

MEETING MINUTES
MANASOTA KEY STREET & DRAINAGE MSTU ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 14, 2015 – Regular Meeting
9:30 A.M. – San Casa Public Works Conference Room

Attendees: Tommy Brock, Joan Dunham-Card, Kim Frahn, B.J. Galberaith, and William Wing

Absent: Lorraine Johannessen (excused)

County: Mike Dallenbach, Rick Doll, Andy Amendola, Karly Greene, Dawn Harrison, Francine Lisby, and Tara Musselman

Guests: Sign-in sheet attached

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m. A roll call was taken that established a quorum was present.

The meeting notes from November 12, 2014 were unanimously approved as amended.

There was discussion regarding proposed changes to the minutes. Mr. Brock asked that his motion include his request that property owners be polled. It was determined that the motion included the requested information. Ms. Dunham-Card requested that a change be made to the flappers gate section from "marina" to Gaspar Divers. Ms. Galberaith advised of a change to the Agenda to include the 60% sidewalk discussion under unfinished business.

Citizen Input on Agenda Items Only (3 Minute Limit)

- Mr. Carroll commented on the February 4, 2015 meeting at the Tringali Center, indicated the previous meeting was poorly run to receive citizen input, noted the South Manasota Key and Sand Piper Key Association would provide the results of a survey regarding the Master Plan and south sidewalk plan, and asked how the information should be provided.
- Mr. Markiewicz commented on the 60% plans, expressed his belief that the plan is grandiose, and asked what guiding principals were provided by the Committee to Weiler Engineering for plan development.
- Ms. Oullette expressed her concern with landscape and foliage destruction and additional concrete that could lead to flooding problems.
- Ms. Carroll suggested the MSTU and Citizens consider other alternatives opposed to the proposed infrastructure changes while considering ecological affects, spoke to non-permeable cement to be used, and urged that other safety solutions be considered prior to expending the money.
- Mr. Conrad questioned the status of the contract for maintaining back flow valves.
- Mr. Carlin asked if the 60% plans were to be reviewed and questioned if a Weiler Engineering representative would be available to answer questions.

Unfinished Business:

- Review Financials / Activity Report –Ms. Galberaith commented on the Shoreview Project costs to November 30, 2014, noted the original estimate costs, and indicated the costs doubled because of delayed project commencement. Mr. Brock questioned costs for the Shoreview Project. Mr. Dallenbach advised that the project was conducted in house and spoke to the bid process. Ms. Harrison stated that the Engineering Department advised the project could be conducted internally. Mr. Frahn asked where the Weiler Engineering expenses were located and questioned total Weiler Engineering costs to date. Ms. Harrison pointed out the location of the costs within the 3 month actuals report. Discussion continued as to total Weiler Engineering costs. Mr. Brock questioned if most of the work included in the Activity Report was conducted by the County and asked how to delineate differences between contract services and County work. Ms. Harrison noted cost codes were included. Mr. Dallenbach advised the property address is used and affirmed he would go through the information following the meeting. Ms. Galberaith requested additional information regarding the Mockingbird Lane work, inquired if there was a way to review the number of times an area is worked on, and asked if consideration should be made for different types of work so the same areas are not continuously worked on. Discussion occurred related to the dates for light inspection.

MANASOTA KEY STREET & DRAINAGE MSTU ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 14, 2015 – Regular Meeting

Page 2

- Mr. Harrison provided the draft budgets and explained estimated costs. Mr. Frahn stated the budget already assumes the project is going forward and asked if additional M&O maintenance costs were included. Mr. Dallenbach confirmed they were not included and advised the costs would most likely be minimal. Ms. Harrison indicated the \$400 bill could be removed and explained contract services costs. Ms. Galberaith questioned design costs. Ms. Lisby indicated the costs were for the design of the community plan. Discussion occurred related to total Weiler Engineering contract costs. Ms. Harrison explained unspent funds would be carried forward, advised that the scuba diver costs would change, noted the flapper gates contract is in Purchasing again, and affirmed she would change the bids. Ms. Galberaith commented on delays caused by Purchasing and requested a first time cleaning cost in addition to maintenance costs. Ms. Harrison indicated the individual decided he no longer wished to do the work and explained that a longer amount of time would be required. Mr. Dallenbach commented on the purchasing process. Mr. Brock commented on history related to the diver for the flapper gates. Ms. Lisby indicated the budget is a draft and the final budget would reflect changes made.
- Mr. Frahn spoke to total Weiler Engineering costs and questioned when the additional money would be expended. There was discussion regarding the FY 16/17 draft budget. Ms. Harrison advised the building rent would be removed and the scuba diver contract services would be adjusted. Ms. Dunham-Card questioned Weiler Engineering Costs for 16/17. Ms. Lisby advised the figure did not apply to Weiler Engineering, explained Weiler Engineering costs, and stated the budget is planned for a 2 year cycle. Mr. Brock questioned the process of setting the Millage Rate, inquired if the County provided any funds to MSBUs, and provided information related to a grant program for sea turtle lights. Ms. Harrison indicated the Advisory Committee could make recommendations and staff would bring the information to the BCC, indicated some roads are funded through gas tax dollars, and noted the MSBU funds projects requested by the community. Ms. Galberaith suggested Mr. Brock inquire of additional sea turtle light grant information. Mr. Brock agreed he would conduct further research. Ms. Harrison noted the Ordinance related to sea turtle lighting should be researched.
- 60% Sidewalk Plans – Ms. Musselman advised the 60% plans have been received for Committee review, noted staff comments have been received, noted citizen input will be received in an adjacent room at the February 4, 2015 Community Meeting, asked that street lighting be reviewed, stated 72 poles will be required based upon County standards, requested Committee input on shell driveways as concrete is the County standard, and advised additional maintenance may be required by M&O to ensure there is not a drop off from the sidewalk. Ms. Galberaith questioned the shell driveway area and inquired if only the portion of driveway adjacent to the street could be done. Mr. Frahn asked what area was being discussed and inquired estimated costs. Mr. Brock read a portion of the Overlay Code into the record, expressed concern of concrete installation and flooding, and questioned if all types of driveway material would be replaced. Ms. Musselman responded to inquiries, advised that the Overlay Code does not affect the County right-of-way, affirmed driveway materials would be replaced and made to ADA standards, and mentioned when direction was received related to light she would be able to provide an estimate.
- Jason Green, Weiler Engineering, indicated all driveways are not identical, commented on plan printing, highlighted the existing site plan with specific details, and noted photographs were provided by staff and included comments. Mr. Brock suggested that utilities be moved to include a sidewalk in the vicinity of the White Elephant, questioned the distance a sidewalk needed to be placed from a roadway, and expressed his preference for a sidewalk in the area. Mr. Frahn questioned protected vegetation, spoke to safety concerns, and asked if property addresses could be included on the 60% plans. Ms. Galberaith inquired if any portion of the eastern side of the road was to be improved, questioned if Mr. Green was aware that the area behind the White Elephant was a bridge, and suggested every fifth property address be included on the plans. Mr. Green explained obstructions near the White Elephant, indicated utilities could be moved however it would be costly, advised that a sidewalk is placed 3 feet from the roadway, defined protected vegetation as mangroves, affirmed he was unaware of the bridge, noted a crosswalk would be utilized for safety, and provided additional detail of existing conditions. Ms. Musselman stated the

inclusion of property addresses on the plans would be hard to understand and noted a separate sheet could be provided with addresses.

MANASOTA KEY STREET & DRAINAGE MSTU ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 14, 2015 – Regular Meeting
Page 3

- Ms. Dunham-Card questioned if asphalt would be continued. Ms. Galberaith asked if the concrete dumpster pad would be removed in this project. Mr. Frahn inquired if property owners were responsible for deterioration of asphalt driveways. Ms. Musselman advised Code Compliance could be contacted regarding the concrete pad, affirmed it was not included in the project, and mentioned most asphalt driveways are for business owners and parking lots. Mr. Green detailed the site plan, indicated striping was proposed, stated a meandering sidewalk was naturally caused and attempted, and spoke to Stormwater requirements.
- Ms. Galberaith asked if the lights illuminate the road or the sidewalk. Ms. Musselman commented on lighting included for the east side of the road, affirmed the lights illuminate the roadway, and mentioned 72 lights were included in the plan. There was additional discussion related to minimum code for sidewalk distance from the roadway, the purpose of a meandering sidewalk, requirements for sidewalk curbing, if a bike path was included in the plan, sidewalk placement within the right-of-way, and landscaping planted for privacy. Mr. Green indicated there is speed benchmarks that dictate required sidewalk spacing, commented on the lack of consistent roadway shoulder for a bike lane, and affirmed sharrows would be placed onto the road. Ms. Musselman confirmed that curbing would be required if the sidewalk abutted the roadway and commented on landscaping planted within the right-of-way.
- Mr. Green pointed out mandatory ADA crossing requirements, affirmed Gulf Boulevard was chosen for safety, and spoke to crosswalk options. There was discussion related to easement processes, lighting conflicts, and County standards related to lighting options. Ms. Musselman stated the County would not maintain lighting outside of the standards and noted the turtle friendly decorative light was chosen per the direction of the Committee. Steve Stubbs questioned light spacing requirements, inquired the process for existing light replacement, indicated priorities may include intersections and sidewalk illumination, expressed his opposition to roadway lighting, and asked of the standards for sidewalk lighting. Mr. Doll advised that there was an additional standard that can be used for walkway lighting that required fewer lights. Discussion continued related to bicycle safety, illumination of the sidewalk, the possibility of using a longer stem for the installation of the light base to be at the back of the right-of-way, if the lights could be installed on the landscaping area between the sidewalk and the roadway, and estimated costs for sidewalk lighting only. Ms. Musselman stated direction was received for roadway lighting, indicated estimated costs of the plans as provided equated to \$1.1 million, and affirmed that lighting would be installed at the back of the right-of-way. Mr. Green noted estimated costs for sidewalk lighting only was not available.
- There was additional discussion regarding biking, pedestrian lighting, and crosswalk lighting. Ms. Dunham-Card motioned to change the street lighting to sidewalk lighting, seconded by Mr. Wing. Discussion continued. The motion and second was withdrawn. Mr. Frahn motion to move ahead with the proposed street lighting, seconded by Mr. Brock. There was discussion of safety, sidewalk lighting, and current existing lights. Mr. Doll advised current lights are low pressure sodium and are used for sidewalk illumination. The motion passed with a 3 to 2 vote. Ms. Musselman requested Committee direction related to driveways. The Committee agreed upon the use of shell for driveway replacement. Ms. Dunham-Card requested identifying numbers be included for easement understanding and locations where citizens have encroached upon the right-of-way.
- **RECESS: 11:26 AM – 11:35 AM**
- Lighting Concerns – Mr. Wing questioned if there were plans to include push button lights at the crosswalks in Weiler Engineering plans. Ms. Harrison affirmed. Ms. Galberaith read a letter into the record regarding the light pole at the entrance of the Villas and would like the decision to be reversed. Ms. Galberaith indicated the light across the street is turned off 6 months out of the year and is privately paid for. Ms. Dunham-Card questioned the number of times the lights has been replaced. Ms. Harrison advised replacement occurred 3 times and stated if a utility easement was given to the County then a

decision would then be reconsidered. Mr. Brock asked the cost of replacement and inquired if there was money budgeted to perform the work. Ms. Harrison indicated the light itself is approximately \$10-12

MANASOTA KEY STREET & DRAINAGE MSTU ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 14, 2015 – Regular Meeting

Page 4

thousand dollars and confirmed the availability of funds. Mr. Brock motioned to approve to expend the dollars if a utility easement was given to the County, seconded by Mr. Frahn and unanimously approved. Mr. Harrison advised the matter would need to go through Real Estate Services and asked for contact information.

- Landscape concerns – Ms. Dunham-Card questioned what was occurring at the public beach and noted it seemed that the grasses were being cut down to appropriate height. Mr. Wing provided details of a meeting from the previous day and expressed his preference for the landscaping to be cut back. Ms. Galberaith indicated Flounders placed all landscaping. Ms. Harrison asked that the request be provided via email so the Project Manager can be provided with the information.
- Ms. Dunham-Card indicated she received two sets of contact information regarding work for the flapper gates and questioned the timeframe for obtaining a contractor. Ms. Harrison stated she could be emailed the contact information. Mr. Dallenbach noted the timeframe is dependent upon the purchasing process.

New Business:

- Letter from Bob Carroll – Mr. Carroll proposed future light pole decoration including four season rotation, independent of electricity, and noted the storage and labor may be at a cost. Ms. Musselman advised that the County will not maintain light poles with flag holders. Discussion occurred related to state specifications for wind zones.
- Flashing Speed Sign – Ms. Galberaith indicated the pole already existed and had a 25 mph, signage was added to the poles, and the signs were added without permission from the Signing and Marking Department. Ms. Dunham-Card indicated the sign is not permanent and asked if additional could be received and be made permanent. Discussion occurred related to maintenance, costs, and portability. Mr. Wing asked if Mr. Ouimet could be invited to a meeting to discuss. Ms. Dunham-Card motioned the information be moved to the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Brock. Discussion continued related to safety.
- Tom Adams Bridge – Ms. Galberaith indicated a report was provided that did not include a date. Ms. Harrison provided information that was included on the Project Status Update via the County website.
- February 4, 2015 Community Meeting – Mr. Frahn expressed his preference that the plans be readily accessible for the Community to review. Ms. Musselman advised poster boards will be available, stated she would arrive early for the meeting, noted a PowerPoint may be provided, mentioned she would be requesting citizen feedback, and indicated she would recommend to the BCC that a survey to all citizens be conducted prior to putting the project out to bid. Mr. Brock asked if the survey would be broken down with options. Ms. Musselman indicated the format is not yet known. Ms. Harrison advised of the process for the survey. Mr. Frahn suggested the feedback form include an overview of the project.

Citizen Input on MSTU Related Items (5 Minute Limit):

- Ms. Bernd-Cohen recommended the plan be available on the website, make available in a PDF mailout format, and to have a hard copy available on the island, asked that the MSTU make it possible for Ms. Musselman to attend the South Manasota Key Association meeting to discuss the plan, and expressed her pleasure with the suggested method for citizen feedback.
- Mr. Markiewicz, 1820 Gulf Boulevard, recommended the plans incorporate ambiance and fit for purpose, noted the guidelines are broad, stated his belief there would be a huge effect on the ambiance, and questioned why a 4 foot sidewalk would not be considered.
- Ms. Markiewicz commented on issues faced with information disbursement and suggested the community be given a vehicle to have their opinion heard. Ms. Harrison indicated she could be emailed, stated she

would pass the information along to the Committee, and mentioned the process for the Community Meeting mailings. Discussion ensued.

MANASOTA KEY STREET & DRAINAGE MSTU ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 14, 2015 – Regular Meeting

Page 5

- Ms. Silva suggested incorporation of all projects for the community survey. Ms. Musselman responded and noted that a separate survey would be conducted for each project
- Mr. Carlin indicated his review of the information presented, opined there would be a lot of cost overrun, stated his belief there is no value or benefit to the sidewalk project, said the lighting should be the main focus, commented that the lighting issue has not been resolved, expressed his belief that the lighting plan has value, suggested the lighting plan be moved forward, and noted his profession in infrastructure work.
- Ms. Oullette thanked Ms. Musselman for considering her presentation of the plans earlier than the scheduled Community Meeting, stated a survey has been requested all along, suggested the cost be published in the South Manasota Key Association, and noted she does not understand the costs. Ms. Musselman stated the \$61,887 was for the master plan, \$13,720 was spent as of this fiscal year for construction plans, and noted approximately \$37,000 had been spent to date.
- Mr. Carroll thanked staff for attending meetings, expressed his frustration with the project, spoke to Manasota Key safety issues, spoke to pedestrian and bicyclist safety related to traffic, commented on reactions to 3 foot sidewalks on both side of the road, stated his belief that all balances have not been made, and mentioned the South Manasota Key Association survey results would be provided at the Community Meeting.
- Ms. Musselman indicated her willingness to attend the South Manasota Key Association meeting and requested Committee approval.

The next meeting was previously scheduled for April 8th, 2015 at 9:30 am at the San Casa Conference Room.

Mr. Brock questioned plan amendments as they come in percentages. Ms. Musselman indicated staff has the ultimate approval of plans; the committee has final say if the project would go forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:07 pm.

Submitted by:



Karly Greene
Public Works Department