

**MINUTES
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH
CITY COMMISSION
HURRICANE DAMAGES WORKSHOP**

November 7, 2017

5:30 p.m.

City Commission Conference Room

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Bill Partington called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

Present were Mayor Bill Partington, Commissioners Dwight Selby, Troy Kent, Rick Boehm, and Rob Littleton, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, City Attorney Randy Hayes, City Engineer John Noble, and Public Works Director Gabe Menendez.

II. HURRICANE DAMAGES

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, stated that the workshop was to discuss damages at Cassen Park that occurred from Hurricane Irma and what the repair options were, along with adding a floating dock and breakwater. She stated that there would also be discussions at the end of the meeting about funding, where it would come from, and how it impacted the bottom line. She asked City Engineer John Noble to walk everyone through the current situation involving the Cassen Park floating dock, the fishing pier repair and replacement, and the Granada Boulevard Bridge lighting.

Mr. John Noble, City Engineer, thanked Ms. Shanahan and stated that he was sure everyone had the chance to observe the damages that had occurred from Hurricane Irma by that time. He explained that there was a collapsed area on the north section of the pier, there were numerous missing deck boards on the south section of the pier, and the boat ramps had lost their feeder piers. He stated that based upon inspections the only intact portions were the north portion of the park and the back of the fishing pier. He showed detailed photographs of the piling bents that were missing deck boards on the south side of the fishing pier.

Mr. Noble noted that this had been the first time that the fishing pier had experienced a collapsed deck. He stated that the cost estimate for that repair from the consultant was about \$11,500. He stated that if the Commission wanted to go the course and keep the pier in the current configuration, he would proceed with the repair and replacement of the collapsed deck so that it could be opened and used again for fishing.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she thought that particular section had been damaged by the southern part of the pier breaking away and slamming into it.

Mr. Noble stated that was correct. He noted the contractor, Custom Built Docks, provided a continuing contract and was ready to order the materials so that the work could be done and individuals could use it again. He stated that another component of the project that could be put together in a relatively short time, as opposed to waiting to do all the work at once, was the destroyed accessory docks by the boat ramps. He stated that the water needed to be checked for obstructions, due to the large amount of debris from the hurricane, but that repair could be done fairly quickly and boaters could start using the ramps again. He showed an aerial view photograph that detailed the lost

deck boards from the south side of the fishing pier and the missing accessory docks. He stated that the projected cost to repair what was damaged by Hurricane Irma was \$1,200,000.

Commissioner Selby wondered if the repair work was included in the \$980,000 estimate for Cassen Park.

Ms. Shanahan stated that it was swag for the city.

Mr. Noble stated that the repair work was included in the \$980,000 estimate. He stated that the fishing pier had been constructed in 1983, that he had looked back at the design plans from that year, and that the south side was Phase 1 of the construction. He noted that the pilings were only imbedded ten feet into the riverbed and that the standards today were to have them imbedded 17 to 20 feet into the riverbed. He stated that the thought was that the old pilings should be removed and replaced with new pilings, so he included that cost as well.

Commissioner Selby wondered if any of the pilings had been lost during the hurricane.

Mr. Noble stated that all pilings were there but that they were cockeyed and the consultant recommended replacement.

Mr. Noble stated that Concept 1 was an overview of what the city planned to do as part of the Cassen Park facility before the hurricane caused damage. He stated that the project involved a 300 foot floating concrete dock that allowed for up to 12 boats, with an average of 26 foot length each, to dock at. He noted that it would be located to the south of the south side of the fishing pier. He stated that a 300 foot living breakwater would be established on the south side of the floating dock and that there would be expanded dredging in the dock and breakwater area.

Commissioner Boehm questioned what the term living breakwater meant.

Mr. Noble stated that it would involve planting various mangroves, oyster mats, or anything that would bring the area to a living environment where birds would roost.

Commissioner Kent joked that bird rookeries smelled lovely.

Mr. Noble reviewed the breakdown of the costs for the Cassen Park floating dock and breakwater project. He stated that the Phase I – Design portion was complete. He stated that the Florida Inland Navigation District (“FIND”) had provided a grant in the amount of \$53,299 for the Phase I – Design portion and that the caveat was that the city would be awarded a FIND Grant in the amount of \$200,000 for the Phase II – Construction portion. He emphasized that it was all or nothing; if the city did not enter into the agreement for the \$200,000 FIND Grant under the Phase II - Construction, then the city would not be reimbursed the \$53,299 for the Phase I – Design Grant. He noted that even with the \$200,000 FIND Grant, there would be a shortfall of \$645,000 for the construction. He stated that \$400,000 had been requested from FIND, but that the city only received \$200,000, and that \$425,000 had been requested from the Florida Boating Improvement Program (“FBIP”), but that the city had received nothing from them. He stated that he had discussions with the Finance Department (“Finance”) and they indicated that \$400,000 in the Community Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Financing (“TIF”) Reserves could potentially be used for the project. He stated that he

discussed it with Ormond Beach MainStreet ("MainStreet") and that they were in agreement that the TIF Reserves should be used on the dock project. He noted that even with the TIF Reserves, it would still leave a shortfall of \$245,000 to finish the construction phase. He noted that Finance mentioned that amount could be funded using the General Fund ("GF") Reserves, if the Commission wanted to go that direction.

Commissioner Selby questioned the reasoning behind the FBIP's rejection of the city's reimbursement request.

Mr. Noble stated that FBIP were not advocates of day docks and preferred to support longer term dockage. He mentioned that FBIP specifically looked at dock facilities that provided pump out stations and electric service for generators.

Ms. Shanahan stated that in a conversation with MainStreet, they stated that they were considering overnight dockage.

Ms. Julia Trulio, Ormond Beach MainStreet, stated from the audience that they were considering 24 to 36 hour stays only and that they would not consider adding any facilities.

Commissioner Kent stated that was the first time that he had heard that staff or MainStreet were advocating for 36 hour stays. He stated that he was not sure where he stood on it, but was thinking it would be day use only.

Ms. Shanahan asked Commissioner Kent to clarify if that meant less than 24 hours.

Commissioner Kent stated that was correct. He stated that he did not want individuals to be docked there longer than that timeframe, tying up the area and dumping waste items in the water near people fishing from the pier.

Mr. Noble stated that the cost for repairs to the hurricane damage at Cassen Park and amenities, along with building the new floating dock, would be a total of \$2,165,000. He noted that the city could expect \$1,100,000 towards the new dock and repairs from city insurance and the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA"); \$200,000 from the FIND Grant which would cover a portion of the new floating dock; \$400,000 from the TIF Reserves; and \$245,000 from the GF Reserves. He stated that even with those reimbursements, there would still be a shortfall of \$220,000 that the city would need to come up with.

Commissioner Kent noted that the cost breakdown mentioned 'new dock' and questioned if that meant new pilings and that everything would be replaced, not just repaired.

Mr. Noble clarified that 'new dock' meant the new floating dock that was being designed and that the city would be applying the grants to.

Commissioner Kent questioned if the Cassen Park Repairs section included keeping the same blueprint of the areas, footprint of the areas, and most of the same materials in the areas that were damaged by the hurricane.

Mr. Noble stated that Commissioner Kent was correct, that it included fixing the accessory docks by the ramps, the board replacement on the south side of the fishing pier, and fixing the collapsed section of the north side of the fishing pier.

Commissioner Selby wondered if the Cassen Park Repairs included new restrooms.

Mr. Noble stated that that was a separate item and would be in a separate Capital Improvements Program ("CIP"). He stated that there would be discussion about the restrooms at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Noble reiterated that if the Commission wanted to proceed with Concept 1, the shortfall would be \$220,000. He noted that there were other concepts for the Commission to consider. He stated that Concept 2 was exactly the same as Concept 1 but included an expanded breakwater. He noted that the expanded breakwater was designed to extend east to the end of the fishing pier and back towards the finger piers near the boat ramp on the west side. He stated that the expanded breakwater increased the cost to \$2,400,000, which would be \$235,000 more than Concept 1. He noted that if Concept 2 was chosen, the Commission had to add the Concept 1 shortfall, \$220,000, to the \$235,000 additional and that would be a total of \$455,000 that needed funding. He stated that that amount most likely would be funded through the GF Reserves.

Commissioner Selby asked if the only difference was a larger breakwater and what that consisted of.

Mr. Noble confirmed that it would be a larger breakwater and would include large rocks and various matting underneath to hold it in place.

Commissioner Boehm questioned if the expanded breakwater would protect the bait shop, the restrooms, and the majority of Cassen Park.

Mr. Noble stated that the expanded breakwater would sit two and a half feet above the water.

Commissioner Selby stated that rising water would still rise around the breakwater and that it was a lump in the water to calm the water and reduce the waves.

Commissioner Kent stated that he was not sure how accurate that was to Commissioner Selby. He stated that the Ormond Beach Yacht Club received very little damage from the hurricane compared to some of the other docks nearby and that there was a breakwater along there. He noted that the breakwater was a natural oyster bar and thought that it had been beneficial to help the structure but stated that he was not an engineer.

Ms. Shanahan noted that in the reconstruction of the fishing pier parts would be attached differently this time. She stated that in the past the parts were toenailed together.

Mr. Noble stated that the Phase I portion of the fishing pier that failed did not have hurricane straps because they were required later.

Commissioner Kent stated that he knew the Cassen Park restrooms and bait shop fell under a separate CIP, but wondered if the city was looking to elevate the structure that included them.

Mr. Noble stated that the city was looking to build a new bait shop and bathrooms that would be elevated above the current flood elevation.

Commissioner Boehm questioned if there were any way to know how much of the hurricane damage was wind driven water versus rising water. He stated that by adding the floating dock and a breakwater in that area that the docks would potentially be protected from being battered and would survive even if the water went over top of them.

Commissioner Selby stated that he had watched outside during the storm and that a lot of wind seemed to come out of the north and due east, but thought the breakwater might protect from the south.

Mayor Partington questioned why only \$245,000 was taken out of the GF Reserves and that \$220,000 was listed as unfunded. He wondered why it would not be \$465,000 (the total amount of those two) out of the GF Reserves.

Mr. Noble stated that it could be done that way. He stated that in the building of the new floating dock, only \$245,000 was needed from the GF Reserves and that the \$220,000 shortfall was needed for the repairs to the existing fishing pier. He apologized for any confusion with the numbers involved.

Mayor Partington stated that if they were to proceed with Concept 2, it would cost \$235,000 (additional cost for Concept 2 over Concept 1) plus the \$220,000 (Concept 1 shortfall) plus \$245,000 (already listed as coming out of the GF Reserves) if they chose to use the GF Reserves to cover all of them.

Mr. Noble stated that that was correct.

Commissioner Kent questioned what the total of that amount would be.

Commissioner Selby stated that the total would be close to \$700,000.

Commissioner Kent wondered why he had heard \$400,000.

Commissioner Littleton clarified with Commissioner Kent that \$400,000 was the amount that would be taken out of the TIF Reserves.

Mr. Noble stated that Concept 3 would incorporate the new floating dock off of the existing fishing pier. He stated that the fishing pier would be rebuilt the way that it was prior to the hurricane and that finger piers would be built off the pier on the south side, with gangplanks going down to the floating concrete docks below. He stated that this concept increased the number of boat slips from 12 to 16. He stated that there would be expanded dredging and breakwater as well. He noted that the cost of Concept 3 would be \$435,000 more than Concept 1, at a total estimated cost of \$2,600,000.

Mr. Noble stated that Concept 4 would incorporate the dock into the south side of the fishing pier extension; he noted that it would involve a wooden dock at the entrance, with a gangplank ramp down to a floating concrete dock, where the boats could dock alongside it on the south side, and a gangplank that went back up to the fishing pier. He stated that this concept would include ten boat slips and the proposed expanded breakwater. He stated that because the dock was being incorporated into the current

fishing pier there would be cost savings, only adding \$35,000 more than Concept 1 with a total estimated cost of \$2,200,000.

Mr. Gabe Menendez, Public Works Director, stated that the total amount taken from the GF Reserves for Concept 4 would only be \$500,000.

Mr. Noble stated that he had heard some negative comments from MainStreet about Concept 4. He stated that boaters going into that area would potentially experience high traffic and those individuals visiting the pier and docks might not feel as secure. He explained that in Concept 2 and Concept 3 the general public walking or fishing on the pier would be more secure with the separate docking area.

Mr. Noble stated that the Cassen Park bait shop and restrooms had experienced flooding damage from Hurricane Irma. He noted that there was a CIP in place to replace the restroom portion but that the thought was to replace the restrooms and incorporate a slightly larger bait shop. He stated that both structures would be elevated and the city would apply for a FEMA grant to fund 75 percent of the project.

Commissioner Kent questioned the costs associated with that project.

Mr. Noble stated that the restroom portion was \$185,000 but that he did not have a cost estimate for the bait shop portion; he thought it would be close to the same and about \$360,000 to \$400,000 total.

Commissioner Littleton questioned if that cost included paving of the parking lot.

Mr. Noble stated that the paving of the parking lot was a separate item under the same CIP and that it would cost \$180,000.

Commissioner Boehm wondered if anyone had specific figures on what the reserves fund looked like at that time.

Ms. Shanahan stated that if they chose Concept 2 (the \$700,000 amount that needed funding), the city's reserves would be about 14.38 percent as opposed to 15 percent. She stated that it was slightly lower due to other projects that had been discussed in the past. She noted that the GF Reserves balance at the start of the 2017 to 2018 fiscal year was about \$6,200,000; if money were removed for all projects discussed that number would go down to about \$4,400,000 and that would be 14.38 percent.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the idea of the workshop was to get direction from the Commission. She wondered if they liked any of the ideas or if they wanted to rethink any of it.

Mayor Partington stated that a decision did not have to be made that evening but that it was a starting point and involved good discussion. He noted that this project was important and that the Commission wanted to get it right at the right cost. He wondered if anyone had spoken with Mr. Ike Leary, owner of the bait shop, to get his input since he was on location daily.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she was aware of discussions with Mr. Leary about the bait shop ideas but was not sure if the proposed floating dock concepts were included.

Mr. Noble stated that he had discussed the original dock concept with Mr. Leary and that he was happy with it, since it put incoming boaters directly in front of the bait shop. Mayor Partington stated that the original concept would double Mr. Leary's exposure versus Concept 4 that he liked due to cost, but that it would be the worst option for Mr. Leary.

Commissioner Kent stated that of the options presented he liked Concept 2 the best. He noted that he thought the fishing pier had a nice layout, it functioned well, and that residents had space to enjoy exercising or fishing from it. He stated that the last thing that Ormond Beach needed next to Cassen Park was a bird rookery. He noted that there was a bird rookery located next to the Dunlawton Bridge and that it was an absolutely brutal experience to be around. He stated that he did not want a living breakwater that would include a bird rookery as part of the plan. He reiterated his support for Concept 2 and noted that Concept 4 was completely out for him. He stated that he loathed the idea of having boats docked at the fishing pier. He stated that not everyone visiting Cassen Park would be an experienced boater and noted the potential for hitting or damaging the pier and scaring or hurting individuals on the pier.

Commissioner Selby stated that he thought segregating casual boating use from the recreation and fishing uses was important. He stated that combining those activities in one area could discourage recreational use and potential boaters. He stated that in that situation, Mr. Leary would essentially be a harbor master, checking boaters in and monitoring length of time at the dock. He stated that he did not support the concept of overnight docking on the proposed floating dock and that individuals should be out by a certain time.

Commissioner Kent stated that he agreed with Commissioner Selby about the overnight docking.

Commissioner Selby stated that he thought overnight docking was considered a different activity as compared to casual boating and day trips. He stated that he was comfortable with the expanded breakwater and thought it would provide more protection to the boat ramps. He stated that most boaters and visitors were probably wondering why the damage had not been fixed at that point.

Mr. Menendez stated that most of the permits would be waived due to replacement only and noted that it was important to get individuals and boats back using the pier and docks at Cassen Park. He recommended making the repairs quickly in order for that to happen.

Commissioner Selby stated that he agreed in making the repairs happen quickly so that individuals could see progress.

Mr. Menendez noted that the expanded breakwater wasn't listed on the original permit so the city would have to make permit modifications, which would take time. He hoped that a permit modification would be the only thing needed if they chose to proceed with Concept 2.

Commissioner Boehm wondered if the city was incorporating as much protection as possible for the boat ramps in the expanded breakwater.

Mr. Noble stated that he would go back to his engineer and make sure that they built a substantial expanded breakwater.

Commissioner Boehm stated that in his opinion the design did not matter, but that it was crucial for the expanded breakwater to protect the boat ramps, the fishing pier, and all areas of Cassen Park. He stated that rising water would cause damage but that the buildings and boat ramps should hold up to that. He noted that wind driven water had destroyed anything in its path and that his ambition was to protect the park from the wind driven water as much as possible. He stated that he agreed with Commissioner Selby and Commissioner Kent on the boat and docking issue. He stated that he was not comfortable with Concept 1 and Concept 4, and stated that he was in favor of Concept 2 or Concept 3, but that he preferred Concept 2.

Commissioner Selby asked if Concept 3 had little finger docks off the main fishing pier.

Ms. Shanahan stated that Commissioner Selby was correct.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he loved Concept 2.

Ms. Shanahan thanked the Commission for their direction and noted that staff would come back at a later date with updated information. She noted that she had heard a consensus to start repairs on the north section of the fishing piers and boat ramps and would initiate that process immediately, if that was what the Commission wanted to do.

Commissioner Kent confirmed with Ms. Shanahan that the Commission did want her to start that process.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the other item on the agenda for the evening involved the Granada Boulevard Bridge Roadway Lighting Workshop.

Mr. Noble started with background on the Granada Boulevard Bridge; it opened in 1983, it was a 1900 foot bridge, and the average lifespan of that bridge was 75 years so that meant it should be around until 2056. He noted that damage had occurred to the lighting on the bridge during Hurricane Matthew in October of 2016.

Mr. Noble stated that the Florida Department of Transportation ("FDOT") standard roadway lighting had been removed after the storm. He stated that included 35 foot aluminum tapered poles and nine dual bridge extension arms down the middle of the bridge, and four single embankment poles along the embankments on the sides. He noted that the FDOT lighting was high pressure sodium light fixtures with spacing at 237 feet. He stated that the lights were previously mounted inside cutouts along the center median or barrier and FDOT considered that dangerous, so they changed the standards. He stated that the concern was that if a car hit the median and started sliding along it, it could get caught in the cutout, jackknife back into the traffic, and cause more drivers to lose control. He stated that FDOT had done away with that design and had come up with a new way to mount lighting on bridges.

Mr. Noble stated that the updated standard involved filling in the cutout and mounting the poles along the top of the median. He stated that the significance of that meant that it would leave a much smaller footprint for the light pole anchor holes. He stated that in terms of decorative lighting, the heavier decorative poles with tear drops had a higher wind load effect and that 35 foot poles could not be used; the poles had to be brought

down to 20 feet. He noted that in order to create the same lighting foot candles with shorter poles, the spacing between poles had to be closer together. He stated that if the city chose to go with decorative lighting on the bridge, there were certain steps that had to be taken to put them every 100 feet. He noted that cuts had to be made into the superstructure to find wires, pull the wires up, and then refill the holes. He stated that doing all of that for decorative lighting turned the process into a complicated ordeal.

Mr. Noble stated that there were a few options for the Commission to consider. He stated that FDOT could install their standard light poles with LED lights, it would take approximately six to eight months, there would be a pushbutton contract, and that it would be at FDOT's cost.

Mr. Noble stated that another option was requesting FDOT to install the decorative light poles which would push it into the FDOT Work Program. He stated that the Work Program was similar to the city's CIP and was required in order to design, bid and install the lighting. He noted that it would be two to three years before the lights were completed with that option and would cost the City of Ormond Beach at least \$200,000 or more.

Mr. Noble stated that the last option was requesting that no lighting be installed which would require submission of a Roadway Lighting Justification Report ("RLJR") to FDOT. He stated that the city received input from FDOT on what was required for the report, staff performed the RLJR, and the study supported the request for no lighting. He stated that FDOT would have to review and approve the RLJR, but was confident that they would accept it.

Ms. Shanahan wondered what would happen to the holes that housed the previous lights if the city decided not to put lighting back on the bridge.

Mr. Noble stated that he believed they would be filled in by FDOT. He noted that the standard aluminum pole lighting was square armed, double armed, 35 feet high and had LED lights. He noted that the embankment poles would be single arm in the four locations where the city had the single arm poles.

Ms. Shanahan asked if hangers would be attached to the new lighting poles for the flagpoles.

Mr. Noble stated that the city would request that hangers be included. He showed a few photos of other bridges in Volusia County. He noted that the International Speedway Boulevard Bridge in Daytona Beach had decorative light poles spaced at 100 feet and a double median in the middle which allowed easier mounting, as compared to the single median on the Granada Boulevard Bridge.

Mr. Noble reiterated the details of the different lighting options from FDOT. He stated that if FDOT installed the standard roadway lighting that there would be no additional cost to the city and the timeline was six to eight months; however, if the city requested decorative roadway lighting it would cost the city \$200,000 or more, the timeline was two to three years, and the design, bid, and installation would go through the FDOT Work Program.

Ms. Shanahan wondered if that was the difference between what FDOT would put back and the city's cost.

Mr. Noble stated that that was accurate.

Commissioner Boehm questioned if there had been an increase in accidents or complaints received since the lights had been removed.

Mr. Noble stated that he had a crash report and indicated that there had been no additional accidents due to lack of lighting.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she was aware of three accidents on the bridge but that they were not related to the lighting.

Ms. Shanahan requested direction from the Commission on whether they wanted to add lights or submit the request for no lighting.

Commissioner Selby directed his question to Mr. Noble and asked if the spacing had to be 100 feet in order to get the same amount of light from the decorative poles.

Mr. Noble stated that due to the fact that shorter poles were required, the spacing had to be 100 feet.

Commissioner Selby wondered that since there was enough light on the bridge without the lights, could they be spaced further and fewer if lights were chosen to be installed. He stated that the city was paying the cost and noted that part of that cost was more poles, more fixtures and the detailed installation process.

Mr. Noble stated that FDOT was saying that if the city put lights up then those lights would need to be in minimum lighting standards, which was one foot candle. He stated that the city would have to meet that and use the shorter space.

Commissioner Selby wondered if the RLJR study minimum was lower than 1 foot candle.

Mr. Noble stated that the RLJR did not actually take into account the lighting levels and that it looked at other traffic related issues. He stated that the city received a checklist from FDOT and for example, it looked at how many roadways turned onto the bridge, what kind of developments were on both sides of the bridge, and were there pedestrian access ways that were lit.

Commissioner Selby wondered why FDOT would tell the city that they did not have to put lights up and then establish a minimum for putting lights up.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff would verify that with FDOT and did not have an answer.

Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, stated that it probably had to do with liability.

Mayor Partington stated that he was inclined not to do anything, but was comfortable with whatever the Commission wanted to do.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he was comfortable with FDOT putting up whatever lighting they wanted to put up on the bridge. He stated that he did not know how

spending money or how additional light poles would add to the economy of the city and did not know how much was worth doing.

Commissioner Boehm stated that if there was no impact and no resident complaints without the lighting, that the city should submit the RLJR request for no lighting. He stated that if FDOT would not approve that, he agreed to put up their lights and let them pay for it.

Commissioner Kent stated that he did not agree with that at all and noted that Commissioner Selby brought up a great point. He stated that if FDOT were not going to make the city put lights up, then he thought the city should be able to put decorative lights up in the exact blueprint of where the old lights were located. He stated that he thought dressing up the Granada Boulevard Bridge and that more lighting would be a good thing, but noted that he thought decorative lighting was the direction to take. He stated that the Ormond Beach residents deserved decorative lighting and that he did not accept FDOT's statement that it would take two to three years to complete. He noted that that was ridiculous and refused to settle for that amount of time. He stated that if the Commission decided to go with decorative lighting, that they needed to get state senators, state representatives, and FDOT involved in the issues around the lighting requirements. He stated that decorative lighting would dress the bridge up and that there were other ideas being discussed on projects for the bridge such as painting. He reiterated that his sticking point was the two to three year timeline from FDOT for decorative lighting completion. He stated that it was outlandish for a government agency to give another government agency that type of timeline. He noted that was almost as wildly inappropriate as the bathroom cost at Cassen Park. He stated that 14 years prior the bathrooms cost \$100,000, and that in those 14 years the cost had increased \$85,000. He noted that he purchased his home 16 years prior for \$105,000 and that it had two bathrooms in it and that the high cost of the Cassen Park bathrooms blew his mind.

Commissioner Selby wondered if Commissioner Kent was saying that he liked the same number of decorative lights where the old ones were located.

Commissioner Kent stated that was correct and that the city did not need them every 100 feet. He stated that maybe FDOT should assist in paying for updates to the Granada Boulevard Bridge, so that it would look comparable to the other new bridges they were building elsewhere. He stated that once the transportation lobbyist was on board, the city might be able to see real dollars to assist with projects. He reiterated that he was in favor of putting the lights in the exact same blueprint where they were previously located, he did not believe the lights needed to be every 100 feet, and that he was in favor of the beautiful decorative lights that lined either side of the bridge, not the decorative lights shown in the photos during the presentation. He noted that city employees were out early attaching beautiful flags for the upcoming Veterans Day weekend on those decorative light poles. He stated that the Commission had a great opportunity to improve the bridge for the next 35 to 40 years before it would be considered at the end of its lifespan and torn down.

Commissioner Boehm stated that since they did not have an exact answer from FDOT on the spacing involved with the lighting, it would be difficult for the Commission to make a final decision at that time. He stated that if the decorative lights had to be 100 feet apart, which meant more lights had to be installed, that a cost of \$220,000 seemed low for what the task involved.

Commissioner Kent stated that he believed Mayor Partington's personal relationships that he had created in Tallahassee, his relationship with the new manager for FDOT in the city's district, and the city's relationships with state senators and state representatives would be beneficial in that situation. He reiterated that he thought two to three years to design, bid, and install lights on the bridge was outrageous. He noted that FDOT was building an entire new bridge with lights installed in Daytona Beach (The Tom Staed Veterans Memorial Bridge) in less time than they had estimated to install lights only on the Granada Boulevard Bridge.

Commissioner Kent stated that since the hurricanes had caused damage, the city needed a new dock and new lighting to replace what had been destroyed. He noted that the city had a savings account for this reason and that they would work to build it back up after using funds.

Commissioner Selby questioned whether TIF Reserves could be used for the bridge lighting.

Commissioner Kent stated that it could be.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she thought the Commission could use a lot of that money on the docks.

Commissioner Selby stated that he wanted to make sure that it was appropriate for those funds to be used on the lighting. He stated that if the city could use those funds, he wanted to hear if MainStreet thought that was a good investment of those funds or not.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that the city speak with FDOT to clarify the answers on spacing and using the existing footprint for decorative lighting before making a decision. She stated that once she had FDOT's answer she would circle back with MainStreet and get their feedback. She questioned if she had heard Commissioner Boehm correctly and that he had stated he would consider putting the lights back in the same footprint.

Commissioner Boehm stated that his concern was that if the lights were placed 100 feet apart, and more lights had to be used for the shorter spacing, that \$220,000 seemed like a low amount and that the cost might actually be closer to \$400,000 or \$500,000. He stated that he was not comfortable spending that amount of money on decorative lights when there was no proof that the bridge needed lights at all. He stated that if the city were able to use the same amount of lights and that those lights went into the same footprint, the cost should be less than \$220,000 and he would be willing to consider that situation. He stated that if FDOT made the spacing every 100 feet, then it would change the situation.

Ms. Shanahan reiterated that she would gather more information from FDOT and provide it to the Commission.

Mayor Partington stated that the Commission should not be surprised if the lighting issue was not resolved in a short amount of time and compared it to the monument signage issue that took longer to resolve.

Commissioner Selby joked that if FDOT made the lighting requirement at 100 feet apart that the city should put decorative poles up without bulbs in them and send the bucket trucks back months later to slide bulbs into the fixtures.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city had some success in the past with FDOT. She stated that FDOT took a meeting with the mayor and were very responsive. She noted that there were other projects that were in progress with FDOT and believed that the relationships the city had cultivated in Tallahassee were beneficial. She stated that those relationships had benefited the city in dealing with FEMA as well. She stated that progress had been made since she had spoken with the FEMA director and staff had a good meeting with the contractors about getting FEMA reimbursement.

Commissioner Selby stated that FEMA had previously stated that they gave the money to the state and that the city would have the money on a previous Friday.

Ms. Shanahan stated that Commissioner Selby was correct but that the city had not received the money on that timeline.

Commissioner Boehm joked that if the city did not need lights on the bridge then they should put holiday lights up. He noted that the city should purchase green and red bulbs to decorate the bridge.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

Transcribed by: Wendy Nichols