SEMINOLE COUNTY PARKS & PERSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

ATTENDANCE: Members Present:	Mark Brandenburg, Nancy Dunn, Angela Fleming, Reid Hilliard, Robert Bowden, Bryce Gibson, Joseph Humphreys, William Wills, Ashlee Woodard
Members Absent:	Tom Boyko, Ed Ghiglieri, Pasha Baker, Jason Sutton, Emily Hanna, Daniel Roy
Guest:	Bill Wharton-Transportation Planning Manager Kevin Fischer-Horizon Civil
Staff Present:	Richard Durr, Leisure Services Director William Pandos, Greenways & Natural Lands Manager Michael Wirsing, Parks & Recreation Manager Sherry Williams, Projects Manager Cindy Kelley, Administrative Assistant
Location:	UF/IFAS Seminole County Auditorium 250 County Home Rd Sanford, FL 32773

Time: Chairman Mark Brandenburg called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. There is a quorum in attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Brandenburg led the pledge of allegiance and introduced new member Angela Fleming and asked her to tell a little about herself. He also introduced Cindy Kelley the new Administrative Assistant for Leisure Services.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Brandenburg asked if there were any questions or corrections regarding the minutes for the April, May, June, and July meeting minutes. There were no questions or corrections. Bryce Gibson made a motion to accept the minutes and Robert Bowden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Greenways and Natural Lands Division Update

Bill Pandos gave the update on Greenways and Natural Lands Division.

- Additional boardwalks have been completed at Black Bear Wilderness this week. They were installed to address erosion of the trail along the St. Johns River.
- Natural Lands Protection Order passed last commission meeting. Still have to do some rezoning to make sure all is zoned as Natural Lands Property.
- Lake Mills refurnished all camp sites with grills and tables.
- Wayside boat ramp renovation-went back out for bid.

SEMINOLE COUNTY PARKS & PERSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

- Got CDBG funding (Community Services), \$300,000, that went into our low income neighborhood area parks: Sunland, Lake Dot and Midway. Put in walkways, basketball goals and other non-movable items.
- FDOT is giving grant for SR46 and Lake Mary Blvd for median improvements
- The Cross-Seminole Trail missing link is now open. Still needs some work before ribbon cutting.
- Snowhill Road parking area is fixed at trailhead
- Working on the trail drop-offs. Previous contractor, Ameriscapes, is back.

Parks and Recreation

Michael Wirsing gave the update on Parks and Recreation Division.

- Perfect Game is a travel baseball group that did 36 tournaments, 131 days
- Summer Day camps-4 hours-1500 kids through camp for the summer.
- Additional shade coverings installed at the Sports Complex
- Renovating bathroom at Sanlando Park
- Have a company doing an ADA assessment in all of our parks.

Old Business

SR 436 and SR 434 Pedestrian and Bike Overpass

Kevin Fisher, Horizon Civil, came in and gave a presentation on their review of the feasibility of tunnels as additional options for the Seminole Wekiva Trail at SR 434 and SR 436. These tunnels were added to the previously presented bridge options. After the presentation, Mark Brandenburg made a motion to support

- Bridge 1 on SR 434
- Bridge 1A on SR 436

Mark Brandenburg amended the motion to include a recommendation to adjust the project from a Tier 2 and 3 to a Tier 1 level project in the 2040 Transportation Plan. The motion was seconded by Joe Humphreys and all were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business:

Budget Updates – Rick Durr

- Deer Run/ Wekiva Golf Club. Buying both as a package deal. Will continue to run Wekiva Golf Club as a Golf Course, no interruption in business. Deer Run will be repurposed into a park, turning the clubhouse into a community center and developing trails on the property.
- Rolling Hills-trails and a playground accessible for all children and adults are being developed. Have grants and looking for partners.

SEMINOLE COUNTY PARKS & PERSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

- Got ARPA (American Recovery Plan Act) funding for park improvements in under-privileged areas. Getting approximately \$2 million to construct a trail and linear park in Midway and other park projects spread across the county.
- Will keep all informed as to when the meetings are on all the projects coming up.
- Looking at different ideas for trail safety improvements.

Other Business:

None

Mr. Brandenburg adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES NEEDING ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD CONTACT THE HUMAN RESOURCES, ADA COORDINATOR 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING AT 407-665-7941.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THIS NOTICE, PLEASE CONTACT THE COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE, AT 407-665-7224. PERSONS ARE ADVISED THAT, IF THEY DECIDE TO APPEAL DECISIONS MADE AT THESE MEETINGS / HEARINGS, THEY WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND FOR SUCH PURPOSE, THEY MAY NEED TO INSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE, WHICH INCLUDES THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED, PER SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES. November 1, 2021

Lee Constantine, Chairman Seminole County Board of County Commissioners 1101 E. 1st St. Sanford, FL 32771

Dear Chairman Constantine,

The purpose of this letter is to submit the Seminole County Parks and Preservation Advisory Committee (PPAC) recommendation regarding the revised Grade Separated Crossing Feasibility Study for SR 436 and SR 434 along the Seminole Wekiva Trail.

Last year, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) instructed Public Works to conduct a feasibility study for tunnels under SR 434 and SR 436 in addition to the already studied above-grade options.

Public Works presented the results of the revised feasibility study to the PPAC on October, 27th, which included not only the tunnel options, but an updated cost-estimate for the previously studied above-grade options.

The PPAC's recommendation has not changed. We still recommend the same above-grade crossings for both SR 434 and SR 436 that we recommended in November last year; bridge alternate 1A at SR 436 and bridge alternate 1 at SR 434.

In addition, we would like to recommend that these two bridge projects be prioritized as a Tier 1 project (listed together) in the County's 2040 Transportation Plan. Currently, the SR 436 bridge is a Tier 2 project and the SR 434 bridge is a Tier 3 project. They should be listed together as a single project, as essentially they are, given the proximity of the two roads.

As always, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments and your consideration of our recommendation.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Brandenburg, CSE, PWS Chairman, Parks & Preservation Advisory Committee

CC: Vice Chairman Amy Lockhart Commissioner Bob Dallari Commissioner Jay Zembower Commissioner Andria Herr Richard E. Durr, CPRP, PLA, AICP Parks & Preservation Advisory Committee Members

Seminole Wekiva Trail Grade Separated Crossing Feasibility Study Final Alternatives

SR 436 at Laurel Street & SR 434 at Orange Avenue



October 27, 2021 PPAC Presentation of Final Alternatives CIP # 02007015

Project Introduction

Purpose and Need

- Seminole Wekiva Trail is one of the most used of the County's trails
- High level of existing vehicle/pedestrian interactions at these intersections
 - Safety concerns
 - Diminished trail user experience
 - Discontinuous trail
 - PPAC request for grade separation

Brief 2020 Study Recap

- Identified Preliminary Alternatives for grade separated crossings
- Inter-Agency Coordination (FDOT, City of Altamonte Springs, PPAC, County Leisure Services)
- 2 Final Bridge Alternatives per Crossing Selected for Additional Evaluation/Cost Estimates
- Study extended by BCC to seek property owner input and evaluate tunnels per request of PPAC, City of Altamonte Springs



Project Introduction

• 2021 Study Scope

- Identify 2 Preliminary Tunnel Alternatives per Crossing
- Inter-Agency and Property Owner Coordination
- Advance 1 Tunnel Alternative per Crossing for Additional Evaluation and Cost Estimate
- Inter-Agency Recommendations for Final Alternative Selected from 2020 and 2021 studies
- Present combined findings of 2020 and 2021 to BCC



SR 436 – Bridge Alternative 1A

Bridge Alternative 1A

- Single Span Bridge across SR 436
- Utilize existing ROW along San Sebastian Trailhead Entrance Road
- Direct connection to Laurel Street

Advantages

- Smooth alignment
- Lower cost
- Pedestrian stairway access is feasible

- Impacts to existing pond (Permitting)
- Property owners favor tunnel and are concerned about business impacts from a bridge



SR 436 – Bridge Alternative 2

• Bridge Alternative 2

- Similar to Alternative 1 on north side
- Switchback ramp south of SR 436
- At-grade connection to Laurel Street

Advantages

- Existing pond not impacted
- ROW impacts only along SR 436
- Street/sidewalk ramp connectivity

- Not a smooth alignment
- Higher cost than other bridge alternative
- Business impacts
- Property owners favor tunnel and are concerned about business impacts from a bridge



SR 436 – Tunnel Alternative 5

• Tunnel Alternative 5

- Straight tunnel segment beneath SR 436
- Utilize existing ROW along San Sebastian Trailhead Entrance Road
- Direct connection to Laurel Street

Advantages

- Smooth alignment
- Favored by property owners
- Pedestrian stairway access is feasible

- Impacts to existing pond (Permitting)
- West approach impacted by topography; Higher cost than both bridge alternatives
- User safety concerns
- SR 436 traffic disruptions during construction
- Long term maintenance required/occasional flooding; shallow water table (10' below grade)



SR 434 – Bridge Alternative 1



- Bridge Alternative 1
 - Single Span Bridge across SR 434
 - Additional bridges across existing driveways west of Orange Avenue

Advantages

- Smooth alignment that bypasses existing driveways
- Limited ROW impacts, utilizes existing ROW along Trail
- Pedestrian stairway access is feasible
- Property owners prefer a bridge

- Sight distance at intersections
- Visual impacts to businesses
- Higher cost than other Bridge Alternative
- Bridge piers required adjacent to existing driveways

SR 434 – Bridge Alternative 2



Bridge Alternative 2

- Similar alignment to Alternative 1, on east side
- Switchback ramp west of SR 434

Advantages

- Street/Sidewalk ramp connectivity
- Better sight distance and lower cost than other Bridge Alternative
- No bridge piers adjacent to existing driveways
- Property owners prefer a bridge

- Additional right-of-way along west side of SR 434
- Not a smooth alignment
- Existing driveway interactions remain
- Business impacts

SR 434 – Tunnel Alternative 6



- Tunnel Alternative 6
 - Straight tunnel beneath SR 434
 - Switchback ramp west of SR 434

Advantages

- Better sight distance
- Limited ROW impacts, utilizes existing ROW along Trail
- Street/Sidewalk ramp connectivity
- No bridge piers adjacent to existing driveways

- Property owners prefer a bridge
- Not a smooth alignment
- Existing driveway interactions remain
- Higher cost than both bridge alternatives
- User safety concerns
- SR 434 traffic disruptions during construction
- Shallow water table

Seminole County Pedestrian Overpass Concept

- Attractive main span structural elements and vinyl coated fencing
- Exposed concrete surfaces enhanced with textures and/or colored finishes
- Beautification options available through landscaping



Examples of Existing Seminole Wekiva Trail Tunnels



SR 434 at Markham Woods Road – Designed by Horizon Engineering Group, Inc.



Lake Mary Boulevard at International Parkway

Common Pedestrian Tunnel Enhancements



Stairway Access in Addition to Approach Ramps Mirrors, Interior Lighting, Directional Arrows and Delineation Striping

Construction Cost Estimates

SR 436 Crossing

- Bridge Alternative 1A = \$7.4 \$8.2 Million
- Bridge Alternative 2 = \$8.7 Million
- Tunnel Alternative 5 = \$13.2 Million

Construction Cost Estimates for SR 436 - Bridge Alternatives 1A and 2 and Tunnel Alternative 5

Alternative	Option	Structures	Drainage	Sidewalk, MOT	Right of Way	Based	d on % of Total (Contingencies																			
						Design/ Engineering	Mobilization	мот	CEI	(% of Total Project Cost)	Total Cost																
Bridge 1A	1 (Flat	\$4,271,326 \$7,596	c \$70.401	6266 91A	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	¢0 150 741																	
	Slabs)		\$7,590	\$79,401	\$266,814	\$693,770	\$462,514	\$462,514	\$555,016	\$1,359,790	\$8,158,741																
	2 (Built-	\$3,825,626 \$22	\$22,287	\$79,401	\$280,556	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	\$7,422,684																
	up Trail)					\$631,181	\$420,787	\$420,787	\$504,944	\$1,237,114																	
Bridge 2	N/A \$4,570	\$4,570,180	¢4 570 180	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 190	CA 570 180	¢4 E70 190	¢4 E70 190	¢4 E70 190	¢4 E70 190	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 100	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 190	¢4 570 190	¢4 E70 190	¢02.000	6140 204	¢115 044	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	¢8 C00 C01
			\$93,088	\$148,384	\$115,044	\$739,004	\$492,670	\$492,670	\$591,203	\$1,448,449	\$8,690,691																
Tunnel 5	N/A	\$6,452,646	\$621,454	\$176,275	\$256,336	15%	10%	25%	12%	20%	\$13,241,838																
						\$1,126,007	\$750,671	\$750,671	\$900,805	\$2,206,973																	

*Structures cost for Bridge Alternatives 1A and 2 include 1.20 Factor for Aesthetic Enhancements

**Cost for business impact for Alternative 2 not included

***All impacted utilities are within public right-of-way and thus relocation costs will be borne by utility company

Construction Cost Estimates

SR 434 Crossing

- Bridge Alternative 1 = \$10.1 \$10.6 Million
- Bridge Alternative 2 = \$6.7 \$6.8 Million
- Tunnel Alternative 6 = \$12.1 \$12.3 Million

Construction Cost Estimates for SR 434 - Bridge Alternatives 1 and 2 and Tunnel Alternative 6

Alternative	Trail		Drainage	Sidewalk, MOT and Traffic Signals	Right of Way	Based on % of Total Construction Cost				Contingencies	
	Width at East Approach	Structures				Design/ Engineering	Mobilization	мот	CEI	(% of Total Project Cost)	Total Cost
Bridge 1	10 feet	\$4,964,707	\$61,494	\$308,730	\$384,670	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	\$10,089,376
						\$857,940	\$571,960	\$571,960	\$686,352	\$1,681,563	
	12 feet \$5,236,7	¢E 226 762	762 \$61,494	\$308,730	\$418,091	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	\$10,628,235
		\$5,230,702				\$903,762	\$602,508	\$602,508	\$723,009	\$1,771,373	
Bridge 2	10 feet	\$3,112,404	\$102,691	\$301,125	\$269,502	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	\$6,678,014
						\$567,858	\$378,572	\$378,572	\$454,287	\$1,113,002	
	12 feet \$3,14	\$3,149,166 \$102,69	\$102.601	02,691 \$301,125	\$302,924	15%	10%	10%	12%	20%	\$6,801,818
			\$102,691			\$578,386	\$385,591	\$385,591	\$462,709	\$1,133,636	
Tunnel 6 (Switchback West Approach)	10 feet	t \$4,705,996	\$2,321,715	\$383,918	\$258,442	15%	10%	25%	12%	20%	\$13,530,005
						\$1,150,511	\$767,007	\$767,007	\$920,408	\$2,255,001	
	12 feet	\$4,787,160	\$2,321,715	\$383,918	\$258,442	15%	10%	25%	12%	20%	\$13,673,179
						\$1,162,685	\$775,124	\$775,124	\$930,148	\$2,278,863	

* Structures costs for Bridge Alternatives 1 and 2 include 1.20 Factor for Aesthetics Enhancements

**Cost for business impact for Alternative 2 not included

***All impacted utilities are within public right-of-way and thus relocation costs will be borne by utility company

Requested Action

Purpose of the 2021 Phase of the Study

- Feasibility study to determine viability of bridge and tunnel alternatives
- Obtain Property Owner Feedback on 2020 and 2021 Final Alternatives
- The 2021 study findings will be merged with the findings of the 2020 Study

Requested Action

• Formal recommendations on the final alternatives at each crossing is requested

• Next steps

- Study team can document any other input and feedback
- Present to the BCC in December 2021
- Finalize Study in December 2021/January 2022

Questions?

Seminole County Project Manager

William Wharton Transportation Planning Manager Public Works Department/Engineering Division 100 East 1st Street Sanford, FL 32771 407-665-5730 WWharton@seminolecountyfl.gov Consultant Project Manager Kevin B. Fischer, PE Senior Structures Engineer Horizon Engineering Group, Inc. 1051 Winderley Place, Suite 400 Maitland, FL 32751 407-644-7755, ext. 186 kbfischer@horizoncivil.com