONSIDER ADDING RRR CRITERIA FOR ALL SPEEDS, PROPOSED CRITERIA JUMPS FROM 1.5 TO 16 FOR A 40 MPH ROADWAY. WE DO SEE A LOT OF 40 MPH IN C4.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	DDC: Could change to "For RRR projects where the Design Speed is 35 mph or less..." Discuss at DDE/DCPME meeting.	y
35.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.103	215	215.2.4	215.2.2	OVERHEAD SIGN STRUCTURES- CONSIDER ADDING SIMILAR CRITERIA AS LATERAL OFFSET TO BRIDGE PIERS.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	DDC: Discuss at DDE-DCPME Meeting	y
59.0	Seth Gay	seth.gay@dot.state.fl.us		F.270	215	215.2.6		I recommend allowing the words "discontinuous" and "continuous" define themselves. Providing examples for one then stating "all other features" for the other causes more confusion than necessary.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. The language in this revision was added to clarify what is meant by discontinuous features. It helps to distinguish between discontinuous and continuous features.	
64.1	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P.153	215	215.2.3	Figure 215.2.1	The third diagram in Figures 215.2.1 (PDF Sheet 281) is duplicated information from the previous diagram (PDF Sheet 281). In addition, the ramp diagram provides X, Y Z values that are not defined. Is unclear why we call out the Standard Plan Index 000-525 that gives guidance for the ramp geometry. The CZ areas are overlapping on this sheet and are already shown on PDF sheet 280 (2-lane mainline to one lane ramp).	Ben Gerrell	Yes		Agreed. This figure was an early draft of the new clear zone figures for ramps. The figure has been deleted.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
24.10	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.009	216	216.4.5		Added section regarding availability of borrow material within project right-of-way seems to go beyond Design responsibility and into Construction means and methods. What are the requirements/outline for "an assessment of earthwork balance"? What does the implementation of this requirement look like in the plans or specs?	Jason Russell and someone from the Turnpike	Yes		No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The Turnpike could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	
28.13	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.008	216	216.4.5		NEED TO GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF EARTHWORK BALANCE ASSESSMENT?	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The Turnpike could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	
28.14	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.008	216	216.4.5		CAN YOU CLARIFY WHY WE ARE SHIFTING APPROACH. NOW WE ARE INDICATING DESIGNER HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO COORDINATE IF MATERIAL WITHIN R/W CAN BE USED AS BORROW THROUGH EARTHWORK BALANCE ASSESSMENT. BORROW WAS ONLY USED ON SMALL PROJECTS. ASSESSMENT AND COORDINATION MAY BE EXCESSIVE TO THE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL ACTUALLY USED. CAN WE KEEP THE SAME AS BEFORE?	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The Turnpike could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	
31.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.008	216	216.4.5		Borrow Excavation: New language reads that every time we are to use borrow excavation we would need to conduct an earthwork balance assessment to ensure product is not available within the right of way versus outside the project limits. If it is determined that material within the project right of way may be used, it may lead to an issue in construction if the material needed is part of a later phase. Given that borrow excavation is paid by what is being used, consider leaving language as is.	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The Turnpike could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	
33.00	Mikhail Dubrovsky	mikhail.dubrovsky@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.108	216	216.4.2	Figure 216.4.8	Since subsoil is not a plan quantity item, unsuitable material excavated within road template/base shall be regular excavation. Subsoil is material excavated for purposes of removal of unsuitable material only. It's area from the bottom of the road template to the bottom of subsoil or to limits shown on the plans, not only to the bottom of subgrade, as shown in the detail. Embankment on projects with significant subsoil excavation should not be a plan quantity item.	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. Please reference Specification Section 120-2.3. "Subsoil excavation also consists of the excavation of all suitable material within the above limits as necessary to excavate the unsuitable material." The figure is a simple depiction of subsoil and does not show all potential scenarios. Please note that the orange hashed existing surface line extends above the blue finished graded surface and that material must be removed and is considered subsoil as stated in 120-2.3. In many cases there will be subsoil that extends beyond the green roadbed line, the depth of which should be determined by the designer. The lateral limit of removal is depicted in Index 120-002. The embankment should be plan quantity and will be adjusted by the final/field measurement of subsoil, as necessary during construction. Designers are required to evaluate the realistic amount of subsoil and embankment per FDM 216.	
33.10	Mikhail Dubrovsky	mikhail.dubrovsky@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.008	216	216.4.5	Paragraph 2	Assessment of earthwork balance is a complex task. The balance should be evaluated not just in terms of volume, but also in construction time/phase. For example, let's say according to pay items we have more excavated material than fill material. However, on day 50 the Contractor will need 1000 CY of soil for fill, but only 200 CY of excavated material is available, so 800 CY of borrow material will be required. Similar changes of balance in both directions may take place multiple times in the course of construction. Excavated material and borrow material shall not be balanced, but estimated independently.	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The Turnpike could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
35.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.108	216	216.4.2	216.4.8	SUBSOIL SHOULD NOT BE SHADED IN AREA ABOVE PROPOSED BASE. THIS WOULD BE PAID AS REGULAR EXCAVATION AND CANNOT MIX PLAN QUANTITY.	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. Please reference Specification Section 120-2.3. "Subsoil excavation also consists of the excavation of all suitable material within the above limits as necessary to excavate the unsuitable material." The figure is a simple depiction of subsoil and does not show all potential scenarios. Please note that the orange hashed existing surface line extends above the blue finished graded surface and that material must be removed and is considered subsoil as stated in 120-2.3. In many cases there will be subsoil that extends beyond the green roadbed line, the depth of which should be determined by the designer. The lateral limit of removal is depicted in Index 120-002. The embankment should be plan quantity and will be adjusted by the final/field measurement of subsoil, as necessary during construction. Designers are required to evaluate the realistic amount of subsoil and embankment per FDM 216.	
59.1	Seth Gay	seth.gay@dot.state.fl.us		P2.008	216	216.4.5		Is this means and methods to the contractor? Why should the designer evaluate the availability of borrow material within the RW? If the contractor chose to provide borrow material they had stockpiled, this effort would be for nothing.	Jason Russell	Yes	Y	No change. This is not a means and methods issue, nor is it a change to the specifications for contractors. The new language is a more detailed explanation of what the FDM already requires of the designers for earthwork quantity determinations. The TP could provide an example of how their designers provided the EBA clarity purposes.	
44.30	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@centraloffice.com	Central Office		221	221.1		Please add provide utility conflict matrix to paragraph 1.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: New Edit - will be considered for FDM 2024.	
6.00	Jamie Polidora	jamie.polidora@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.001	222	222.2.3.2	Exhibit 222-1	Exhibit 222-1 is not included in Section 222.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is not a valid P.number. Exhibit 222-1 was not edited and is not included in the review package.	
6.10	Jamie Polidora	jamie.polidora@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.002	222	222.3		This portion about detectable warnings is being removed and not included in Section 224. Are there no longer concerns with placing the ones on the APL on asphalt?	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is not a valid P.number and it's not clear what this comment is referencing.	
7.20	Kevin Stewart	Kevin.Stewart@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike		222	222.4.1		fix spelling "provideped"	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y		
11.80	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		222	222	222.2.1.3 (Sidewalk Grades and Cross Slope) / 224.6 (Shared Use Path)	It is recommended to note an exception for longitudinal slope on ADA Ramps on bridge approaches. There have been instances in the recent past where there was disputes regarding the max slope being exceeded where and ADA ramp was placed to provide a raised sidewalk on a bridge approach. Since the ADA ramp is steeper than the adjacent roadway profile, and the combination of the longitudinal slope and ADA ramp exceeded maximum criteria, there was not a clear direction on how to correct the design leading to a dispute between the EOR and FDOT Construction.	DeWayne Carver	Yes			
24.20	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.164	222	222.4.1		Phrasing to "obtain direction from the District Design Engineer for enclosures of sidewalks, shared use paths, or pedestrian bridges over Limited Access Right of Way" is unusual in FDM. Recommend to change to "Obtain approval from the DDE..." for consistency with approach throughout other areas of the FDM.	DeWayne Carver				
28.15	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.164	222	222.4.1		CONSIDER REWORDING TO OBTAIN APPROVAL FROM THE DDE INSTEAD OF OBTAIN DIRECTION FROM THE DDE. SO IT DOES NOT CREATE A SITUATION WHERE DESIGNERS SEND REQUEST FOR DIRECTION FROM DDE WITHOUT PROVIDING INPUT/BACKGROUND.	DeWayne Carver		Y	DDC: Discuss at DDE/DCPME meeting	Y
42.30	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.123	222	222.2.1.3		There should be no need for repeating the need for shielding drop-offs; it is given in Figure 222.4.1. In the first paragraph: "When sidewalk is not adjacent to a travel way" and "consistent separation from curb" is the same thing. Clarify.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Add to DDE Agenda	Y
42.40	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		222	222.2.2		Add "USDOT 2006" for consistency with the list of publications.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
63.3	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.164	222	222.4.1		add and rail roads.	Tiffany Gehrke	Yes		Agreed. TG: Added "and railroads."	
64.2	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.164	222	222.4.1		Revision of word "provided" is adding a "pe" and reads "provideped". This appears to be an error.	Darrell Lewis	Yes			

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
6.20	Jamie Polidora	jamie.polidora@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.003	223	223	Exhibits 223-1 to 223-3	Exhibits 223-1 to 223-3 were not included.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is not a valid P.number. Exhibits were only included if they were being edited.	
28.16	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.317	223	223.2.3		CONSIDER INCLUDING C3 FACILITIES. WE HAVE MANY C3 FACILITIES THAT ARE LIMITED IN R/W THAT CAN BENEFIT FROM AN URBAN SIDE PATH.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: The roadway speed range is too high in C3 for the minimum separation of an USUP. The conventional SUP should be used in C3.	
42.50	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		223	223.2.1.3		There is a discrepancy with Section 223.4. regarding the bike lane (keyhole) width.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
42.60	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		223	223.2.1		Recommend to include an illustration of an Urban Side Path, depicting the vertical separation from the roadway.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
30.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		224	224.1		CONSIDER ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE RELATED TO URBAN SIDE PATH/SIDEWALK ON C5/C6. DO WE NEED SIDEWALK ON BOTH SIDES/URBAN SIDE PATH ON BOTH SIDES	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
42.70	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		224	224.7		(horizontal clearance): In the first paragraph it states that for restricted conditions, certain features may be located within 4-ft. of the edge of pavement. Please state the minimum distance at which these features can be.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
42.80	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		224	224.17.1		Revise to: "Provide a pavement design with the minimums as follows:", rather than "equivalent to standard shoulder pavement". Standard shoulder pavement has 1" minimum of structural course. Indicate "Optional" Base Group 1.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
64.5	Edgar Muñoz, P.E.	edgar.munoz@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.135	224	224.6		What defines an Independent R/W and a Highway R/W? Does this "Independent R/W" mean purchased specifically for the use of constructing a Shared Use Path? Does this definition is established in any document? No clear definition is a legal issue if argued in court. Limiting the shared use path grade to no more than the grade of the adjacent road is ill advised. Roads are usually very flat in FL. What if the road has a grade of 0.5% but the shared use path due to the adjacent terrain needs to have a grade of 3%. Many times, the grade of the shared use path needs to be completely independent from the grade of the road.	Tiffany Gehrke			A shared use path within the right of way of the highway directly aligns with the roadway and utilizes the roadway intersections when crossing adjoining streets. Shared use paths within the highway right of way are sometimes referred to as sidepaths and are a feature of the roadway facility. A shared use path in independent right of way is considered a separate facility from the roadway and uses separate mechanisms/traffic control devices outside of the roadway intersection to safely navigate through cross streets. The definition in the AASHTO bike guide is the following, "Sidepaths are a specific type of shared use path that runs adjacent to the roadway, where right of way and other physical constraints dictate." According to the AASHTO Bike Guide, paths in a public right-of-way that function as sidewalks should be designed in accordance with PROWAG. Shared use paths in independent rights of ways should meet ANPRM with respect to ADA. The definition of public right-of-way by PROWAG is, "a complex space serving multiple users and functions. The sidewalk and street crossing network is the basis unit of pedestrian mobility []. All modes of travel, including motor vehicles, rail transit, and foot traffic share time and space at intersections..." PROWAG states, "Except as provided in R302.5.3, where pedestrian access routes are contained within a street or highway right-of-way, the grade of pedestrian access routes shall not exceed the general grade established for the adjacent street or highway." PROWAG also states, "Where pedestrian access routes are not contained within a street or highway right of way, the grade of pedestrian access shall be 5 percent maximum." We can add the additional language from PROWAG, "Where compliance with R302.5.1 or R302.5.2 is not practicable due to existing terrain or infrastructure, right-of-way availability, a notable natural feature, or similar existing physical constraints, compliance is required to the extent practicable."	Y
30.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		225	225.2		CONSIDER ADDING CONTEXT FOR RRR FACILITIES/TIGHT R/W THAT CAN NOT MEET 8X5 BOARDING AND ALIGHTING AREAS.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
44.40	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		228	228.2	3 H	Add power source		Yes		No change. DDC: New Edit - will be considered for FDM 2024. Bogus F. numbers have been deleted.	
63.4	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.237	228	228		Is 228 deleted? I still see it.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: 228 will be replaced.	
63.5	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.318	229	F.318		Is 229 deleted? I still see it.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: 229 will be replaced	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
9.00	Ryan Drendel	ryan.drendel@	District 4	F.137	230	230, 230.3.1.3		The FDM language for the 24" longitudinal bars on special emphasis crosswalks says high-friction thermoplastic is the default material and seems to suggest the designer should decide if preformed thermoplastic is needed instead; however, the DQE says high-friction thermoplastic is only an alternative to preformed, should not be called out in the plans, and is used at the contractor's option. Recommend these instructions in the FDM are clarified.	David Amato	Yes		Agreed. DSA: Revised language to reflect Preformed as the default and High Friction Thermo as contractor's option.	
10.10	Ricardo Policicchio	Ricardo.Policicchio@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	P1.175	230	230.2.4		• Current Language: "To eliminate use of lighting on an existing structure, consider replacing all sign panels with those having Type XI sheeting." • Recommended Language: "Where any sign panel on an existing overhead sign structure is to be replaced with Type XI sheeting, ensure all existing sign panels facing in the same direction on the sign structure are replaced with Type XI sheeting." • Background: The intent is both to eliminate the use of sign lighting and to ensure all sign panels on the structure are consistently either lighted (non-Type XI) or unlighted (Type XI).	David Amato	No		Agreed. DSA: Revised language as follows: "To eliminate the use of lighting on existing overhead sign structures, confirm all panels on the structure utilize Type XI sheeting. All panels not utilizing Type XI sheeting must be overlaid with Type XI sheeting or replaced with new panels utilizing Type XI sheeting prior to elimination of the lighting."	Y
11.90	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		230	230	230.4.1(9) Exit Ramp Intersections	"Install wrong-way vehicle detection system and a pair of Light-emitting Diode (LED) Highlighted WRONG-WAY (R5-1a) Signs. For long ramps or for ramps with limited sight distance, two sets of the pairs of Highlighted Signs may be used, as illustrated in Exhibits 230-1a and 230-1b. The Highlighted Sign assembly may be solar powered or AC powered. If powered by AC, provide a power service assembly, conduits, and power conductors from the Highlighted Sign to the local cabinet. The Highlighted Sign must be integrated back to the District's Traffic Management Center (TMC). Connectivity between the Highlighted Sign and the TMC may be provided by either fiber optic or wireless communications. If fiber optic communications are used, include the fiber optic cable, conduit, and transmission equipment. If wireless communications are used, include the antenna and communication devices." Please provide clarification on how/where to place WWVDS on ramps with bridge sections or barrier walls protection on either/both sides of the ramp pavement. There are currently no developed design details for bridge mount WWVDS, and it is unclear if one will be developed or if the design should have special considerations at these locations.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: This is a new edit that can be considered for the 2024 FDM.	
24.40	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		230	230	Exhibits 230	FDM 230.4 states that all Do Not Enter and Wrong Way Signs (and some One-Way signs) are to have the retroreflective strips. Only the installation Details on Exhibit 230-1a and 230-1b repeat this retroreflective requirement. Was the intent to only apply the retroreflective requirement on those specific exhibits? If retroreflective requirement applies to only those exhibits, 230.4 language needs to be modified. If intended to apply to all exhibits, remove that installation detail note from Exhibits 230-1a and 230-1b (see exhibits below).	Darrell Lewis	Yes		Agreed. Modification has been made to remove installation detail from Exhibits 230-1a & 230-1b.	
24.40	Darrell Lewis	Darrell.Lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		230	230.4	230-1a & 230-1b	Comment received from D4 regarding Note on verticle red retroreflective strips being consistantly placed on all Exhibits. Modification has been made to remove installation detail from Exhibits 230-1a & 230-1b.	Gevin McDaniel	Yes		Agreed. Change made as indicated.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
35.12	Patrick Marchant	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.175	230	230.2.4		Suggest to modify sentence to say "Include sign lighting photometric calculations" in the Lighting Design Analysis Report. Why remove the existing lighting sign system for overhead signs? If the sheeting does not function correctly over time due to harsh environment than lights can be turned on, should we classify areas of harsh environments?	David Amato		Y	DDC: Flagged for district discussion.	Y
52.13	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.175	230	230.2.4		Please include the option of overlaying existing panels with Type XI sheeting.	David Amato	Yes	Y	Agreed. DSA: Included language for option of overlaying existing panels.	
63.6	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.175	230	230.2.4		Consider adding "not subject to conditions (6) – (8) above" after "structures" in the added paragraph.	David Amato	Yes		No change. DSA: Disagree. The added paragraph explains how to eliminate the lighting requirements for overhead sign structures subject to (6)-(8).	
63.7	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	F.137	230	230.3		Are there sufficient contracts requirements for all white markings on concrete?	David Amato	Yes		No change. DSA: No requirements to this section were added or taken away. The modified language was for improving the clarity of pavement marking selection requirements.	
90.02	Gevin McDaniel	gevin.mcdaniel@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.370	230	230.4.1	230-1a & 230-1b	Revise per new criteria on WWD countermeasures	DeWayne Carver			Agreed. Change will be made.	Y
4.0	Rob Swann	rob.swann@dot.state.fl.us	District 1	F.239	231	231.1		The edited paragraph notes pedestrians but does not include bicycles or the other modes of transportation such as scooters, electric bikes, mono wheels and sometimes golf carts. Maybe all of these modes can be grouped as OTHER? as to be included in consideration.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. The proposed revision only simplifies the current FDM wording and includes more modes of transportation in the general statement of benefits. This general statement is not defining a specific requirement, so it is acceptable to use the broad definition of "vehicle" that includes all devices you've mentioned.	
35.13	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.243	231	231.1		Consider adding language to allow breakaway light poles in the media without behind protective barrier as long as not a hazard to opposite direction traffic lane.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. The revision does not change current policy. Medians must generally remain free and clear of light poles unless accompanied by a barrier for the added delineation and protection. The proposed revision only clarifies this current requirement to help ensure it isn't overlooked.	
35.14	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.243	231	231.1		suggest to add that decorative light fixtures can be used as long as they meet FDOT specifications	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This suggestion is outside the scope of proposed revisions. The current policy is to allow for luminaires approved on the APL, and this includes some decorative fixtures. The FDM will not supersede the APL process to allow for any decorative fixture not on the APL.	
35.15	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.243	231	231.1.5		(2) suggest "Install minimum 40' of ground rod at each electrical service point." Specifications require 5 ohms resistance to ground for service panels	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This comment is outside the scope of proposed revisions. It will be logged for consideration in the 2024 FDM.	
35.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.116	231	231.1	215.2.9	TABLE 215.2.9 STATES LIGHTING CAN ONLY BE BEHIND BARRIERS WHEN BARRIER IS PRESENT FOR OTHER REASONS. CONSIDER TO RECONCILE WITH 231.1 WHICH STATES THAT LIGHT POLES ARE PERMITTED IN THE MEDIAN WHEN LIGHTING FROM OUTSIDE CANNOT MEET CRITERIA WITHOUT SUPPLEMENTING FROM MEDIAN.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This comment is outside the scope of proposed revisions. The current policy remains because it is not the intention to install barrier for the sole purpose of lighting. It's a rare case where a very wide roadway does not have a median barrier. If a District decision is needed to relax a requirement, then this process should be documented through a variation.	
43.00	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.249	231	231.2		For high mast lighting, ensure that maximum and uniformity ratio requirements are documented in the LDAR to avoid bright spots.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. These requirements are already shown in FDM Table 231.2.1, so calculations can be checked against the governing FDM version. Next, the proposed FDM 943.3 additionally requires placing this applicable lighting design criteria in the General Notes of the Lighting Plans as a back-up reference. As a result, this information is already available without a redundant listing in the LDAR.	
43.10	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.249	231	231.2		meet NEC for all lighting electrical design including but not limited to conduit design, pullbox capacity, electrical components, etc.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This comment is outside the scope of proposed revisions. It will be logged for consideration in the 2024 FDM.	
43.20	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.034	231	231.6		Coordinate locations of lighting equipment and conduits with any ITS, Signal design or toll site equipment layouts. In general check light poles, pullboxes and lighting circuit equipment to avoid physical conflicts or interference with IS or toll site functions	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	Agreed. This revision was originally written to accommodate the Turnpike Design Handbook migration for limited access facilities, but consideration for signalized intersections can be added. Change made.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
50.12	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.258	231	231.3		The last statement indicated that lighting design analysis is needed with the replacement of more than three new consecutive luminaires on existing light pole runs for maintenance or other purposes. This would be a major change from last FDM version. Most of existing lighting system are being maintained by local municipalities and utility companies. In this case they will need to perform lighting analysis when swapping existing HPS to LED. First, we may not be able to meet FDM lighting criteria due to the restriction of existing pole spacings and mounting heights. Second, Local municipalities and utility companies do not have the resources to run the lighting design analysis for our roadway. This will require significant funds and efforts from the district.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. The intent of the current policy did not change. The FDM requires that new lighting systems receive a correct lighting design. In our district quarterly lighting meetings, districts were concerned that Lighting Retrofit and maintenance policy misinterpretations were being used to avoid design work for long project lighting replacements. This revision is intended to ensure that lengthy new lighting systems receive a proper lighting design. This design analysis is particularly important due to the performance differences between HPS and LED fixtures, where the new LEDs are expected to remain for 20+ years after install. This revision clarifies FDM design requirements by directly addressing the maintenance misinterpretation while still providing leeway for smaller maintenance fixes. It is understood that avoiding the design work costs less, but this is not acceptable. This revision is needed to help prevent the practices described in the review comment.	
50.20	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.243	231	231.1.4		Recommend replacing "last device" with "last luminaire"	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This comment is outside the scope of proposed revisions and will be logged for consideration in the 2024 FDM.	
50.30	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.243	231	231.1.5		Please consider adding grounding for lighting system under FDOT specs section 718-18 Method of Measurement.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This comment is outside the scope of proposed revisions and will be logged for consideration in the 2024 FDM.	
50.40	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.255	231	231.2		Please clarify or give example of "objects"; i.e. overheadsign structure, bridge.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	Agreed. "Solid objects" language has been removed. The focus of this clarification is the usage of the "direct method" instead of the "full radiosity method" in design software, so a mention of solid objects was not needed. Change made.	
50.50	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.249	231	231.2		Does this statement conflict with note (2) at bottom of Table 231.2.1.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This does not conflict.	
50.60	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.0.31	231	231.3		FDOT staff hour estimate form (updated June 2022) does not include comments or additional hours for performing 3D photometric analysis. Need to include additional hours for lighting analysis tab 23 as meeting requirements of the FDM will take more effort. The 3D photometric analysis will require significant man hours.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change (to FDM). Agreed. See response to repeated comment 50.80.	
50.70	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.177	231	231.3.6		In some instances specially with wide bridges, the use of pendant under deck lighting may still be necessary if criteria cannot be met with wall mount fixtures. We had this situation in couple of DDI projects in D5 that we got CO approval to use pendant under deck lighting.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. The current policy for pendant lighting did not change in the proposed FDM revision. Pendant lighting is currently approved by CO on a project-specific basis to ensure it is only used as a last option and in the correct location.	
50.80	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.019	231	231.3.6.2		FDOT staff hour estimate form (updated June 2022) does not include comments or additional hours for performing daytime photometric analysis. Please include additional hours for lighting analysis Tabs 23 and 24 as meeting requirements of daytime lighting per FDM will take more effort for analysis and plans.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. (Repeat of comment 50.60). Agreed. 3D and daytime underdeck lighting designs were already being performed by Districts. Now that this topic will be covered in the FDM, refinements are logged for consideration in the Staff Hour Estimates (SHE) Guidelines based on future practice and feedback. This type of advanced design is expected to be relatively rare. For now, it can be handled through the current SHE Guidelines using 23.11 and 24.6 with others.	
50.90	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.024	231	231.2.2		Most of our roadway luminaires are within 1000 feet from residential properties. This distance sounds very excessive. It may be applicable only for tilted luminaires. Recommend reevaluating this distance and be more specific.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	Agreed. This distance threshold requires no other action besides selecting a luminaire with OEM shielding options available for potential use in the future. This is intended to be 100 feet. Change made.	
52.14	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.249	231	231.2		What is the source of the maximum of 10%. This 10% will result in a range between 1.5 and 1.65. This can create confusion as we can go up to 1.65 F.C for crosswalks at signalized intersection, however we allow 2.3 FC at midblock crossings. Recommend removing this restriction.	Richard Stepp	Yes	Y	No change. This revision was added because of district concerns for very high light levels due to no maximum limit. Districts explained that designers were taking advantage of no upper limit and quickly overdesigning areas thinking it was "conservative". In some cases, designed luminaires were substituted with brighter luminaires because designers and contractors had the misconception that "brighter is better". This revised language also helps to clear misinterpretations like the idea that midblock crosswalks and intersection crosswalks can be designed the same way despite the differing requirements.	
62.10	Omid Fallahinejad	omid.fallahinejad@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		231	Section 231.2		Recommend replacing the first paragraph under Lighting Values with the following wording: Listed values on Table 231.2 are target values, not minimums unless so stated.Using word exceed may create confusion for designers who may propose exorbitantly high values.	Richard Stepp	Yes		No change. It is agreed that there is district concern for exorbitantly high light levels caused by designers taking advantage of no maximum light level. This was the reason for adding this revision. The draft's next sentence explains that light levels must also be kept as low as practical, and numerical limits for maximum light levels are newly added. This revision directly addresses and prevents this excessive brightness concern.	
17.90	Melissa Hollis	melissa.hollis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.358	232	232.5 (2)		Remove 2nd sentence; the designer doesn't need to refer to APL.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. DDC: 2nd Sentence has been removed.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
43.30	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.144	232	232.5		power system analysis report should be prepared and submitted as part of the signal documents.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: Comment does not seem to be address the proposed FDM modification.	
10.20	Ricardo Policicchio	ricardo.policicchio@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	P2.070	233	233.10		Regular incident cameras that provide coverage of roadway may not always be able to view or monitor critical infrastructure such as master hub shelters and/or generators. However, cameras providing a visual of the premises will enhance surveillance and ensure network security is not compromised. Hence request to include the following bullet under section 233.10: - Locate cameras to provide coverage of critical infrastructure such as master hub shelters and generators.	Mariano			The comment or concern is not addressed in the update labeled P2.070. No such bullet found.	Y
17.12	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.063 / P2.070	233	233.1		Clarify that "place cameras on sign structures" means "proposed" or "new" structures where it can be considered in the design. Adding equipment to existing structures requires analysis per FDM 261.7.	Mariano	Yes	Y	Agreed. Especially since District ITS/TSM&O Engineer's approval is needed.	
17.40	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.191	233	233.4		Please be sure that all foundation and cabinet requirements are captured in the FDOT Standard Plans so that special designs are not required.	Mariano	Yes	Y	Agreed. Addressed and rewritten in plain language.	
17.60	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.196	233	233.6.1		If lowering devices are required for mounting heights of 45ft or greater, then update Std Plans 641-020 and 649-020 which shows fixed mounting for heights greater than 45ft. Also this text implies a mounting height of 45ft could be used, however the lowest mounting height in the Standards is 50ft...reconcile FDM criteria with Standards.	Mariano		Y	This might need more thought. When multiple cameras are mounted on a pole, this may cause a conflict. Also, this may also be in conflict with the type of pole. This is typically done on CCTV poles which have a hollow center for conduit and cables. It may not be feasible on concrete or other types of poles.	Y
17.70	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.064	233	233.7.4		Include Maintenance Service Slabs in the FDOT Std Plans. Also this says "ensure design"...maintenance slabs should be in the FDOT Std Plans so that "design" is not necessary.	Mariano	Yes	Y	Agreed.	
17.80	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.197	233	233.9.3		Confirm that design assumptions for the CCTV poles in the Std Plans can accommodate the MVDS equipment. Also, be sure that the attachment details for the MVDS "work" with the CCTV pole configurations in the Standards.	Mariano	Yes	Y	No change. New language covers maximum spacing.	
17.90	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.063 / P2.070	233	233.1		See previous comment about mounting heights versus Std Plans	Mariano	Yes	Y	Agreed. Found on 233.10. Note that it is typical to measure the height of the pole from the base with a typical height of 40' above the edge of the road not the crown. Verify with districts if 45' above crown is accepted... because it may affect the maintaining crews depending on their trucks.	
43.40	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.040	233	233.3.4		Step-up and step-down transformers must include a minimum of two 2.5% full capacity below normal taps and two 2.5 above normal taps on the primary side. Ensure proper ground and overcurrent protection per NEC	Mariano		Y	No objection to update, but wording needs clarification. Use plain language. 2.5% what? Missing units. Could mean watts, heat tolerance...etc.	Y
43.50	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.064	233	233.7.4		service pad should be 3 feet per NEC working space requirements, suggest replace 3 feet for 2 feet 6 inches	Mariano	Yes	Y	Agreed.	
46.10	Ricardo Policicchio	ricardo.policicchio@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.070	233	233.1		Regular incident cameras primarily cover limited access facilities and may not always be able to view or monitor critical assets such as master hub shelters and/or generators. However, cameras providing a visual of the premises will enhance surveillance and ensure network security is not compromised. Hence request to include the following bullet under Section 233.10: - Locate cameras to provide coverage of critical assets such as master hub shelters and generators.	Mariano	Yes	Y	No change. The comment or concern is not addressed in the update labeled P2.070. No such bullet found.	
62.20	Omid Fallahinejad	omid.fallahinejad@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.044	233	FDM 233.3.9.1 Generator Design Requirements		The last sentence on the fourth paragraph states "Install a manual transfer switch for all generator installations." Beginning sentence of fifth paragraph states "Include an automatic transfer switch for permanent generator installations." These two sentences might be misleading for the designer.	Mariano			The way the sentences are written, we are asking for two transfer switches on permanent generators. This might be the case, but more likely case is that we want a manual disconnect in lieu of a redundant manual transfer switch.	Y

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
11.12	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		240	240	240.2.2.1 Signs; 240.2.2.2 Work Zone Pavement Markings	Please consider providing direction to maintain temporary signage and pavement markings within school zones within the TCP/TMP. There has been high variation in the notes/Traffic Control Plans provided in regards to providing temporary school zone markings as well as maintaining flashing beacons and signage within active work zones during construction.	Derwood Sheppard			No change. BJG: No changes were made to these sections. This is a new edit. Can it be considered for 2024?	
22.40	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		240	151, 240		We have been seeing an increasing number of Alternate Traffic Control Plans. As you know, the Contractor is required to provide signed and sealed plans that comply with the FDM. One source of confusion during the ATCP process, is how to number the plan sheets. Some ATCP's replace the entire original Traffic Control Plan. While others only replace portions or phases. Revising sheet per sheet does not always work well. I would recommend including a section in this chapter of the FDM to address how to handle ATCP's.	Derwood Sheppard			BJG: This may be a new edit. Can it be considered for 2024?	
24.30	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	P2.088	240	240.2.1.8		"Pavement drop offs must be more than 2 inches from a lane line" would be better suited in Standard Plans 102-600 Sheet 8 with the other drop-off condition notes. Standard plans criteria is better suited for TTCP construction details.	Derwood Sheppard				
30.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.147	240	240.2.1.6		CHANGING TO 10 HOUR MINIMUM LANE CLOSURE REQUIREMENT IN D6 WILL BE DIFFICULT TO MEET. WE WILL BE REQUESTING APPROVAL FROM SRDE ON ALMOST ALL PROJECTS. OUR CURRENTLY GUIDELINES IS TO PROVIDE 8. PROVIDING MORE THAN THAT IS DIFFICULT ON MOST OF OUR URBAN FACILITIES.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	DDC: Add to DDE/DCPME Face to Face Agenda.	Y
30.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.088	240	240.2.1.8		WITHIN DETOUR BULLETS WE DISCUSS THE NEED TO DO SPREAD ANALYSIS. THIS SHOULD ALSO BE DISCUSSED WITH DETOURS, DIVERSIONS, AND LANE SHIFTS SECTION.	Derwood Sheppard		Y	GJM: Derwood, I think this is a valid comment; however, I defer to you on final response.	
30.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.088	240	240.2.1.8		ADDED CRITERIA INDICATES TO PROVIDE LANE LANES ON CROSS-SLOPE BREAKS. FOR MOST TTCP APPLICATIONS WE REDUCE LANE WIDTHS AND SHIFT LANES. MEETING THIS REQUIREMENT IS QUITE DIFFICULT. ARE WE NOW SAYING WE NEED TO TEMPORARY OVERBUILD DURING CONSTRUCTION TO MEET THIS CRITERIA.	Derwood Sheppard		Y		
30.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.095	240	240.2.1.16		CONSIDER ADDING DISCUSSION ON COORDINATING PULL OF AREAS WITH TSM&O AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS	Derwood Sheppard		Y	GJM: Derwood, I agree with this comment.	
30.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.078	240	240.2.2.20		WE ARE EXCEEDING MUTCD REQUIREMENTS BY GOING WITH A 200-FT RAMP OPENING WIDTH INSTEAD OF MUTCH REQUIREMENT OF 100-FT. WHY CREATE CRITERIA FOR MINIMUM RAMP OPENING WIDTH. SHOULDN'T WE REVERT TO MAKING SURE WE PROVIDE APPROPRIATE RAMP LANE WIDTH AND MEET THE APPROPRIATE RAMP DEFLECTION.	Derwood Sheppard		Y		
35.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.081	240	240.2.1.8		CLARIFY WHEN TRUCK TURNING TEMPLATES ARE NEEDED AND WHAT TYPE OF TRUCK TO USE.	Derwood Sheppard		Y		
48.2	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.088	240	240.2.1.8		What is the purpose of 2" separation from lane line to pavement drop-off. M&R operations are typically completed along lane lines to ensure longitudinal joints are not within wheel paths. Is the intent here simply to ensure the lane line is maintained? If paint is provided following the M&R operation, is that separation needed? In some constrained conditions, this could mean 5-8" of lane width lost for the lane shift where meeting minimum lane width is already problematic.	Derwood Sheppard		Y		
48.30	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P2.095	240	240.2.1.16		Is this intended only for long-term TTCP configurations, or is this a requirement for temporary lane closures as well? Consider clarifying intent if only for long-term. If this also applies to temporary lane closures, would this be better suited to be addressed in specs than in the TMP/TTCP?	Derwood Sheppard		Y		

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
61.00	Saud Khan	saud.khan@dot.state.fl.us		F.147	240	240		1. 1st Line - Should the end of the line include "if warranted by lane closure analysis." to read – work period if warranted by the lane closure analysis. 2. 2nd Line – Should the following be added after "work period" and "cannot" to read - work period when lane closure analysis cannot be provided.	Derwood Sheppard		Y		
63.8	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7	P2.095	240	240.2.1.16		Is the intent that this be implemented only if shoulder is less than 8 ft for a distance of more than one mile? It seems some sort of clarification as to what length of reduced shoulder width triggers this requirement. Also, maintaining adjacent lane cross slope may be impracticable. Can we allow a certain % breakover instead?	Derwood Sheppard				
7.30	Kevin Stewart	Kevin.Stewart@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike		251	251.1		Fix spelling "und" should be "and".	Jacqueline	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Change made.	
17.13	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.113	260	260.1.1	Fig 260.1.1	Show the requirements for shoulders that were added to Table 211.4.1	Ben Gerrell		Y	Note number 3 was added to Figure 260.1.1 to accommodate the new Turnpike Shoulder width requirements in Table 211.4.1. Additional edits to this figure will be made in 2024 FDM. Changes need to be more fully vetted than can be done for 2023.	Y
17.14	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	SSM.028	261	261		Add commas after ITS (some are there, some are missing).	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Commas added.	
17.15	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P2.209	261	261.2		Blue box: Why delete for DB? It should still require approval....remove blue box.	DeWayne Carver	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: Blue box has been removed	
29.30	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.152	261	261.8		Items (1) and (2) are not clear of what they are referring to in the sentence "Submit the information for items (1) and (2) to the District Structures Maintenance Engineer (DSME) for review and concurrence. Include the DSME's comments and recommendations in the submittal to the DSDO."	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: There is an MS Word Numbered List error. It has been corrected.	
29.40	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.209	261	261.2		Does this requirement include multi-column ground sign structure or just overhead sign structure support? Multi-column ground sign has breakaway and crash related issues, should it be approved by roadway office? Why DSDO need to approve custom designed overhead sign support structure?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Intent is for overhead sign structures not ground mounted signs. Language revised.	
30.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.152	261	261.8		FIX LIST NUMBERING FOR SUBMISSION OF AN ANCILLARY STRUCTURES EVALUATIONS. CURRENTLY STARTS AT (7) INSTEAD OF (1). Substantial rewrite of FDM 261. See entire chapter	Darrell Lewis	Yes	Y	Agreed. DDC: There is an MS Word Numbered List error. It will be corrected.	
90.01	Gevin McDaniel	gevin.mcdaniel@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.369	261	All			DeWayne Carver			Agreed. Change made.	Y
29.50	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P2.103	262	262.2		1. Take out the sentence "provide an analysis with the 60% Structure Plans meeting the requirements of SDG 7.8. For wall projects without bridges, provide the analysis with the Phase II Submittal." It is repeating. 2. Where is SDG 7.8?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Recommend keeping as is. This is consistent with existing language in 262.2.2(2). The 60% Structures Plans submittal does not always exactly align with the Phase II Roadway Submittal.	
17.17	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.1		Designer qualifications are now provided in both FDM 266.2 and SDG 10.3....suggest that such information be contained in only one place and not duplicated, provide a cross-reference between manuals as needed I've not seen 2023 edits to SDG 10.3, but 2022 language is different than what is shown here in FDM. SDG refers to "private" projects, crossing FDOT roadways, etc. Terminology should be consistent if both sections remain.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Discussed with Russ Snyder. 2023 SDG 10.3 refers to FDM 266 for designer qualification requirements for pedestrian bridges. No change.	
18.00	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2		This language requires pedestrian bridge designers be technically prequalified. Section 121.12 requires the IPR firm also to be prequalified. Why is this just for pedestrian bridges....for a regular bridge, does the original designer need to be prequalified (technically) for a non-Dept owned structures within/under/over DOT R/W? Where is that addressed in FDM?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Discussed with Russ Snyder. This issue needs attention but not enough time in this cycle to resolve. Have added this as a task for next cycle. DDC: Item will be considered for 2024 FDM.	
18.10	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2		This criteria is written for "engineering firms", how are FDOT qualified Specialty Engineers addressed?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Discussed with Russ. The intent is that the work must be performed by an engineering firm and not an individual specialty engineer. DDC: Item will be considered for 2024 FDM.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
18.12	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.190	266	266.3		Why "State Road" right of way? Use a consistent terminology throughout. Check the flowchart too. This section just says "within or over" but not "under" like 266.2....see previous comments about pedestrian tunnels.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder. Updated to make State Road right-of-way consistent throughout FDM 266. Updated to make "Within, under or over" consistent throughout FDM 266. This chapter is not intended to cover buried structure pedestrian facilities.	
18.13	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.273	266	266.3	Fig 266.3.1	This revised detail now shows a vertical clearance of 10ft min, three items: 1. Please update the Std Plans Index 550-012 to provide this clearance 2. Based on the language in the FDM, vertical clearance over a "sidewalk" is different than the vertical clearance over a "shared use path"....it would seem this value of clearance depends on the facility. 3. Please advise the maximum clear width that can be used with the Std Plans details for full fence enclosure.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Partial implementation in 2023. Discussed with Russ Snyder. 1. Coordination required with Structures Standards group. Window for proposed changes to Standard Plans has already closed. 2. Figure 266.3.1 will be updated to reference FDM 222 and 224 for vertical clearance. 3. Coordination required with Structures Standards group. Window for proposed changes to Standard Plans has already closed.	
18.14	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.218	266	266.4		Title: Why just "on FDOT Projects"? There was newly added language that says this applies to non-FDOT projects. Also, suggest a global edit to make use of Department, FDOT, etc. consistent throughout this section	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder. Title for FDM 266.4 updated to remove "on FDOT Projects". Unnecessary to state this as all policies and procedures apply to Department projects.	
18.15	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.218	266	266.4		Footnote 1 says span means an individual span. That definition is not consistent with how the term "span" was used elsewhere in this section. For example: (3) The width of the steel truss span is constant: "The span"....what if there are more than one span? Shouldn't this be written to imply "all" spans...or maybe just simply "the bridge" Comment applies to almost every bullet in this section. Check edits...steel truss was deleted from (1) but left in (3) and (4).	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder. Updates made and item resolved.	
18.20	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2		For a bridge....what is the difference between "within" and "over"? Other definitions like this use the term "adjacent"...was that intended? (In fact, "adjacent" can be found in the flowchart in Section 266.4.3)	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder. Updates made and item resolved.	
18.30	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2		"Under" implies that a box culvert used for pedestrians (tunnel) would be held to the same requirements? And if so, does it need to be large enough to meet the definition of "bridge culvert" since this sentence specifically says "pedestrian bridges"?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change made. Discussed with Russ Snyder . This chapter is not intended to cover buried structure pedestrian facilities.	
18.70	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2	Table 266.2.1	In the box for Department/No/Contractor's EOR: If the Contractor redesigns the steel truss, isn't he also responsible to redesign the substructure also to correspond with his new superstructure design?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. The boxes under Contractor EOR for Category 2 CSIP redesign has been updated to include substructure and foundation.	
18.80	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.189	266	266.2	Table 266.2.1	The table shows "Non-Department" projects and asks if 266.4 is satisfied. Note that the title of 266.4 is "Prefabricated Steel Truss Bridges on FDOT Projects". The title implies that 266.4 only applies to Department projects....reconcile this discrepancy.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Title for FDM 266.4 updated to remove "on FDOT Projects". Unnecessary to state this as all policies and procedures apply to Department projects.	
19.12	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	The flowchart says "adjacent" to right-of-way. If that is intended, then need to add to main text and define "adjacent". Flowchart also says "State Road R/W", other locations say Department or FDOT R/W...be consistent.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Discussed with Russ Snyder . This chapter is not intended to cover buried structure pedestrian facilities.	
19.13	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	Why does this say "following 121.12" when the other flowchart bubble just says IPR, but doesn't say it has to follow 121.12...be consistent...makes it seem like the criteria is different.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updates made and item resolved.	
19.14	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	Why is it necessary to define IPR requirements in the flowchart? See far right box that says IPR must be 4.2.2 qualified.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updates made and item resolved.	
19.15	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	Far right boxes have criteria for convention vs non-conventional. Since this is a flowchart, why not ask the question and give the answer in Yes/No boxes?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Recommend keeping as is.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
19.20	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.218	266	266.4		In Blue Box: Why is the superscript 1 deleted on span here, but left in on the main text for conventional projects? Why is "Foot" deleted here, but left in on the text for conventional projects?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updates made and item resolved.	
19.60	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.2	Fig 266.4.1	"Is FDM 266.4 satisfied?". Question should be "Is the bridge Category 1 per FDM 266.4?" (all applicable boxes)	Mo Hassan	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updated table to state "Category 1 per FDM 266.4?" and flowchart updated for consistency.	
19.70	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	In the boxes under Not an FDOT project, there is criteria for SMO QA Inspectors. This is not in the FDM text. Suggest the flowchart summarize the text, this seems to add new criteria. If this is a requirement, add it to the FDM text	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Added references to Materials Manual Chapter 11 Volume 1.	
19.80	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	Should "Completed truss bridge details" be "Complete truss bridge details"? Completed implies finished, while complete implies all inclusive (both super and sub details). Might want to clarify (applies to other boxes also)	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updates made and item resolved.	
19.90	Russ Snyder	Russ.Snyder@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	F.221	266	266.4.3	Fig 266.4.1	One box says "Plans", another box says "Structure Plans"....be consistent.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Discussed with Russ Snyder . Updates made and item resolved.	
29.20	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.221	266	266.4.3	Figure 266.4.1	Figure 266.4.1, Project Processing of Prefabricated Steel Truss Bridges Flowchart. The very bottom, on the left side, under the "NO" for "Is FDM 266.4 Criteria Satisfied", the last bullet point shows "Consult the SDO on the need for an Independent Department Review". Since this is a conventional project, should this instead be an Independent Peer Review?	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	Agreed. Flowchart will be updated.	
29.60	Hailing Zhang	Hailing.zhang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.190	266	266.3	Figure 266.3.1	Figure 266.3.1 is confusing as single box girder is illustrated. Per email communication with CO structure office, this single box section bridge will be taken out from the 2023 FDM.	Ben Goldsberry	Yes	Y	No change. DDC: No proposed edit to this item. Confirm with Ben Goldsberry. BMG Response: The figure with the single box section is being replaced (the single box is removed). Maybe the comment is referring to the old figure with the single box that is struck out but still visible in the redline document.	
25.00	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.209	270	270.1		Suggest to change "Planting Plan" to "Landscape Plan", and modify the sections of the Staff Hour Estimate guideline to reference "Landscape" instead of "Planting" for consistency.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. The language was developed by Landscape Staff Hour Committee and concurred with by District Landscape Architects and Managers. Landscape Plans (title on Key Sheet) includes the three elements of design: Planting Plan, Irrigation Plan and Hardscape Plan.	
25.10	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.209	270	270.2		use "Proposed plant material" instead of "New plant material"	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. It is understood that "new" plants are plants that are purchased material brought onto the projects site.	
25.20	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.209	270	270.2		add "unless there is a Maintenance Agreement in place the maintaining agency" after "The need for irrigation following plant establishment"; add "when feasible" after "The Need to amend or replace existing soil", some projects will have this requirement based on location and existing soil conditions, for example, new median where previously there was a road.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edits made to clarify when to avoid use plants that require irrigation system.	
25.30	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.209	270	270.2.1		suggest to remove "Rigid geometric designs focused on repetition should not be used". This sentence seems unnecessary.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. This sentence was added many years ago to avoid planting plants that line up trees along the roadway. When a tree(s) die it leaves undesirable/detracting views when not replaced.	
25.40	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.212	273	273.2.1		Suggest to modify the first sentence to "Convey the design intent of the landscape design"	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	Agreed. Edit made.	
25.50	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.212	273	273.2.2		Move "Hardscape and site amenities preservation" to 273.2.1 Design Intent.	Paul Hiers	Yes	Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
9.10	Ryan Drendel	ryan.drendel@	District 4	F.279	900	900, 900.1		900.1 still says to follow 300 series chapters if the 900 series chapter is under development. Is this still applicable under the 2023 FDM? If so, should this be clarified to use the 2022 300 series chapters?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. Removed sentence referencing 300 series when 900 series sheet is "under development". F.363	
24.50	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		900	900.3.1		For projects involving multiple state roads, recommend putting a specific number (>3?) instead of "only a few" and "many".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. Language revised so if multiple state roads are involved, the state road numbers should all be listed when there is adequate space in the box or listed as "Districtwide" when adequate space is not available. F364	
24.60	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		900	900.3.1	Table 900.3.1	Recommend allowing 36x48 and 36x72 sizes for PNC, all sizes for SWPPP, all sizes for Soil Survey/Report of Core Borings. Restricting sizes in these categories reduces benefits of large format sheet sizes.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. 24"x36" will be added as optional size for Report of Core Borings. Working with Survey office and Survey Staff Hour Committee it was reported that 24"x36" is a standard size sheet used by survey firms/work. They did not recommend any this bigger. SWPPP sheets are being removed from the plans set. Almost always, Soil Survey does not require a sheet larger than 11x17.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
30.12	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		900	900.3.1		WHY ARE WE REMOVING REFERENCE TO CADD SOFTWARE. CONTINUE REFERENCING CADD SOFTWARE SO WE GET APPROPRIATE PROJECT INFORMATION BLOCKS LOADED ONTO SHEETS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Reference is not needed. The beginning of 900.3 states "Plan sheet borders are contained in the FDOT CADD Software."	
30.13	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.278	900	900.3.2		BULLET 2 INDICATES WHERE TO PLACE REVISION BLOCK. SHOULD HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY IN PLACEMENT IF REVISION BLOCK IS BLOCKING PLAN INFORMATION.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. The language is flexible enough to more revision cell that avoids blocking information.	
30.14	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.278	900	900.3.2	TABLE 900.3.1	MISSING TABLE	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Table has been added.	
30.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		900	900.1		BULLET 3 MAKES REFERENCES TO LOD 300 AND HIGHER. WHAT IS THIS, SHOULD WE DEFINE?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. "Level of Development (LOD)" added to sentence. F.365	
30.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.279	900	900.1		WE ARE REMOVING ALL REFERENCES AND SUNSETTING FDM 300. HOWEVER, WE HAVE SENTENCE INDICATING WE WILL STILL HAVE SOME 900 CHAPTERS UNDER DEVELOPMENT AND STILL USE SOME 300 SERIES CHAPTERS. PLEASE CLARIFY	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Language removed.	
48.40	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5		900	900.3.24		Consider more flexibility for placement of the large-format Revision block as provided in 2022 version, or include the revision block as part of the sheet border cell (as is done on standard format borders) if the location is required to be there so that sheets are cut with that placement in mind.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. The language is flexible enough to more revision cell that avoids blocking information.	
57.0	Jonathan Harris	jonathan.harris@dot.state.fl.us		900.3	900	900		The District Utility Office has concern with the large format plans and reconciling that with the 2017 UAM / F.A.C. Rule 14-46 requirement to provide utilities agreed upon plans for markup. Negotiating a different format "mid-stream" adds time to a process that it is already pressed for time. While an EOR can provide 11x17 working sheets this is an added expense / time to the project. Once the utility's facilities are included into the large format plans they must be verified thus requiring additional "working sheets" or verification on the large format sheets. Many UAO's do not have the ability to print large format sheets or a "copy center" close by to have them printed. This situation may be multiplied by numerous utilities on the same project. Each utility needs to be able to see what other utilities are proposing in order to coordinate "who goes where". Time and money savings via large format plan sheets may ultimately be lost by increased time/cost to coordinate utilities. At a minimum, decisions on when and where to use large format plan sheets needs to take into account utility coordination efforts.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Your concerns are noted.	
59.2	Seth Gay	seth.gay@dot.state.fl.us		F.278	900	900.3	Table 900.3.1	There is reference to the SWPPP. This happens multiple times throughout this chapter.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. References to SWPPP has been removed. F.366	
63.9	Allan Urbonas	allan.urbonas@dot.state.fl.us	District 7		900	900		D7 has not completed its review of the 900 Series. Various stakeholders (utilities, CEI, etc.) have express concern with its implementation.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Your concerns are noted.	
55.40	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson	District 3		900	FDM 900.1		FDM 900.1 – If 300 series is being sunset, how can one "use the corresponding FDM 300 series chapter" if an FDM 900 series chapter is "under development?" Will all chapters currently under development be available by implementation of 2023 FDM?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. Removed sentence referencing 300 series when 900 series sheet is "under development".	
55.50	Anna Harlson	anna.harlson	District 3		900	FDM 900		There is no discussion on the level of detailed modeling required for roadway projects. Will this be something that the district has control over?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Modeling standards are being developed and will reside in the CADD Manual. Anticipate a December release for new modeling standards	
8.0	Kyle Howard	Kyle.Howard@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.281	901	901.3 and 901.3.1		Table 901.3.1 Does not show that a preliminary Drainage Map is required for Phase I submittals but Section 901.3.1 states a Drainage Map is required for Phase I submittals and describes what information is to be shown.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Table 901.3 has been revised to include preliminary Drainage Map for Phase I submittals. F.367	
24.70	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		901	901.2		36x60 listed for optional line and grade submittal is not an allowable sheet size listed in 900.3.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. 36"x60" has been revised to 36"x48" for the Optional Line and Grade submittal.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
24.80	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		901	901.4.1		Consider that all District ERC systems might not be set up with the Response Required Comment or FYI Comment fields.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. This DB review process has been in place many years. Will consider for 2024 FDM.	
24.90	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		901	901.4.1		Including direction to other office plan reviewers for their comment format in the FDM is unusual. Other offices are not routinely looking to the FDM for guidance. This information would be better suited in an ERC Help Guide document.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. This DB review process has been in place many years. Will consider for 2024 FDM.	
30.15	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.046	901	901.2		SHOULD WE CONSIDERING ADDING A TABLE SIMILAR TO TABLE 901.3.1 OR INCLUDE THE 15% LINE AND GRADE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS IN FDM TABLE 901.3.1	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. FDM 90.2 provided necessary information concerning these sheets.	
30.16	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		901	901.2.1		CONSIDER ADDING THE FOLLOWING TO THE LINE A GREED SHEETS: (9) EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF RW NEEDS FOR INITIAL VALIDATION/COORDINATION, (10) EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF BRIDGE STRUCTURE IMPACTS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Sentence added.	
32.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.017	901	901.3		CONSIDER ALSO ADDING THAT ANY SHEET THAT SUPPORTS R/W ACQUISITION SHOULD BE COMPLETE BY PHASE II SUBMITTAL.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Many sheets that influence R/W takes are preliminary at PH2.	
32.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.281	901	901.3		IN PLAN VIEW AND PROFILE VIEW REQUIREMENTS FOR PHASE 1. CONSIDER ADDING "BEGIN & END FOR SPECIFIC CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY TYPES (RRR, RECONSTRUCTION, OVERBUILD, EXCEPTIONS, ETC.)	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Work type is dictated by Work Program. Current practice of calling out "begin and end" resurfacing, widening, etc. suffices.	
32.12	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.029 & F.280	901	901.4.6		THIS SECTION REQUIRES DOCUMENTATION PER FDM 111.7. HOWEVER, 111.7 DOES NOT PROVIDE GUIDANCE FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL PROJECTS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. Project Documentation is required for all projects; there is no difference for DB	
32.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		901	901.3.2		LINE ITEM (2) ONLY REQUIRES THE LOADING OF PAY ITEMS ONTO AASHTOWARE. ADD THAT QUANTITIES AND PAY ITEMS SHOULD BE LOADED AT PHASE II WHEN REQUEST BY THE DISTRICT. EQ REPORT SHOULD BE CREATED WHEN QUANTITIES ARE LOADED AT PHASE II.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. The guidance in this section is intended to represent typical work to be performed. Should the District desire quantities and pay items to be loaded earlier than typical, this should be included in the scope. FDM 902 provides instruction when preliminary quantities are provided with PH2.	
32.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.001	901	901.3.2		UNDER TEMPORARY TRAFFIC CONTROL PLANS FOR PHASE II, ITS IDENTIFIED TO LIST NEEDED PAY ITEMS. THIS IS REDUNDANT AS IT IS ALREADY COVERED IN GENERAL DESCRIPTION IN PHASE II ITEM (2).	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Description for Temporary Traffic Control Plans has been updated to remove "List of needed pay items".	
32.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		901	901.3.2		UNDER UTILITY ADJUSTMENT, WE SHOULD BEGIN PRELIMINARILY IDENTIFY KNOWN ADJUSTMENTS/IMPACTS TO UTILITIES. CURRENTLY THIS IS ONLY IDENTIFYING A NEED TO SHOW EXISTING UTILITIES.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
32.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.280	901	901.4	TABLE 901.4.1	BASED ON TABLE 901.4.1, WE ARE REQUIRING DB FIRMS TO HAVE A PC SHEET. IS INTENT TO PROVIDE THEM THIS INFORMATION WITH THE RFP PACKAGE OR WILL THEY NEED TO CONSULT WITH SURVEY FIRM TO DEVELOP THIS FOR TECH PROPOSAL?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. This is not a change to current requirements.	
32.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.280	901	901.4	TABLE 901.4.1	CONSIDER ADDING P FOR UTILITY ADJUSTMENTS UNDER TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. MAJOR IMPACTS ARE IMPORTANT WHEN EVALUATING A TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
32.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.280	901	901.4	TABLE 901.4.1	ITS PLANS MAY BE CONSIDERED P IF WE ARE ASKING FOR SPM. MANY OH STRUCTURES ARE TIED TOGETHER TO DMS SIGNS, DYNAMIC TOLLING, ETC.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
32.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.089 & F.280	901	901.4.2		UNDER SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKING PLANS WE ARE ONLY ASKING FOR SIGN DETAIL SHEETS FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. MANY TIMES ITS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND SIGNAGE PLACEMENT ON LIMITED ACCESS FACILITIES.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
32.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P1.029 & F.280	901	901.4.5		REFERENCE WHETHER IT IS THE DESIGN OR CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGERS RESPONSIBILITY TO RELEASE FOR CONSTRUCTION.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. The department PM can be either from the design office of construction office, depending on district.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
44.60	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		901	901.1	10	Add Utilities	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			Agreed. UWHC Plans added	
44.70	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		901	901.3.2		Add develop conflict matrix	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y		Agreed. Language to develop conflict matrix at Phase II has been added under Utility Adjustments. F.368	PH - don't agree with this response. Utility Conflict Matrix is not described anywhere in the FDM as to what it is or how its used. It is not a requirement for this sheet. It is necessary for utility coordination.
51.1	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.017 & F.281	901	901.3	Table 901.3.1	SWPPP removed from Phase Submittals for Conventional Projects, but the chapter is still included (see next comment). SWPPP still required for >1AC disturbed soils? If so, should remain in Table 901.3.1. Please clarify.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. The SWPPP chapter is being removed. A SWPPP is still required for disturbance >1 acre but is the responsibility of the Contractor.	
25.70	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.067	904	904.1		Add "A Landscape Opportunity Plan is prepared when proposed landscape is not part of a roadway construction project, but landscape will be installed"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. This guidance is provided in the second paragraph.	
32.13	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.043	905	905.1		THIRD PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE INDICATES "CROSS-SECTION SHEETS FOR COORDINATION PURPOSED AS NEEDED". CORRECT TO PURPOSES INSTEAD OF PURPOSED.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Revised language from "purposed" to "purposes".	
32.14	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.043	905	905.1		NOT SURE WHY CROSS-SECTIONS ARE NOT A SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENT IN DDD MODULE. MAY INCREASE NEGOTIATION EFFORTS MOVING FORWARD.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. This is a step toward full model-centric plans delivery.	
32.15	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		910	910.2.10		FIRST PARAGRAPH, THIRD SENTENCE, READS: "THE NOTE IS SHOW IN THE TOP RIGHT...". CORRECT SHOW TO SHOWN.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Revised language from "show" to "shown".	
32.16	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		910	910.3.5		WE ARE NOW MOVING AWAY FROM ALWAYS PROVIDING KEY SHEETS WITH EVERY REVISION, HOWEVER, DEVELOPMENT OF A SIGNATURE SHEET ALWAYS INTRODUCES A NEW SHEET 2A, 2B, ETC. THIS WILL ALWAYS REQUIRE A MODIFICATON OF THE KEY SHEET. CAN WE ADD A STATEMENT THAT ADDING A SUFFIX TO THE KEY SHEET PAGE # SHOULD NOT REQUIRE A MODIFICATION OF THE KEY SHEET?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Each component that requires revisions will include a new Key Sheet that records all changes made to that component. These revised components will include a signature sheet (if more than one signatory) to S&S the revision plans set.	
35.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		910	910.2.6.1		CONSIDER ADDING LANGUAGE THAT EARLY WORKS ARE TO UNDERGO FINAL PLANS PROCESSING AT TIME THEY ARE SIGNED AND SEALED. FOR EXAMPLE, WE OFTEN RECEIVE COMMENTS AT FINAL PLANS PROCESSING FOR A MISSING DIGITAL NOTE OR SIMILAR COMMENT THAT REQUIRE US TO TRACK DOWN THE FIRM AND DOCUMENTS THAT WERE SIGNED AND SEALED YEARS PRIOR.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
35.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		910	910.2.9		IS THE INTENT THAT IF THE REVISION ONLY INCLUDES A COMPONENT THE LEAD KEY SHEET WONT HAVE TO BE INCLUDED? IF YES, CONSIDER ADDING "COMPONENT" KEY SHEET.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edit made.	
42.90	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		910	910	Key Sheet exhibit	Key Sheet (General): In the example exhibits, the Fiscal Year should be consistent with the date of the Governing Standard Plans. For example, for the 2023-24 Standard Plans the fiscal year should be 24. The date of the Governing Standard Specifications should be July 2023 or January 2024.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edits made.	
51.00	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5		910	910.2.9		Suggestion to leave 'lead component' before 'Key sheet' text to avoid confusion.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Each component that requires revisions will include a new Key Sheet that records all changes made to that component. There is no longer a complete list of revisions for all components shown on the Roadway Key sheet (typically lead). Each component Key Sheet will list all revisions made to that component.	
9.20	Ryan Drendel	ryan.drendel@dot.state.fl.us	District 4	F.293	912	912, 912.2		Is there a reason the 36x48 and 36x72 large format sizes are no longer allowed for project control sheets?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. 2022 FDM only allowed 11x17 and 24x36. The edited version provided for review was confusing.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?	
11.40	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		913	913	913-7	Exhibit 913-7 overbuild details needs to be distributed for review and comment. Current plans preparation for cross slope correction projects have had confusing or incomplete details required to monitor paving operations. It is highly recommended for the tables to provide approximate tonnages per lane per station in this table. Previous cross slope corrections have provided max depth, cross sectional area, etc. across the entire typical section, which has not been adequate for tracking progress during construction and monitoring pavement layer thickness for adequacy. This leads to errors in the field that are not discoverable until the entire roadway section is already paved.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass				No change. This table has been in the FDM for more than 5 years, but your comments are good suggestions that should be considered for 2024 FDM. Or perhaps the table should be removed for 2023 FDM.	
24.12	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		913	913.2		The added statement in quotes below is obvious and doesn't seem necessary to state as each section 913/120 says the required information in each format. "Most often, the typical sections created for the Typical Section Package (see FDM 120) are also used on the Typical Section plan sheets."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. It does seem obvious, but is needed to reinforce the Staff Hour guidelines. To often hours are negotiated as if they are unrelated tasks.		
42.12	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		913	913.2.1		In item 8, revise the spelling of friction course.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Spelling has been revised to "course".		
42.13	Pablo Alonso	pablo.alonso@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		913	913.2.2		Item 5: Revise to: "For new construction projects with asphalt base (type B-12.5 only), indicate.....".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edits made.		
51.2	Lori Trebitz	lori.trebitz@dot.state.fl.us	District 5		913	913.2	913.2	Uncommon spelling of "templet" used here in lieu of "template" used elsewhere in the manual.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Revised "templets" to "templates". CADD Manual use "Templates".		
11.20	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		914	914.2.2(4)	Section 914.2.2(4) Required General Notes	"(4) SR XX is an Emergency Shoulder Use (ESU) route between _____ and _____. Maintain a usable shoulder during all phases of construction that can be open to ESU traffic when directed by the Construction Project Manager." From the construction perspective, the direction would need to originate from either the Resident Engineer or the District Construction Engineer. This would not be a delegated authority to the Construction PM.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			Agreed. Each district may handle differently. Changed to "directed by the Department."		
44.80	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		914	914.2.2	3	Add email address to utility agency owner Remove Also include: • Contact information for persons responsible for the maintenance of FDOT utility infrastructure such as traffic counters, lighting, signal components, and ITS. • Transportation Data and Analytics Office when there is a traffic-monitoring site on the project or within one-half mile of the construction. The contact person is the Traffic Data Section Manager This info appears to be for FDOT personnel not the UAO.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Adding email is a change that may be considered for 2024 FDM. Additional Department contact information was requested by CO/district offices and is appropriate information for the contractor.		
62.00	Omid Fallahinejad	omid.fallahinejad@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		914	Section 914.2.2		Are General notes 1, 2 and 3 also required to be shown on Lighting, Signalization, and ITS General Notes Sheets?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. FDM 914 is a roadway sheet and is not intended to be applied to other components included in the Contract Plans Set. However, they may be included in those components when they are stand-alone projects.		
11.30	Kevin Micocci	kmicocci@cegroupfl.com	CE Group		915	915	915.3.5.1 Shoulder Rocking Gutter Profiles	Is there a maximum and minimum reveal for concrete barrier walls that has been established? Excessive impacts to the reveal of existing walls in cross slope correction and shoulder rocking projects has been a repetitive issue on projects of that scope.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			Agreed. Sentence added to reference FDM 211 section where criteria can be found.		
34.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		915	915.3.5.1		INDICATES THAT PROFILES CAN BE DEPICTED IN TABLE OR GRAPHICAL FORMAT. CAN WE PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF A TABLE FOR CONSISTENCY.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Good suggestion. Will be considered for 2024 FDM.		
7.40	Kevin Stewart	Kevin.Stewart@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P3.007	918	918.2		fix spelling "when know" should be "when known."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Language updated to state "when known".		
38.10	Adriana Kirwan	adriana.kirwan@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	P3.007	918	FDM 918.2		Item (7): Last word of the second sentence needs to be changed from "know" not "known".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Language updated to state "when known".		

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
24.13	Brad Salisbury	brad.salisbury@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		923	923.2		Rephrase "To be abandoned" as "to be placed out of service" - abandonment of utilities in Department R/W is not a good practice.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			Agreed. Edit made.	
34.00	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		923	923.2		WE USE "GERMANE". MAYBE ITS JUST ME BUT I NEED TO GOOGLE DEFINITION.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Replaced "germane" with "relevant".	PH - Germane is the more appropriate word, meaning something that is closely related to the topic. Using relevant is fine, most people don't understand the difference.
34.10	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		923	923.2		BULLET (6) INDICATES TO PROVIDE UTILITY VERIFICATION INFORMATION IN TABLE PER SHEET. WE SHOULD AVOID THIS AS SUE CONSULTANT IS GOING TO PROVIDE ONE TABLE THAT IS SIGNED AND SEALED WITH EVERYTHING. WE ARE NOW ASKING OUR DESIGNERS TO BREAK INFORMATION UP BY SHEET WHICH INCREASES LIKELIHOOD OF ERRORS TRANSFERING INFORMATION. RECOMMEND TO VERIFIED UTILITY INFORMATION MAINTAIN IN ONE STANDALONE SHEET.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Last sentence in bullet 6 allows the table to be placed on separate sheet.	
41.00	Xenia Rodriguez	Xenia.Rodriguez@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		923	923.2		Please consider replacing the "germane" to "relevant" "Do not display information and graphic data that is not relevant"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. replaced "germane" with "relevant".	
41.10	Xenia Rodriguez	Xenia.Rodriguez@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		923	923.1		Please consider making updates reflected below. "Utility Adjustments sheets provide a plan view that depicts the location of existing and proposed utilities. These sheets are used when the project corridor contains numerous utilities with significant conflict. Projects with minor utility work or impacts may include this information on roadway(or other component) plan sheets."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Suggested edits that can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
58.3	Gabor Chiorean	gabor.chiorean@dot.state.fl.us			923	923.2		923.2 Required information Item (3) [Redline Page 133 of 199] Y Rename "To Be Abandoned" to be "Placed out of service".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edit made.	
25.90	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		924	924.3.3		spelling correction to "diameter of tree trunk". Use active voice instead: "Disposition of tree (e.g., "Remain", "Protect", "Removed.", "Relocate"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edits made.	
27.00	Edward Williams	edward.williams@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		924	924.1		(2) Recommend that first bullet is revised to read "Removal of undesirable trees and vegetation, while preserving desirable trees and vegetation."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Covered by second bullet.	
27.10	Edward Williams	edward.williams@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		924	924.3.1		1st paragraph - remove the word undesirable. Vegetation that is removed due to A conflict with construction activities, etc. is not always "undesirable vegetation" Confusing that there is a vegetation removal table and a tree disposition table. Couldn't this be combined.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Suggested edits can be considered for 2024 FDM. Combining tables is a good idea.	
8.1	Kyle Howard	Kyle.Howard@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.307	925	925		Would a better name for this chapter be the "Sediment Runoff Control Plan"? The purpose of the SWPPP was to provide counter measures to reduce the amount of erosion and sediment transport during construction activities that disturb the soil. The name Stormwater Runoff Control Plan implies that the intent is to control the flow of stormwater.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y		
8.2	Kyle Howard	Kyle.Howard@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.307	925	925		Are erosion and sediment controls still to be shown on appropriate plan sheets? These erosion and sediment controls are required to be shown on the plans when obtaining a permit through the local Water Management District.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y		
8.3	Kyle Howard	Kyle.Howard@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.307	925	925	Exhibit 925-1	Should the Exhibits for 925 and the 925 SWPPP section be deleted?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. This section is being deleted.	
34.20	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.307	925	925.1		PARAGRAPH 2 INDICATES TO PROVIDE EXCEL SPREADSHEET WITH SUMMARY TABLES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. IS THIS BEING PROVIDED IN OUR CADD SOFTWARE? CAN WE PROVIDE EXAMPLE FOR CONSISTENCY?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y		
34.30	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.307	925	925.2		WE ONLY DISCUSS REQUIREMENTS OF PLAN SHEETS. WE DO NOT DISCUSS REQUIREMENTS OF EXCEL TABLE.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y		

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
34.40	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		940	940.4.1		BULLET (8) INDICATES TO PROVIDE UTILITY VERIFICATION INFORMATION IN TABLE PER SHEET. WE SHOULD AVOID THIS AS SUE CONSULTANT IS GOING TO PROVIDE ONE TABLE THAT IS SIGNED AND SEALED WITH EVERYTHING. WE ARE NOW ASKING OUR DESIGNERS TO BREAK INFORMATION UP BY SHEET WHICH INCREASES LIKELIHOOD OF ERRORS TRANSFERING INFORMATION. RECOMMEND TO VERIFIED UTILITY INFORMATION MAINTAIN IN ONE STANDALONE SHEET. WE ARE NOW BEING ASKED TO ADD ON ALL COMPONENTS. WILL LEAD TO ERRORS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. VVH are only provided for overhead sign installations that have potential utility conflicts.	
34.50	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		940	940.4.2		PARAGRAPH 1, SENTENCE 1 ADD "OF". ...TYPICAL SECTION INDICATING PLACEMENT [OF] TRAFFIC MARKINGS....	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Added "of" to sentence.	
34.60	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		940	940.6.1		ARE WE GOING TO REQUIRE THE MULTI-POST SHEETS, NOT USED IN PLANS, TO BE PLACED IN DDD. NO CURRENT GUIDANCE. CONSIDER PROVIDING.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Creation of these cross sections are optional. Lengths can be determined from the design file, but districts may request that these be provided. If created they should be placed in PSEE Project Documentation module.	
35.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		940	940.4		IS THE INTENT TO INCLUDE UTILITY INFORMATION ALWAYS, OR WHEN WE DON'T HAVE UTILITY ADJUSTMENT SHEETS? IF IT IS TO BE INCLUDED ALWAYS, THIS WILL DUPLICATE WORK AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY FOR ERRORS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. VVH are only provided for overhead sign installations.	
52.3	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.052	940	940.4.1		Item (4). Recommend adding labeling the partial station of each type of marking begin end, message and radii, dimension lane widths before and after lane width change	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Sentence added.	
52.4	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.052	940	940.4.1		Item (8). We do not see any benefits of providing VVHs information in the SPM plans to the SPM contractor. This information may be provided only at overhead structure location as needed. Providing this VVHs will cluttered the SPM plans with no benefits.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Clarified that this is only for overhead sign installations.	
58.4	Gabor Chiorean	gabor.chiorean@dot.state.fl.us			940	940.4.1		940.4.1 Required information [Redline Page 150 of 199] Revise the second sentence of the second paragraph to include language about existing and proposed utilities. Suggested re-write in Blue - "Identify potential conflicts with existing and proposed utilities, drainage, landscape features, sidewalks, and driveways in the plans."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. The proposed language requiring identification of "potential conflicts with utilities..." covers both existing and proposed.	
34.70	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		941	941.4		WE INDICATE WE SHOULD HAVE ONE COMPLETE INTERSECTION ON ONE PLAN SHEET. IF THAT'S THE CASE, WITH 40-SCALE, AND 50-SCALE, I DON'T SEE US USING LARGE SCALE PLAN SHEETS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. There may be times when two intersections are close together that can be effectively shown on a single large-format sheet. Or the LF sheet can be subdivided.	
34.80	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		941	941.4.1		BULLET (14) INDICATES TO PROVIDE UTILITY VERIFICATION INFORMATION IN TABLE PER SHEET. WE SHOULD AVOID THIS AS SUE CONSULTANT IS GOING TO PROVIDE ONE TABLE THAT IS SIGNED AND SEALED WITH EVERYTHING. WE ARE NOW ASKING OUR DESIGNERS TO BREAK INFORMATION UP BY SHEET WHICH INCREASES LIKELIHOOD OF ERRORS TRANSFERING INFORMATION. RECOMMEND TO VERIFIED UTILITY INFORMATION MAINTAIN IN ONE STANDALONE SHEET. WE ARE NOW BEING ASKED TO ADD ON ALL COMPONENTS. WILL LEAD TO ERRORS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. VVH are only provided for signal installations that have potential utility conflicts.	
43.60	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.308	941	941.2		Consider adding the following sheets: - Video detector installation detail - Controller cabinet installation detail - Concrete Service Pole	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Provided sentence in FDM 941.6 that other details may be required.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
43.70	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	F.308	941	941.4.1		I would add the following to the list - controller timing reference table - ped. signal orientation detail - video detection zone table - loop detection zone table - controller operation notes - intersection ID number -Roadway Bearing on all approaches, on each sheet. The reviewers need that information to confirm the bearing on proposed mast arms	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Suggested edits can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
50.10	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.6		Locations and orientations of pedestrian push buttons at the intersections to be compliance with ADA requirement is a concern. Please consult with ADA office to see if push button details at each corner are needed to be shown in the plans. The District had successful experience in providing such details to make sure that push buttons are compatible with both MUTCD and ADA requirements.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Suggested edits can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
52.12	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.6		Recommend adding special details insets showing each pedestrian pole locations in reference to the curb ramp and push button orientation meeting ADA requirements. These details are very helpful during construction of ped poles. The standard index is not enough as each intersection corner is unique. Please consult with ADA office.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Suggested edits can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
52.5	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.4		Using scale of 1"=40' or 1"=50' for one intersection in a large scale 48x36 format will show the intersection too small. We recommend using 1"=20' scale in this case.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. 1"=20' is added.	
52.6	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.4.1		Recommend adding all ITS above and below conduit and cable runs within plans sheet.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Suggested edits can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
52.7	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.4.1		Item 11. Recommend adding stations and offsets for ped poles.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Added to 941.4.1 #6	
52.9	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	941	941.4.1		Item (14). Typically VVHs during design are used as a base for the designer to place the signal pole foundation. Because of the time gap between design and construction, typically, contractor is required to do his own VVHs during construction and provides to the EOR an RFI if the pole needs to be relocated. Will providing VVHs in the plans put the liability on the EOR to place the pole as shown in the plans and the contractor does not need to do his own VVHs. VVHs do not have to be required information as would be optional for the EOR to provide to the contractor for information purpose only.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Many districts do obtain VVH during design and they should be shown. How would this be any different than VVHs shown for roadway, or overhead sign installations?	
58.5	Gabor Chiorean	gabor.chiorean@dot.state.fl.us			941	941.4.1		941.4.1 Required information [Redline Page 163 of 199] Revise second sentence of second paragraph to include language about existing and proposed utilities. Suggested re-write in Blue - "Identify potential conflicts with existing and proposed utilities, drainage, landscape features, sidewalks, and driveways in the plans."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. The proposed language requiring identification of "potential conflicts with utilities..." covers both existing and proposed.	
50.00	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	942	942.6.3		Service point details are provided in standard index 639-001. Do we need an electrical engineer to review all new electrical requirements and sign and seal panel schedule plan?	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Details are provided only when the standards don't adequately provide necessary project specific information.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
34.12	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		943	943.5.1		BULLET (4) INDICATES TO PROVIDE UTILITY VERIFICATION INFORMATION IN TABLE PER SHEET. WE SHOULD AVOID THIS AS SUE CONSULTANT IS GOING TO PROVIDE ONE TABLE THAT IS SIGNED AND SEALED WITH EVERYTHING. WE ARE NOW ASKING OUR DESIGNERS TO BREAK INFORMATION UP BY SHEET WHICH INCREASES LIKELIHOOD OF ERRORS TRANSFERING INFORMATION. RECOMMEND TO VERIFIED UTILITY INFORMATION MAINTAIN IN ONE STANDALONE SHEET. WE ARE NOW BEING ASKED TO ADD ON ALL COMPONENTS. WILL LEAD TO ERRORS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. VVH are only provided for lighting installations that have potential utility conflicts.	
34.90	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		943	943.5		CONSIDER ALLOWING SAME SCALE THAT WE ALLOW ON ROADWAY PLAN SHEETS. SEEMS LIKE ON LIGHTING PLANS WE ARE NOT ALLOWING 1"=100'	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edits made.	
43.12	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.062	943	943.5.1		Conduits and size? Is not clear here, we usually show the number of runs, length of run, and conductor sizes when labeling the conduit runs	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Edits made. (#2-a)	
43.80	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.057	943	943.3.2		I would add mounting height	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Mounting height is included in the Lighting Data Table.	
43.90	Patrick Marchant	Patrick.Marchant@dot.state.fl.us	District 6	P3.011	943	943.4		I would add a table with the lighting design criteria that has been used at the photometric calculation	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Non change.	
52	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.062	943	943.5.1		Please correct "signal components" to "lighting components"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	Agreed. Updated "signal components" to "lighting components".	
52.1	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.062	943	943.5.1		Item 4. Typically VVHs are not required at every light pole only as needed by the EOR.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Show VVH only when obtained.	
52.2	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	P3.054	943	943.6.5		One-line diagram is provided in standard index 639-001. This may cause confusion.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. Plans often provide a project specific service point diagram.	
58.6	Gabor Chiorean	gabor.chiorean@dot.state.fl.us			943	943.5.1		943.5.1 Required information [Redline Page 184 of 199] Revise the second paragraph to include language about existing and proposed utilities. Suggested re-write in Blue - "Show existing and proposed underground and overhead utilities, signing structures, lighting structures, and ITS structures that may conflict with the installation of signal components."	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass	Y	Y	No change. The proposed language requiring identification of "potential conflicts with utilities..." covers both existing and proposed.	
25.12	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		944	944.1.1		Modify "Pay items categorized as small are plants less than 7 gallon..." to "Landscape Complete pay item - Small plants, is used for plants less than 7 gallon.", modify "pay items categorized as large are plants 7 gallon or greater container size" to "landscape Complete pay item - Large plants, is used to plants 7 gallon or greater constrainer size, and trees and palms".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. This language was determined by the District Landscape Architects and Mangers duering statewide meeting June 6th and 7th.	
25.13	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		944	944.2		use "Landscape Plans" instead of "Planting Plans and Details", add "landscape Details" as separate sheets; use "Irrigation Plans" and add "Irrigation Details" as separate sheets.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. The language was developed by Landscape Staff Hour Committee and concurred with by District Landscapre Architects and Managers. Landscape Plans (title on Key Sheet) includes the three elents of design: Planting Plan, Irrigation Plan and Hardscape Plan.	
25.14	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		944	944.4, 944.4.1		Use "landscape" instead of "Planting"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. The language was developed by Landscape Staff Hour Committee and concurred with by District Landscapre Architects and Managers. Landscape Plans (title on Key Sheet) includes the three elents of design: Planting Plan, Irrigation Plan and Hardscape Plan.	
25.15	BaoYing Wang	baoying.wang@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		944	944.4.1		Change "Clear trunk height for trees and palms" to "Clear trunk height for palms, and overall height for trees".	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. This language was determined by the District Landscape Architects and Mangers duering statewide meeting June 6th and 7th.	
27.20	Edward Williams	edward.williams@dot.state.fl.us	District 4		944	944.1 General		2nd paragraph include the word "let" to read "standalone maintenance let project"	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass			No change. Suggeded edits that can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
52.8	Ayman Mohamed	ayman.mohamed@dot.state.fl.us	District 5	F.308	946	946.4.1		Item (12). Lane lines with orientation arrows and median nose locations with turning radii are signing and pavement marking items and not signal items.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	No change. This is comment to FDM 941.4.1. This is shown in signal plan view.	
34.13	Raymond Valido	Raymond.Valido@dot.state.fl.us	District 6		948	948.6		CONSIDER REFRENCING BACK TO TTC CHAPTER IN 900 SERIES FOR REQUIREMENTS OF TTC PLAN SHEETS.	Paul Hiers, Miranda Glass		Y	Agreed. Added reference to FDM 921.	

ID	First and Last Name	E-Mail Address	District	F.# or P.#	Chapter	FDM Chapter and Section	Figure, Exhibit or Table	Your Comment or Question	Assigned to	Item Resolved?	Send to CO for review? Y/N	CO Response	Add to DDE/DCPME F2F?
44.12	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.009	all	Through out		"To Be Abandoned" should only be use on turnpike plans when referencing FGT.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		Agreed. Changed to "Placed Out Of Service"	
44.50	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office		all	throughout		Change DUE to DUA	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
44.90	Shawn Lewis	shawn.lewis@dot.state.fl.us	Central Office	F.009	all	Through out		Remove Show utility line height where overhead lines to remain may impact proposed construction.	DeWayne Carver	Yes		No change. DDC: New edit. Can be considered for 2024 FDM.	
46.00	Ricardo Policicchio	ricardo.policicchio@dot.state.fl.us	Turnpike	PGD.008	Chapter 2	Chapter 2 Exhibits	Turnpike Traffic drawings 102-1, 102-2, 102-3	Based on the final TDH guide drawings disposition matrix, FTE's understanding was that TDH Guide Drawings 102-1 (AET Connecting Roadways Typical Signing), 102-2 (AET Ramp Typical Signing), and 102-3 (AET Mainline Typical Signing) were to be incorporated into FDM Part 2 as exhibits. The new exhibits have been omitted.	Darrell Lewis		Y	Agreed. This change will be made, but the drawings are still under development.	