

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	7/6/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Post-Public Hearing			Review Complete	7/24/2020-08/06/2020	County	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	8/17/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Eng & Legal			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	Comment Chart	Because we moved things around in the sub regs, some of the original comments don't match up with regards to the sections they are in. I guess that's ok right?		Clarify	We show the comment resolution in this spreadsheet and we refer to where the changes were made in the document. Between that and the redlines, reviewers will be able to follow the trail if they need to.			
2	22	Original Statement: a. Building and setback lines shall be fifty (50) feet from the edge of the right of way on all major highways and roads, and twenty-five (25) feet on all public roads other than major highways and roads. If the County setback lines differ from those adopted by a municipality with extraterritorial jurisdiction, the larger or more stringent setbacks shall apply. No building or structure may be permitted in the area between the setback line and the roadway right of way. New Statement: a. Building and setback lines shall be fifty (50) feet from the edge of the right of way on all major highways and roads, and twenty-five (25) feet on all public roads other than major highways and roads. If the County setback lines differ from those adopted by a municipality with extraterritorial jurisdiction, the larger or more stringent setbacks shall apply. No building or structure may be permitted in the area between the setback line and the roadway right of way.		Y	Revised.			
	33	Mailboxes: Need to specify that cluster mailboxes need to be located on the roads edge in a manner that does not obstruct maintenance of the road and drainage. It also needs to be accessible to USPS and residents so mailboxes cannot be in an easement or on a lot.	Comments in document 7/24	Clarify	Cluster mailboxes face away from roadway to provide safe refuge for residents. TxDOT guidance states, "TxDOT encourages the use of Neighbor Delivery and Collection Box Units (NDCBU) at locations with numerous mailboxes, such as mobile home parks and apartments. Due to their size and weight, NDCBUs should be installed off of the highway right-of-way and on low volume intersecting roadways or on private property. These cluster mailboxes are generally in an HOA easement.			
	36 (2d and 3)	Correct wording for Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P)	Comments in document 7/24	Y	Revised Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) to Erosion Control and Sediment Pollution Protection Plan as was previously revised in Drainage Design Manual			
	37 (5f)	Is this the most appropriate place to state this? I want them to know that all application rates will be shown on the plans. I don't want to go into specifics as the road standards to that, but we need all application rates. 5. Roadway Typical Section/f. Pavement section including subgrade, materials with application rates, and depths.	Comments in document 7/24	Y	Added.			
	67/Plat Notes	Add: Individual lots in a subdivision are considered part of a larger common plan of development, regardless of when construction activity takes place on that lot in relation to the other lots, and are required to have BMPs and comply with the Construction General Permit.	Comments in document 7/24	Y	Added.			
	67/Plat Notes	Add: The developer, contractor, or builder of any structure on a single lot in a developing subdivision shall prepare a SW3P and submit to the Director of Engineering prior to receiving any permits.	Comments in document 7/24	Y	Added.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	7/6/2020 LSE		
Submittal Phase		Post-Public Hearing			Review Complete	7/24/2020-08/06/2020 County		
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	8/17/2020 LSE		
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Eng & Legal			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
3	72/Construction Notes	Another question: This is found in the Construction Notes: Phases of Construction; Inspection B., 7,a a. Two-course surface treatment - Flexible base shall receive prime coat within 24 hours of base approval. First course of surface treatment shall be applied within 48 hours of prime coat application. Integrity of base shall be maintained during paving process. Type of asphalt material and the application rates for each course shall be submitted to Director of Engineering for approval. The total gallons of asphalt applied to each roadway shall be submitted to the Director of Engineering for application verification. This conflicts with the fact that we allow the compaction reports to be good for 72 hours. Should we change the above to be First Course of surface treatment72 hours	Comments in document 7/24 & e-mail dated 7/24	Y	Revised Subdivision Regulations to state, "Flexible base shall receive prime coat within 72 hours of base approval."			
	Construction Notes	Mike would like to add back in a lot of the testing notes he had in a previous version. Can you go back to testing section in the roadway standards and place them back in here for the engineer to place in the notes section. He just wants it to be clearly stated in plans what we expect. Or maybe we can say all applicable testing and inspection notes, from the Collin County Roadway Standards, shall be added to this General Notes section. Thoughts?	Comments in document 7/24	Y	Added notes based on email 8/24.			
5	Definitions	As I was amending the application and fee sheet I realized that we have a definition for amending plat but we don't have one for Minor plat. Do you think we need one?	Email 8/2	Y	Added a definition for Minor Plat. The lawyer should verify that this is acceptable.			
6	Appendix	Changes to Bond Language as per lawyer edits. Sent via email 8/2/2020	Email 8/2	Y	Edited based on these updates (including Maintenance Bond)			
7	Appendix	Edits to Application to be done by County once fees are updated internally. Sent via email 8/2/2020	Email 8/2	n/a	Added Plat App from email 8/24.			
8	Appendix	Insert Warranty Agreement. Sent via email 8/4/2020 & 8/6/2020	Email 8/4 & 8/6	Y	Added. This has been inserted as Appendix I, Warranty Letter.			
9	Appendix	Language edited in Maintenance Bond. May require editing language in the Warranty Letter. County to let us know. Sent via email 8/6/2020	Email 8/6	Y	Maintenance Bond edited to reflect these changes and the changes sent on 8/2			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, Mck, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	0	The regulations don't mention preliminary plat, are they no longer required?	BGE	Clarify	Preliminary plats are forbidden by State law now		No change	
2	0	When are variance requests required? With submittal of the final plat? Prior to submitting the final plat?	BGE	Clarify	Discuss - might be good to submit variance requests with drainage plans/studies, etc. Prior to plat submittal, take it to Court. Or submit with Final Plat.		Revised to have variances submitted with the plat submittal. This is 1.12.B	
3	0	Since the final plat is approved prior to construction and ultimately recorded after construction, can any changes be made on the final plat before recordation as a result of changes made during design or construction? For example, if an easement needs to change because of something that changes during final design or construction, can those be revised on the plat to be recorded or do you have to go back and get a new final plat approval?	BGE	Clarify	Discuss - this is a procedural comment Give Court authority to give D of E authority to approve due to Eng related. Court for planning type.		Added as 1.01.G.9	
4	0	Is any title information required with submittal of the final plat so that ownership of the property can be confirmed?	BGE	Clarify	Discuss - might be good to require this Ask for deed showing ownership. Owner signs app. Developer is designated rep on plat.		Added to 1.03.D as the 5th item	
5	0	The guidelines talk about monuments (refers to survey monuments), but a lot of subdivisions will put in entry monuments. Those should be restricted to outside the ROW, and not in the ROW in case the road is ever widened, then they could be become a sight obstruction.	BGE	Y	Will revise		Revised in 1.05.H.4	
6	6	1.01.G.1.c. - Add "each" to the end of the sentence	Plng	Y	Will revise		Now 1.01.H.3 - revised	
7	8	The definition of collector roadway references a roadway serving 150 lots or more, including those outside the subdivision. How is the lot count determined along the roadway?	BGE	Y	Discuss how to best clarify. After 300 lots, the TIA can be used to determine. Interconnected w other subdivisions, maybe change term		Added a couple of examples of what "outside the subdivision" could be	
8	8	1.02 Definitions - Add definition for "Building line or setback lines - A line established, in general, parallel to the front street line. No building or structure may be permitted in the area between the building line and the street right of way."	TH/CollinCt y	Y	Will revise		Definition added. The portion about no structure permitted between the setback and right of way has been added to the applicable sections of the Regs.	
9	8	1.02 Definitions Alley - Remove "or private roadway easement"	KHA	Clarify	Discuss. Private roadways are allowed. This definition allows private alleys not maintained by County. Never alleys in public ROW		Removed public ROW from definition - alleys are allowed but only in private roadway easements.	
10	8	1.02 Definitions As-Built Plans - Remove "exact dimensions"	KHA	Clarify	Discuss - seemed they also took issue with the certified elevations in Roadway ID anything that changed in construction that was agreed to by the County inspectors during construction.		Revised to make less restrictive but also note these changes have to be approved	
11	8	1.02 Definitions As-Built Plans - Says as-builts will reflect "all" changes, show location of "all" elements, etc. Not possible. "ALL" is a tough word to enforce. Most Developer plans are approximate and good enough.	KHA	Clarify	Discuss how accurate the County wants plans and final documentation given the intent of these new regs		Revised to make less restrictive but also note these changes have to be approved	
12	9	1.02 Definitions Developer - Revise to "...participates in the performance..." and replace "Regulations" to Standards in last sentence	KHA	Y	Will revise, except for "Regulations" - this definition is in Subdivision Regulations		Revised	
13	9	1.02 Definitions Easement - "...public utility/entity..." Doesn't always have to be public.	KHA	Y	Will revise		Added "or private"	
14	10	1.02 Definitions Grade - "...finished" surface. Either define "finished" or remove.	KHA	Y	Will remove		Removed "finished"	
15	10	1.02 Definitions Manufactured Home Rental Community - Where are the Collin County Regulations for Manufactured Home Rental Communities Infrastructure found?	KHA	Y	Will include information to locate these		Added to contact Collin County Development Services	
16	11	The definition of residential roadway references a roadway serving less than 150 lots, including those outside the subdivision. How is the lot count determined along the roadway?	BGE	Y	Discuss how to best clarify. After 300 lots, the TIA can be used to determine. See above		Added a couple of examples of what "outside the subdivision" could be	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, Mck, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
17	11	1.02 Definitions Residential Roadway - "... including those outside the subdivision." Define what those are.	KHA	Y	Take this out of the definition, but explain in Roadway that road usage will be evaluated overall, not just for the road in the subdivision		Definition matches the one in Roadway. Roadway elaborates on this concept.	
18	12	1.02 Definitions Roadway - Should this say a "paved" right of way?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
19	14	1.03.A.10 - "Record Civil Construction plans" are not defined anywhere SO remove and replace with as-builts.	KHA	Y	Will revise		This is no longer in the procedures section. It is noted in 1.08 in the last paragraph. Added that submitting the As-Builts is a condition of plat filing.	
20	17	Section 1.04(A)(7) requires the final version of drainage plans to be submitted with the final plat. Is that referring to an overall plan for drainage of the subdivision based on the drainage study or is that referring to detailed storm calculations and drainage area maps showing which areas drain to what inlets? Since construction plans are not required with final plat submittal, the detailed storm calculations and drainage area may not be available yet. This requirement is also referenced on page 29 under item 7.	BGE	Clarify	Will clarify - this is for determination of easements and ROW, to show that what is on the plat is correct		Handled this in the Drainage Standards. The drainage plan checklist is separated between Final Plat and Construction Plans items.	
21	17	1.04.B.2 - Add bullet w/ verbiage for setbacks from Sec.233.032 "A building or set-back line established under this subchapter may not extend more than 25 feet from the edge of the right-of-way on all public roads other than major highways and roads; nor more than 50 feet from the edge of the right-of-way of major highways and roads. Building and set back lines shall be shown on both preliminary and final plats."	TH/CollinCt y	Y	Will revise and carry through as needed		Added as 1.03.E.2.k	
22	18	1.04.A.10.e. Perhaps there is a way to require the Developer to estimate the monthly cost of roadway maintenance , and sewer and water if private. Over the years I have heard that homeowners are surprised at the cost of a MUD or similar expense.	Plng	Clarify	Can the County legally do this, and do they want to? How would a property owner get this information during the course of purchasing a home?		No change. These items are not County business.	
23	19	The third to last bullet requires pavement widths to be labeled on the plat. I've never included pavement information on plats previously. Typically the ROW is shown and then the pavement width information is included on the construction plans.	BGE	Clarify	Discuss - I don't have an issue with removing this since the ROW width will still be shown Just show ROW width		Revised	
24	19	The second to last bullet requires the plat to include the "Total number of lots, including those outside the subdivision, contributing to each roadway." How is that determined? For a major thoroughfare that extends for several miles, it would be difficult to determine. It also may change over time as additional development occurs along the roadway.	BGE	Clarify	These Regs are specifically for subdivisions and the roadways within the subdivision. Do we want to limit the count to connected subdivisions without a Thoroughfare to take the traffic? What about cut-through traffic assumptions?		Revised to clarify what "total number of lots" means	
25	20	The second bullet under item 3 requires post-development contours to be shown on the final plat. I've only included pre-development contours previously. The post development contours wouldn't be finalized until construction plans are complete and those aren't required to be submitted with the final plat.	BGE	Clarify	The County is now very limited in what they can require for platting. The post development contours are to assist with verifying the drainage and easements. Drainage plans should be fine		Removed the topo/contour requirements from platting	
26	20	The first bullet under item 4 requires a sanitary easement around wells. Is that the same sanitary control easement that is required by the TCEQ? Does it need to meet the same requirements as the TCEQ sanitary control easement? Or is this intended to be above what the TCEQ requires?	BGE	Y	This needs to be revised - it needs to at least meet TCEQ or refer to TCEQ for requirements		Revised to say the easement must meet or exceed TCEQ requirements	
27	20	1.04.B.4 - Second Bullet - Utility easements.... This is not really a big issue. We put utilities in 100-yr floodplains.	KHA	Clarify	County wants utility appurtenances to not obstruct design flow, so utilities can go in 100-yr. Will clarify with "(ie. 10-yr)"		Revised for clarity	
28	22	Item E(1) references public roadways to be maintained by the County or private roadway to be maintained by a HOA. Should reference also be made to public roadways which are not maintained by the County?	BGE	Y	For these regs, that would be roads controlled by the MUD MUD roads are public dedication, private maintenance		This was removed by the lawyer. It now refers people to the Roadway Standards.	
29	22	Section E talks about Classification of roadways can be County controlled or HOA, should you add MUD as well?	BGE	Y	Will revise		This was removed by the lawyer. It now refers people to the Roadway Standards.	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, Mck, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
30	22	1.05.B.2 - Is 1.5 acres for lots utilizing individual water systems a new requirement for minimum lot size?	KHA	Clarify	No - it's in Court Order 2008-187-03-11, which also set the more stringent 1-acre requirement. Will clarify the sentence, though.		Lawyers removed any mention of lot size from these Regs. Lot size is controlled by the OSSF Rules and developers will need to look there.	
31	23	1.05.H.3. - Stop at "...a minimum of two (2) points of access for subdivisions." Exclude remaining verbiage in that sentence. Then, continue with "Roadway stubs for future connections...."	KHA	Clarify	This came from Fire Marshall		This was removed from the Subdivision Regs by lawyer. We added it to the Roadway Standards.	
32	23	1.05.H.4. - "...measured in a straight line between accesses, ..." Why? Each piece of land is different therefore it's not always possible.	KHA	Clarify	This came from Fire Marshall		This was removed from the Subdivision Regs by lawyer. We added it to the Roadway Standards.	
33	24	1.05.H.5. - What is maximum length?	KHA	Clarify	Discuss No max		This was removed from the Subdivision Regs by lawyer. We added it to the Roadway Standards.	
34	24	1.05.J.1.c.i. - Add "where possible" at end of the sentence.	KHA	Clarify	Discuss Clarify - as referenced in drainage		This is 1.05.E.1 now. No change otherwise.	
35	25	1.05.L.2. - Why? Cluster mailbox systems can also be on HOA lot	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
36	25	1.05.L.3. - Speed Limit of 40 mph is higher than what's shown in Roadway Manual	KHA	Clarify	Discuss - all design speeds in Roadway Standards are 30 mph. Mailboxes might need to be in Roadway if you want to control mailbox types outside subdivisions. Road policy and/or ROW policy and road standards		No change.	
37	26	1.06.A.3. - Sentence should read "...media of the complete civil construction plans,..."	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised. Now 1.06.B.2.c.	
38	26	1.06.A. 4. - "Mixture designs for hot-mix asphalt or concrete pavement..." is normally a submittal from the Contractor.	KHA	Clarify	Whoever put a material on a set of civil drawings has to review the submittal before it is submitted to the County. It's not up to County to determine if the material is in accordance with what is called out on the plans. Will try to clarify.		Revised to clarify the intent. Now 1.06.B.2.d	
39	31	1.07.A ETJ Subdivisions - Change this to say "Developments in the ETJ of cities in Collin County are regulated by the city in whose ETJ the development is located."	CD/CollinCt y	Y	Will revise		Now 1.01.F.2.a	
40	31	1.07.B ETJ Subdivisions -This should NOT say the Developer has to submit the OSSF to the Director of Engineering.	CD/CollinCt y	Y	Will revise		Now 1.01.F.2.b - revised	
41	31	1.07.C ETJ Subdivisions - Do not direct the Developer to contact Collin County. If the City tells them to, then so be it. That language does not need to be written into our rules. Suggest cities include Collin County in their review. The small cities may be an exception to this, not the rule.	CD/CollinCt y	Y	TH says do not revise		Now 1.01.F.2.d - no change	
42	36	Items 1 and 6 seem to conflict with each other. Is the Performance Bond always required or is it only required if the Owner wishes to file the plat before roadways are completed in order to sell lots?	BGE	Clarify	It's only required if the Owner wishes to file before roadways are complete. The rest of the section only pertains to that situation.		This has been overhauled by the lawyers. The intent stayed the same, but the words are very different. Left lawyer version as they wrote it.	
43	36	Item 3 states that improvements should be completed within 18 months after approval of the final plat. Depending on the size of the subdivision, that may be difficult. Can an extension be granted if construction isn't completed?	BGE	Y	Discuss - I think there should be some flexibility but also recognize that the time limit is to prevent half-constructed subdivisions. Can we say extensions may be granted and outline the conditions under which an extension is granted?			
44	36	1.10.A.3. - "The Developer shall complete ALL construction ..." If this is phased it won't work. Is this 18 months per phase?	KHA	Y	Discuss - I think there should be some flexibility but also recognize that the time limit is to prevent half-constructed subdivisions. Can we say extensions may be granted and outline the conditions under which an extension is granted?			
45	36	1.10.B.1. - Developer Provide Contractor's Bond. Bond not by Developer.	KHA	Clarify	This comment is for the Maintenance Bond - County is holding Developer responsible. Leave where worded for Developer. If can't get a bond, require that the Developer enter into a maintenance contract and that contractor get the bond.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020 LSE		
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020 PUB		
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020 LSE		
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, Mck, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
46	45	Items 6 & 7 reference that adjacent homeowners are required to maintain existing creeks and drainage channels and the county will not maintain them. Based on what I've been familiar with in the Houston area, it seems unusual for individual homeowners to be responsible for maintenance of creeks or drainage channels.	BGE	Clarify	County has not historically maintained creeks and channels. Confirm this is not changing with these Regs.		No change	
47	48	Note 2 references that detention basins must be sodded if they are not used as sedimentation basins. Is seeding to establish grass not allowed?	BGE	Clarify	Seeding is not allowed to establish vegetation in detention basins		No change	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	6/2/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Post-Public Hearing			Review Complete	6/17/2020	County	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	7/6/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Eng & Legal			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	Vegetation	Where would we talk about vegetation requirements for acceptance into two year warranty and then acceptance of roadway for Maint?	County	Y	It's in the Drainage Manual and Subdivision Regs. Vegetation requirements are covered most in Drainage so that the non-subdivision developments have to follow the requirements, too.			
2	Vegetation	Detention/Retention Ponds: Drainage Design Manual states that Detention ponds need to be sodded and retain 100% vegetation until fully accepted. Do you mentioned anything about retention ponds? Should those be vegetated to the normal pool line with sod?	County	Y	Edited the pond vegetation language so detention ponds are fully sodded, retention ponds sodded from top to normal pool.			
3	Vegetation	County road ditches: Maint. Bond section states that if 100% vegetation is not achieved then the cost to achieve 100% vegetation will be added to the bond. I think we need to make it clear what we expect them to vegetate and how much vegetation we will allow being each acceptance.	County	Y	The expectations part of this is in the Drainage Manual, so it's required of all development not just subdivisions. It's clear that acceptance = 100% coverage or a bond, in both the Drainage and Subdivision docs.			
4	Vegetation	I see in Drainage Design Manual under the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan checklist where it says to show all areas to be vegetated and specification of that perennial vegetation but we don't tell them what we expect.	County	Y	For the plans checklist, added that they need to provide warm and cool weather options. The expectation for acceptance is in the Stormwater Quality (new name for 1.06) section.			
5	Vegetation	Sometimes the builder will sod to the CR surface. We had been telling those developers, who's builders are sodding ditches, to go ahead and to seed it and then cover with erosion control mats for acceptance into two year knowing that it would get sodded at some point. Then for full maint. acceptance, we need to see 100% vegetation. Can this be written somewhere and do we need to specify what types of seed we will accept for what seasons? Is it too much to make the developer sod all CR ditches before two year warranty or is that too much.	County	N/A	Drainage Manual: We require erosion control mats in ditches and say an perennial grass must be planted at the first appropriate growing season before construction will be accepted, and we are not saying "accepted into 2-yr warranty" here because this manual is not specific to subdivisions. 100% coverage for acceptance of the construction, which then leads to warranty period for subdivisions or permits for other uses. Sodding CR ditches is too much. They just have to get it stabilized with mats & some vegetation product as soon as the elevation verifications are accepted (added from Subdivision Notes to Drainage 1.06.7)			
6	Vegetation	Large drainage easements: Knowing that the builder probably won't sod these areas, we have been asking our developers to fully sod or hydromulch before acceptance into 2 year warranty and then obviously retain that throughout until full maint. acceptance. Should we just say sod or give them the option to hydromulch?	County	Y	They have the option. It was in the Subdivision plan notes section and I copied that to the Drainage Manual Section 1.06.8			
7	Vegetation	If we do allow hydromulch, how much vegetation coming up do we need to see for acceptance into 2 year warranty?	County	Y	100%. A 2-yr warranty period is subdivision specific, so this is in Subdivision 1.07.B.6.			
8	Vegetation	What do they hydromulch with for each season? Or do we point them to a place that tells them and then they put that on the plans? Sometimes they are trying to vegetate during times when getting Bermuda to grown might now be feasible.	County	Y	NCTCOG Item 204.6 shows planting seasons and application rates. We have updated the checklist to state that warm and cool options must be provided on the plans and and to refer to this section in the NCTCOG standards.			
9	Vegetation	All other disturbed areas: Areas outside the ROW.. we have been asking them to over seed all areas and then protect the steeper slopes with mats for acceptance into two year and then obviously fully vegetated for maint. Acceptance with the exception of sites that are being built on.	County	Y	We change everything to be 100% for acceptance into 2-yr based on previous regs meetings. You can decide how mature the grass needs to be for acceptance. Subdivision Regs say "evidence of germination" and we added 100% coverage to that definition in Subdivision 1.07.B.6. "Evidence of germination" is probably sufficient for subdivisions that have a 2-yr warranty period. Might need to be more mature for commercial development acceptance. I think that's something you decide on a case-by-case basis so you have flexibility if something isn't going right with the grass.			
10	Vegetation	For all scenarios above, do we talk about the types of vegetation that will be allowed at certain times of the year?	County	Y	No, we say "appropriate for the growing season" and otherwise do not limit what they use. Added that a vegetation plan is required as part of the post-construction stormwater plan checklist, including options for warm and cool plants.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Subdivision Regulations			Submitted for Review	LSE		
Submittal Phase		Post-Public Hearing			Review Complete	County		
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	LSE		
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Eng & Legal			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
11	Vegetation	You mention permanent perennial in a section but can they get a permanent perennial if they are finishing up in the fall. That is too late to seed or hydromuch Bermuda, right? What is the alternative and if they need to use a blend that will die off in the summer, do we need to specify that a permanent perennial will need to be laid at some point in the two years.	County	Y	The whole Drainage Section 1.06.7 says "Grass areas shall be established with 100% coverage with appropriate grass for the growing season. An approved perennial grass shall be planted at the soonest growing season for that grass before construction activities will be accepted by the County. If 100% coverage cannot be established prior to acceptance, temporary cover protection of all disturbed areas will be required as well as the addition of the cost of 100% vegetative coverage into the Maintenance Bond, when applicable." I really think this accomplishes what you want without being way too specific.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Floodplain			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, Mck, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	13	1.03.B.11. Should LOMA/LOMR be obtained prior to building permit, particularly in residential? How will we require developer to file LOMR and complete process after the residential lot is sold to a homeowner?	KHA	Y	In Subdivision Regs, no building construction is allowed until the plat is recorded. LOMR is a condition of plat filing. So need to edit Floodplain Regs to be consistent with Sub Regs.		Edited flow chart, 1.03.B.11, 1.05.A2, 1.05.B.1.a.	
2	13	1.03.B.12. Just confirming that we are requiring a CLOMR for any grading in the floodplain	KHA	Clarify	For a Zone AE, any work in the floodplain should be documented and the maps revised. This helps keep track of what the developer community is doing to change the floodplain vs having to track it in County records.		N/A	
3	15	1.05.B.1.a. Eliminate the "or"	KHA	Clarify	Should read "LOMA or LOMR" per previous comment		Edited flow chart, 1.03.B.11, 1.05.A2, 1.05.B.1.a.	
4	19	1.06.A - Document says "Upon the determination of the Floodplain Administrator..." Technically a LOMA doesn't require action from a Floodplain Administrator	KHA	Y	Will edit. LOMA is still required, but the property owner's surveyor/engineer determines the elevation.		Edited 1.06.A.	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Floodplain			Submitted for Review	6/11/2020 LSE		
Submittal Phase		Re: 6/11/2020 Submittal			Review Complete	7/6/2020 County		
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	7/24/2020 LSE		
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Engineering			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1		The TOC spacing needs to match sub regs.			Revised			
2		Look at the flow chart. In the track changes format I see an extra box at the bottom right. When I accept all the changes, that box goes away. Was that box added and is it supposed to be there.			This is from a long ago version where we were less clear about CLOMRs, LOMRs, base flood elevations, etc. It was deleted on purpose.			
3		I noticed all reference to CLOMRs were removed. So any situation in this flow chart ever necessitate a CLOMR?			No. In order to get plat approval or permits, we say NO building in the floodplain. That means a LOMR or LOMA are required, period. In public comment, someone suggested removing allowances for plat approval with a CLOMR to force developers to finalize the LOMRs. That should be in the comment matrix.			
4		We talk about Rvs but only allowing them if they are there only 14 days and are highway ready. So does this infer that any other circumstances like permanent residence are allowed only if they are elevated and removed like in a situation as a house? Should we add this scenario since most RV parks are ending up being permanent residence scenarios?			If it's there more than 14 days, it has to be outside the floodplain. We can't say "permanent" because that implies a foundation.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Drainage			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, McK, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	3	1.01 Definitions - Adverse Impact - ..."negatively impacting.." Vague definition	KHA	Y	Rewrite to line up with explanation later in regs (1.02.K)		Rewrote definition to remove "negatively"	
2	4	1.01 Definitions - Flood Study - BFEs include area outside of SFHAs	KHA	Clarify	We distinguished studies as "flood study" for FEMA studies and "drainage study" to satisfy County requirements. A drainage study includes a flood study, drainage study will establish BFEs outside SHFA. Will make sure this is clear.		Revised definitions of Drainage Plan or Study and Flood Study	
3	4	1.01 Definitions - iSWM - Current as of date of this manual? Or most current (adopt future iSWM updates automatically)	KHA	Clarify	Most current iSWM - adopt automatically		Changed to "most recently issued" in definitions and 1.02.A	
4	8	1.03.A.1. - Replace "Runoff Coefficients" with "Rational Method Coefficients/CN values"	KHA	Y	Will edit		Edited in title and paragraph. Rewrote for existing conditions watershed to follow change in rest of document.	
5	9	1.03.B.2. Closed Storm Sewer - Back lot storm drains may be an unintended consequence of this. Recommend making them HOA maintenance	McK	Clarify	To discuss - require storm sewer in road ROW? Is County ok with maintaining back lot storm sewer in easements? County will only maintain storm sewer in ROW. Back lot storm sewer in easement with deed restrictions clarifying maintenance. Plat notes.		The Lawyer version of the subdivision regs removes the County from all drainage maintenance - 1.03.D.9. The drainage regs stayed unchanged.	
6	9	1.03.B.2.c. Is this possible with curb and gutter? Need a detail if it's to remain	McK	Y	Edit to require 1 passable lane		Edited to limit ponding to 1/2 the outside travel lane	
7	9	1.03.B.3.a. What about velocity increases due to development? Might erode existing ditches into the roadway without some stabilization	McK	Y	We can make this more clear, that even existing channels need analysis. That was the intent by saying "when possible".		Added some analysis requirements for capacity and erosion protection to both Open Channel and Roadside Ditch sections	
8	9	1.03.B.3.c.ii. These setbacks may not be adequate in newer areas where there will be significant erosion due to development	McK	N	We talked about City of McKinney's requirements when we wrote this. My recollection is that these setbacks provide time to identify and fix before significant erosion occurs. Add language that these aren't additive, it's the more restrictive.		I reread this paragraph and to me, it's a 25' setback. It can be reduced if a stabilization measure is provided and part of the construction plans.	
9	9	1.03.B.1.a. Recommend removing "on-site" qualifier	KHA	Y	Will edit		Done	
10	9	1.0.3.B.1.a.i. "The 100-yr" And design storm?	KHA	Y	Will edit i		Done	
11	10	1.03.B.4.c.iii. Minor cross culverts allowed 0.3%. 0.5% for driveways and ditches ... are the streets typically 0.5% or more?	KHA	Clarify	Minor cross culverts can be 0.3%. We're requiring minimum 0.5% for driveway culverts, ditches, and the roads with C&G.		No change	
12	11	Safety end treatments. It says they're required when the ends of the culvert are within the roadway right of way. This would mean you'd need SETs on almost all cross culverts. There should be something about non-curbed sections and the clear zone.	BGE	Y	Will revise. Also need to revise the sizes of culvert that trigger pipe runners.		Edited. SET with pipe runners are required if the culvert end is inside the ROW OR the front slope is steeper 4:1. It applies only to horizontal openings larger than 30" - so any culverts over 30" in diameter if installed perpendicular to the road, or some of the smaller diameter skewed pipes.	
13	11	1.03.4.d.iii. Cover seems pretty light. Recommend engineer verify what cover is necessary based on the use	McK	Y	Will revise		This section is for all driveway culverts, not just the subdivision ones with formal engineering. Changed to 12" min, with less if engineering analysis is done.	
14	11	1.03.B.4.d.iii. Culvert in pavement? Do we want to reference need for direct drive culvert if in pavement or subgrade?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Added a bullet for this	
15	11	1.03.B.4.e.i. reads "...20 feet" change to 20 feet "wide"	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
16	12	1.04.A.6.a. I've never liked this rule. Recommend adding a caveat such as "The director of engineering may request H&H modeling if there is reason to doubt the 10% rule will adequately protect the downstream owners"	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
17	12	1.04.A.6.b. This will invite people dividing a property into pieces just small enough to avoid detention. My thought is there is no difference in flow between 100- 1 acre sites and 1- 100 acre site.	McK	Y	Will revise		Deleted 1.04.A.6.b	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Drainage			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, McK, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
18	12	1.04.A.8.a. "...analysis of pre-development,..." Do we intend to make the development responsible for not just their developed flow, but all upstream developed flow? Should we also include post-development, existing conditions watershed?	KHA	Clarify	Need to discuss Handle existing through subject property		Revised to evaluate the impact of developing the subject site on the overall watershed in its existing condition. Assumes going forward that all development will follow these rules and mitigate impacts.	
19	13	Outfall Design 6b. It says outfall velocities that exceed 6 feet-per-second would need energy dissipators or stone protection. Six feet-per-second seems low and would result in a lot of outfalls needed rip-rap or other channel protection. I'd consider raising that minimum to 8 feet-per-second, and/or adding a part about recommended max velocity from a Geotech.	BGE	Y	Will revise. Not sure we should require stone protection. There are some really good natural products out there to prevent erosion.		Revised to set the threshold at 8 fps. Already included part about evaluating erosive velocities, so no change to require the velocity come from Geotech.	
20	13	1.04.B.5.a. This is difficult to do successfully, and there's still the extra volume to consider. We've seen issues with this where commercial development drains onto residential development.	McK	Y	May ask McK for additional guidance on how to successfully do this		Left the intent as-is. Detention is required. The outfall design parameters were clarified to be for mitigating site development impacts with surrounding existing conditions watershed.	
21	13	1.04.B.5.b. Correct spelling "pdrainage" area	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
22	13	1.04.B.6.a. Maybe consider a maximum exit velocity instead of grade?	McK	Clarify	The intent was to create a hydraulic jump and start slowing water down inside the pipe		No change	
23	13	1.04.B.6.b. Very few channels have anything other than dirt at the end. I'd consider protection for all outlets. Makes it simpler for all.	McK	Y	Will revise. Not sure we should require stone protection. There are some really good natural products out there to prevent erosion.		Very few channels have anything other than dirt, but this also applies to ditches, swales, etc. Made adjustments to the requirements, but the intent was maintained.	
24	13	1.04.B.5.b. "...allowable post-development, fully developed watershed discharge is equal to the pre-development, existing conditions..." Appears to require detention of future offsite development. Not sure if this can be required.	KHA	Clarify	Need to discuss - Handle existing conditions outside property		Revised to require that peak flows and discharge type match existing conditions. Does not require mitigation of future development outside the project site.	
25	13	1.04.B.5.b. "...pdrainage" Incorrect spelling	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
26	14	Downstream Conveyance. It says that there can be a zero-foot rise in the 100-yr floodplain water surface elevation. This would depend on the type of floodplain. A Zone A floodplain is allowed up to a 1-foot rise per FEMA. I'd revise to say something about the type of FEMA floodplain.	BGE	N	We really do intend to have no-rise in Zone A. That's the main intent of these regs.		No change	
27	14	1.04.B.6.e. The 10% point? Don't know if volumes will ever be the same.	McK	Y	Let's change "volumes" to WSEL. The flood width and the velocity need to get back to pre-development.		Revised	
28	14	1.04.C.1. "...prior to plat or plan approval" then add "and the filing information shall be recorded on the plat"	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
29	14	1.05.A.1. Replace the word "ensure" with "require"	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
30	14	1.05.A.2. Consider using 5-yr instead of 10-yr storm	McK	Clarify	Make sure full mitigation or easements are clearly required		Maintained at 10-yr, but moved the part about mitigating adverse impacts for all other storms to its own	
31	14	1.04.C.1. "...zero-foot rise..." Do we intend to allow 0.04 rise? If rounded, that is zero foot.	KHA	Clarify	Will revise to "no-rise"		Revised	
32	14	1.04.C.1. "...zero-foot rise..." Between predevelopment existing condition and post development fully developed condition?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
33	15	Design Criteria. HEC-1 is a very old method and isn't really used anymore. I'd remove that part from the manual, or revise it to say HEC-HMS.	BGE	Y	Will revise		Revised	
34	15	1.05.B.2. Might be good to note that for a residential subdivision it must be in an HOA lot. One owner would be hard pressed to maintain a basin, and they usually don't know it's their obligation.	McK	N	We discussed this at length and County wanted to allow the options		No change	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Drainage			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, McK, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
35	15	1.05.C.2. This is a repeat comment. I recommend saying it one time so it's easier to not make a mistake if it's changed in the future.	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
36	15	1.05.B.2. "...detention facilities..." Should we define as basin, outfall, downstream erosion control? Outfall channel until reaches drainage easement?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Added an item defining the parts of "detention facility"	
37	15	1.05.C.1. "...where a large drainage basin..." Vague. Earlier we said 200 acres. Shouldn't basin be worked into downstream evaluation? If so, I would expect model to be unit hydrograph and that would size the pond.	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised so all facilities are designed with Hydrograph Method	
38	15	1.05.C.1. "...SCS Tabular..." I assume this is TR-55. Detention calculations in TR-55 state the "procedure should not be used to perform final design if an error in storage of 25 percent cannot be tolerated (Chapter 6). I don't recommend allowing this.	KHA	Y	Will revise. All of 1.05.C.1 should be removed or rewritten to say Hydrograph Method for all ponds.		Revised so all facilities are designed with Hydrograph Method	
39	15	1.05.C.1. "...HEC-1..." Obsolete. Reference HMS	KHA	Y	Will revise. All of 1.05.C.1 should be removed or rewritten to say Hydrograph Method for all ponds.		Revised so all facilities are designed with Hydrograph Method	
40	15	1.05.C.1. "...TR-20..." Obsolete. Recommend HMS	KHA	Y	Will revise. All of 1.05.C.1 should be removed or rewritten to say Hydrograph Method for all ponds.		Revised so all facilities are designed with Hydrograph Method	
41	15	1.05.C.2. "...post-development, fully developed watershed..." Detaining future offsite flow seems aggressive.	KHA	Clarify	Need to discuss - Handle existing conditions outside property		Whole document revised to do existing conditions for offsite watersheds.	
42	15	1.05.D.2. "...minimum 0.50%..." Recommend 2% minimum slope in areas other than pilot channels	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
43	15	1.05.E.2.a. "A maintenance ramp shall be provided for vehicular access for maintenance purposes. The slope of the ramp" Boundaries of lot should extend to 10 feet outside of top of bank with a flat area to allow access to pond perimeter for maintenance	KHA	Y	Will revise		Added an item for access boundary for all detention/retention basins.	
44	16	1.05.F.1. Should say "reinforced" concrete box structure instead of reinforce	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	
45	16	1.05.G.4. Do we want to commit to "Director of Engineering shall provide final inspection...." This verbiage may imply they don't need to be responsive if it doesn't function.	McK	Clarify	Merge 3 and 4 to specify the conditions of approval		Merged 3 & 4 so the inspection & approval is a condition of plat filing.	
46	19	1.08.B.2 (1st bullet) May want to comment on adding spot grades as necessary	McK	Y	Will add		Added "spot elevations as necessary". Also added spot elevations to the Grading Plan requirements.	
47	23	We've seen some failures of RCP joints where the pipe is deflected. Might be good to consider straight line and an access point at all bends	McK	Y	Will revise		Revised	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations		Date		Initials		
Document		Drainage		Submitted for Review	6/11/2020	LSE		
Submittal Phase		Re: 6/11/2020 Submittal		Review Complete	7/6/2020	County		
Engineer		JVH/JKP		Responses Provided	7/24/2020	LSE		
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering		Responses Resolved				
Reviewer		County		Changes Made				
Organization		Collin County Engineering		Changes Verified				
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1		I noticed in the Drainage design manual that under the Drainage Plan requirements all the items are listed with boxes. We went away from that in the sub regs so should be consistent and do the same here?			Removed boxes and replaced with numbers.			
2		I also noticed that the sub regs TOC spacing is different from the Drainage design manual and flood regs manual. Can you make sure they are consistent? I like the spacing in the sub regs the best.			Revised.			
3		In addition, the plan requirements all read for plat submission but we have to remember that this is also being used for commercial permitting. We need to make sure throughout this section you reflect that the civils are not broken up for permitting. All gets turned in with the permit application.			The wording that was added to the last version to explain what's going on is in 1.08.B and says: "Items required for submittal with final plat applications are indicated under each sheet in the Drainage Plan Checklist. All items listed under Final Plat Package Submittal and Additional Information for Civil Construction Plans are required for Civil Construction Plans submittals, when required."			
4		On page 20, #1, you state that the SW3P is not required for final plat submittal but #2, Post construction Storm water Quality plan is required for Final plat submittal? Is that correct?			Yes. The reasoning is that the Erosion Control Plan is a construction thing, not a long term item that would need an easement. For plat submittal, we're limited to only those things that affect what a plat is intended to show – land use and property rights. So, post construction quality plan includes like the riprap at the end of an outfall, in an easement, which needs to be on a plat. Where silt fence goes does not impact the plat at all. I'll look at this when addressing other comments and make sure it makes sense.			
5		Section 1.06: I had not paid attention to this before but it popped out at me this time. The term SWPPP is very specific in the TCEQ construction general permit. It refers to a whole written document that the operator/owner has to create for sites with disturbance over an acre. What you are describing is more of an erosion control/Site BMP plan and not a whole SWPPP. Should we rename this section? Maybe we refer to the TCEQ website describing the need for this document but I do not usually review these. I only review the Site plan/erosion control plan that contains the site BMPs. I am not sure how to truncate this but we probably don't need to state that this is the SWPPP because it's not. I guess I do not like how this is worded and I think this needs to be the Erosion Control Plan or Site BMP Plan. Something like this. It can be phased for construction and include Post construction measures as the last phase. This could simplify #1 and 2 into one document. Thoughts? This would not be required at final plat submittal but would be required for commercial permitting			We tell them they have to follow TCEQ and get permits. Therefore, all the rules of permitting are covered. We changed it to "Erosion Control and Sediment Pollution Protection Plan". We left that plan and the post construction BMP plan separate. There is so much information that it could not all fit on 1 sheet and see what's going on anyway.			
6		Page 9: Closed storm Sewer – C. you state ½ of any outside travel lane... so basically 6 feet not under water? You also say design frequency? Does that mean at lower frequency events (larger rain events) the road can be unpassable? We really need to have a passable lane in the 100 yr event. Are you saying this anywhere?			It used to say both lanes clear and the public commented. We changed it to 1 travel lane, basically, so the road is still passable but the engineers don't have to put as many curb inlets in. Reworded to say 1 - 12' lane passable at 100 yr storm.			
7		Do we say anything about allowing a passable lane in the ROW for a rural section?			No, added to 1.03.B.4.			
8		Tell me again what a direct Drive culvert is?			This is a culvert that is designed to withstand vehicle traffic.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date	Initials		
Document		Drainage			Submitted for Review	6/11/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Re: 6/11/2020 Submittal			Review Complete	7/6/2020	County	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	7/24/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County Engineering			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
9		Page 17: You talk about "embankments for detention ponds shall be designed"...Should we always refer these to detention/retention ponds or is it inferred that is you have a pond it is first and foremost a detention pond and some may just retain water? I want to be sure we are being consistent and that all these rules also apply to retention ponds as well. We just had a scenario where a developer called out an easement as a detention easement but they ended up retaining water. The septic setbacks are different for retention ponds and since the easement was called a detention easement but the actual pond retained water, the septic's were not designed right. I need to be sure we distinguish the two and we make sure we call out all the things that apply to both throughout the regs.			JKP - edited a lot of the Stormwater Detention section. See Track Changes. Carried through the rest of the doc.			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Roadway			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, McK, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	4	1.02 Definitions Alley - Remove "or private roadway easement"	KHA	Clarify	Discuss. Private roadways are allowed. This definition allows private alleys not maintained by County.		No change	
2	4	1.02 Definitions Collector Roadway - Last sentence change County roadway to County Roadway (capital R)	KHA	Y	Will revise throughout		Revised throughout	
3	4	1.02 Definitions Developer - Revise to "...participates in the performance..." and replace "Regulations" to Standards in last sentence	KHA	Y	Will revise, here and other regs		Revised in Roadway, Floodplain, Subdivision, and Drainage	
4	5	1.02 Definitions Residential Roadway - Last sentence change County roadway to County Roadway (capital R)	KHA	Y	Will revise throughout		Revised throughout	
5	6	1.03.B.2 Second paragraph change "signed" to "sealed" by an Engineer...	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
6	7	1.04 Table 1.04-1 ROW Widths - Roadway Type RR & ROW Width 60'. This was 50' Confirm/verify	KHA	Clarify	Revised to meet LGC requirements and comments earlier in process		No change	
7	7	1.04.A.2. Paragraph says "dedicated". Should this say reserved instead?	KHA	Clarify	This language is correct		No change	
8	8	Figure 1.04-1 Typ Geometric Sxn for Rural Residential Roadways RR - Comment is 26' pavement width and 60' ROW - why wider than previous?	KHA	Clarify	Revised to meet LGC requirements and comments earlier in process. Need more ROW for ditches.		No change	
9	8	Figure 1.04-2 Typ Geometric Sxn for Urban Residential Roadways UR - Typical shows only 1 travel lane. How does this work? Need 2 thru lanes at all times	KHA	Clarify	Discuss. This typical section came from earlier comments from County. Take dimensions off, just show 26' pavement width		Revised - the residential roadways show a pavement width. The collectors show pavement and lane configs.	
10	10	Table 1.04-2 Minimum Geometric Design Criteria for Roadways - Comments: - Minimum Grade % RR & UR - Should always have some longitudinal slope NOT 0%	KHA	Clarify	Discuss - these don't have curb & gutter, so the water drains via cross slope. The ditches must have 0.5% slope or greater. Ok as is		No change	
11	10	Table 1.04-2 Minimum Geometric Design Criteria for Roadways - Comments: - Maximum Grade % All Columns - May not be possible in areas of Collin County with a lot of elevation change	KHA	Clarify	Anything steeper would require a discussion with the County and possibly a variance		Changed to 15% per TxDOT Local criteria	
12	10	Table 1.04-2 Minimum Geometric Design Criteria for Roadways - Comments: - Min Horiz RADii/Min Vert Crest Curve/Min Vert Sag Curve - Reference AASHTO for all these values	KHA	Y	Will confirm values and add language		Confirmed values. Referenced TxDOT in 1.04.B.2.b - that manual is a free download. AASHTO Green Book is not.	
13	11	1.04.B.2.g - "...signs..." Are these regulatory signs? i.e. Stop, Yield, Speed Limit, etc.	KHA	Y	Will revise to "decorative signage"		Revised	
14	12	1.04.C.2. - "Radii... shall be thirty (30) feet..." - Twenty (20) feet works fine	KHA	Clarify	30' for fire trucks, especially if there's street parking		No change	
15	12	1.04.C.4. - Is the length still 600'?	KHA	Clarify	The length restriction was removed, the restriction is on number of lots now		Cul-de-sac info was in Subdivision and Roadway. Lawyer removed it from Subdivision. All of it is in Roadway now.	
16	12	1.04.C.5. - Add "unless approved by Engineering" to end of sentence.	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
17	13	1.04.C.6 - If the Intersection Clear Sight Triangle is used for the current proposed roadway width that is narrower than the future proposed roadway width, you could have an object, such as an entry monument, within the Sight Triangle once the ROW is fully improved.	BGE	Y	Will revise - sight triangle based on Thoroughfare Plan or with the understanding that entry monuments/fences placed per existing conditions will be moved at Developer's expense if the road expands.		Revised to base sight triangle on Thoroughfare plan	
18	14	1.04.D.1. - Shouldn't this be tied to a TIA?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
19	14	1.04.D.2. - Why are LT/RT lanes wider than some thru lanes?	KHA	Clarify	Discuss. The narrower lanes also have 8' parking lanes adjacent.		No change	
20	15	1.04.D.3. - Shouldn't this be tied to a TIA?	KHA	Y	Will revise		Added that turn lanes should be per the TIA, 200' minimum.	
21	15	Table 1.04-4 Driveway Design Criteria - Comments: - Min Width (ft) Residential 10 - Max Width (ft) Residential 18 & Commercial 30 - Radius (ft) Residential 5 & Commercial 20	KHA	Clarify	Discuss. We're ok with it, but with a note on Commercial that there has to be enough room for a fire truck. Fire requires 20' min width for commercial. They don't dictate residential. Do not change yet.			
22	15	1.04.E.3.d. - use 10% grade change NOT 12%	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
23	16	1.04.F.1.b. - Add "or pedestrian easements" to end of sentence.	KHA	Clarify	Will revise. County will not maintain if in pedestrian easement, so add that.		Revised	

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Roadway			Submitted for Review	1/13/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Planning Board Review, 1st Public Comment			Review Complete	3/4/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	3/23/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		Public			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County, BGE, KHA, McK, Plng			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
24	19	1.06.B.1 - "... including those outside the Subdivision." - Is there a requirement for perimeter roads to be improved?	KHA	Clarify	Our understanding is that these regs are just for subdivision roads. Do we want to extend to the County roads? If TIA shows turn lane is required, pavement for the turn lane needs to be designed. Otherwise, the County can't require they upgrade the roadway. Match exist pavement surface.		Added paragraph for turn lane pavements	
25	19	Sulfates section is too narrow	KHA	Y	Can revise to something like "if sulfates are present..." and make it more global		Revised	
26	22	1.07.E.2. - A lot of cities have gone to 4,000 psi instead of 3,600 psi	KHA	Clarify	This is straight out of NCTCOG specs		Revised to 4,000 psi	
27	23	Figure 1.08-1 Subgrade Preparation Requirements - Note 2 change to 95% Max. 98% is too strict	KHA	Y	This was discussed in depth during reg development		Revised	
28	24	1.08.A.3.c. - Change to 95% from 98% SPD	KHA	Y	This was discussed in depth during reg development		Revised	
29	24	1.08.A.4.c. - Scarify a minimum of 8" before placement instead of 4"	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
30	24	1.08.A.4.e. - Change to 95% from 98% SPD	KHA	Y	This was discussed in depth during reg development		Revised	
31	26	1.09.B.2.b. - Says "Embankment". Should this say "Borrow"?	KHA	Clarify	"Borrow" makes me think it came from off-site. On-site may be suitable, but also has to be tested/confirmed		No change	
32	27	1.09.B.7.a - Developer's Engineers are not versed in mixture design. Change to PCCS's Engineer - Sealed submittal	KHA	Clarify	Whoever put concrete on a set of civil drawings has to review the submittal before it is submitted to the County. It's not up to County to determine if the material is in accordance with what is called out on the plans. Will try to clarify.		Revised	
33	27	1.09.B.7.c. - Remove this line item c. Already specified in the typical section	KHA	Clarify	This section is for required submittals - shop drawings are communication of understanding		Revised	
34	27	1.09.C - Certified Elevations - Is this an As-Built Survey? This is going to be VERY expensive.	KHA	Clarify	No - it's a verification of depth and that ditches/ponds will flow. Define that these are spot elevations, the purpose, and that tables are acceptable.		Revised	
35	28	1.09.D.2.c. - Remove this line item c	KHA	Clarify	County wants to continue to allow water trucks for proof rolling. "Completely"		Added "completely"	
36	28	1.09.D.4.d. - Remove this line item d	KHA	Clarify	County wants to continue to allow water trucks for proof rolling. "Completely"		Added "completely"	
37	30	1.10 Maintenance - Who supplies maintenance bonds?	KHA	Y	Will revise/clarify		Referred to Subdivision Regs	
38	33	Appendix A Pavement Patching Details - Concrete Expansion Joint Repair Spec - Use same font as rest of document	KHA	Y	Will revise		Revised	
39	33	Concrete Expansion Joint Repair Spec - 3. Surface Prep and Application - Second Paragraph - Cleaning: Change "sandblasted" to "wiped".	KHA	Y	Will revise		Changed to "sandblasted or wiped"	
40	33	Concrete Expansion Joint Repair Spec - Where did this come from?	KHA	Clarify	This is something Trevor (CCG) wrote for Collin County Facilities in 2016-2017			

Project Name		Collin County Development Regulations			Date		Initials	
Document		Roadway			Submitted for Review	6/6/2020	LSE	
Submittal Phase		Post-Public Hearing			Review Complete	6/16/2020	PUB	
Engineer		JVH/JKP			Responses Provided	7/6/2020	LSE	
Organization		Lamb-Star Engineering			Responses Resolved			
Reviewer		County			Changes Made			
Organization		Collin County			Changes Verified			
ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	Definitions	Rural should be after Roadway	County	Y	Revised			
2	21-22	You mention residual Rates. Mike stated that the numbers referenced reflect actual application rates and not residual. We do want the regs to reflect actual rates so can you take out residual and put in actual?	County	Y	Yes - tracking the actual rates is easier, too. Revised so the rates are actual, not residual. Also, confirm the version - the section about residual rates is on Page 23 in my copy.			
3	29	E.4 Add that we need a minimum of 3 locations.	County	Y	Revised - added language for 3 test series for each roadway			
4	27	1.09 A 2 You capitalize Owner Verification Testing. Why? Or should this be in the definitions? I'm deciphering on whether we want the county to be the one with the testing contract. We may go back to only allowing certain firms but we will change that in the standards later if that is the way we go.	County	Y	It's an industry term, but usually for much heavier infrastructure projects. Revised to say the County will perform verification testing, and the Developer bears the cost.			
5	31	1.09 H 2 and 3: For slump, entrained air, and temp what are we expecting from the tests? We state the tests needed but not the results we are wanting to acquire.	County	Y	Revised to reference NCTCOG Item 303. Requirements for each of these tests are found here.			
6	32+	Asphalt patching detail does not look like the details for the roadways. Can you match the exact formatting so all details look the same?	County	Y	Revised			
7	32+	Concrete expansion Joint repair sheet. o Do you have this so it can be edited? I would like the format to match the rest of the document. o Under # 2 materials the three types need to be formatted to line up. Also you have Performed Bituminous Fiber Material boards underlines but then nothing after it. o Second page of this doc. Second paragraph: "Alternate cleaning proposals may be submitted in writing to the Contracting Officer for consideration." does not apply to this document. Should be changed to probably Director of Engineering possibly.	County	Y	Revised			
8	32+	Expansion Joint Repair Detail: Just make sure all the details are formatted in a way that they all look to be a part of the same document and not just thrown in.	County	Y	Revised			

Project Name	Collin County Development Regulations	Date	
Document	Roadway	Submitted for Review	7/6/2020
Submittal Phase	Post-Public Hearing #1	Review Complete	7/24/2020
Engineer	JVH/JKP	Responses Provided	8/10/2020
Organization	Lamb-Star Engineering	Responses Resolved	
Reviewer	County	Changes Made	
Organization	Collin County	Changes Verified	

ID	Sheet # or Name	Comments (Limit to One Item Per Row)	Reviewer	Agree? (Y/N)	Response	Resolved	Fixed	Verified
1	17/Geometry/Cul-de-sacs	<p>Question internally about what we have stated for cul-de-sac radii. Here is the statement in the regs in question. 1.04 H.4</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs shall provide a turn-around with an outside pavement radius of at least fifty (50) feet. The right of way radius shall be at least sixty (60) feet.</p> <p>Mike said our current regs read this: Such cul-de-sacs shall provide proper access to all lots and a turn-around shall be provided at the closed end, with an outside property line radius of at least sixty (60) feet and a street line (outside edge of pavement) radius of at least forty-five (45) feet.</p> <p>Why did we change to 50' at edge of pavement? If we are going to change this, should we also say that the ROW should be at least 10' greater than the outside edge of pavement just to allow room for the entire ditch to be encompassed within the ROW?</p>	Email 7/24/2020	Clarification	<p>IFC states 96' diameter cul-de-sac. We rounded from 96' diameter to 100'.</p> <p>Currently, the Roadway Standards show: "Cul-de-sacs shall provide a turn-around with an outside pavement radius of at least fifty (50) feet. The right of way radius shall be at least sixty (60) feet," so basically the 10' greater than the comment references.</p>			
2	6/Pavement type chart	Table 1.03-2 Pavement Types Chart. Revised for Lots 1.0 acre or greater with 150 lots or more to "Design by Geotechnical Engineer, AR minimum". Revised Lots less than 1.0 acre with 150 lots or more to "Design by Geotechnical Engineer, CR minimum"	Email 7/24/2020	Y	Revised to remain consistent that lots 1 acre or more should be a minimum of AR and lots less than 1 acre should be a minimum of concrete; however understanding that the more lots there are feeding that roadway, the design may call for a higher standard. Higher standard could be concrete or HMAC for lots greater than 1 acre or could be a thicker section or more substantial subgrade for lots less than 1 acre.			
3	8/Typical sections (1.04 B.2)	Clarence wants the arrows removed from these sections. I can insert the new ones if you will send me new clips without the arrows. 1.04 B.2	Email 7/24/2020	Y	Revised.			
4	12/Intersections	"There is not a requirement specified in 2009 IFC for turn radius. It is called out but left up to the AHC. 26' is what we require based upon the size of our trucks. The only time you would see 30' or, in some instances greater, would be in a jurisdiction that has a Tiller. A tiller is the 110' ladder truck in high rise jurisdictions that has the cab at the rear of the truck with an additional driver. There is not one in any jurisdiction in Collin County of that size. Some COG amendments increase radius for this reason."	Email 7/24/2020	Clarification	TxDOT Roadway Design Manual states: Radii of 30 ft [9 m] or more at major cross streets should be provided where feasible so that an occasional truck can turn without too much encroachment.			
5	29/Subgrade/Excavation	If for some reason the county doesn't make it to this testing date, can we say that County must be present or County's testing facility will determine is more testing is needed as a result of proof rolling? Just don't want to make it necessary for us to be there just in case we cannot make this test. Thoughts on that?	Email 7/24/2020	Clarification	The County, or the firm hired to manage construction, should monitor proofrolling. The reason this is included is so that the County does not have to rely on the Contractor's observations.			