

Team Support Review Top Comments

The top comments and/or issues that are identified during reviews are as follows:

1. Baseline(s) from historic contract(s) are not recreated and held as the existing R/W baseline and an explanation is not provided.
2. Property ownership information does not exactly match recorded documentation.
3. All existing easements are not shown.
4. Existing easement label does not include reference document.
5. Existing R/W dedications that are determined not to have been dedicated in FEE are incorrectly shown on the plans as absorbed into the Existing R/W. The dedication should be displayed as an existing easement outside of the existing R/W. The metes and bounds of the acquisition figures for the parcel should be recomputed to the existing R/W line, and the area occupied by the R/W dedication noted in the Remarks field in the R/W Data Table.
6. Existing R/W by PE is incorrectly shown on the plans as Existing R/W in FEE. The parcel sidelines should extend to the existing R/W baseline. The metes and bounds of the acquisition figures for the parcel should be recomputed to include a separate figure for the RW by PE area.
7. The need for a proposed acquisition is not shown/identified on the plans.
8. Proposed acquisitions do not encompass the LOC or do not encompass needs for construction phasing, utility relocations or other aspects of the project.
9. Multiple acquisitions of the same type from the same parcel are not numbered sequentially and/or are not numbered sequentially in the direction of the road stationing.
10. Proposed acquisitions have sequential number when there is only one type of acquisition for an individual parcel since proposed acquisitions should not receive sequential numbering unless there are multiples of the same type of acquisition on an individual parcel.
11. Areas occupied by existing easements are not noted in the Remarks column in the Data Table.
12. The most current ownership and/or property lines are not shown.
13. Complete documentation of research is not included and/or is not assembled per Project Parcel or in a logical manner.
14. Resolution of Existing Right-of-Way and/or parcel boundaries is not fully and clearly discussed in the Survey Report for Consultant designed projects or in the CADD "Existing RW Design Notes" level for In-House designed projects.
15. Private/commercial driveways and entrances are generally not eligible for RTE use and must use a TCE, unless we can show that the entrance was publicly funded or that the state has been maintaining for 20 years. The designer should ask for guidance from Team Support/Legal on RTE's where there is a question of applicability.