



SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS LLC

331 ANCLOTE RD #105 TARPON SPRINGS, FL 34689

---

## Report on Linger Longer Property

Prepared by Merlin E. Seamon, Shoreline Development Consultants

12/11/11

After reviewing the pertinent documents related to the possible City of Tarpon Springs purchase of the former Linger Longer property, I offer the following comments.

1. I agree with the City's consultants that it would be possible to permit the construction of a boat ramp and related parking on a portion of the property. As the City's consultants indicated the permitting process is not quick and simple and will take considerable time to complete but this is not unusual or in any way unique to this property. Any site where there would be potential for construction of a boat ramp would require the same efforts. This site is in no way more problematic to permit this development on, it is actually an easier site than many other potential sites because there is no submerged aquatic vegetation that could be impacted. The fact that there is also a small existing ramp in the location proposed for the ramp also helps to make permitting a little bit easier. The current regulatory environment should be favorable toward the project because of the well-documented shortage of boat ramp facilities in the area. Both the Tarpon Springs and the North Pinellas Comprehensive Plans recognize a deficiency of public boat ramps.
2. The filling of the existing dranageway should be avoided. This would complicate the project permitting and increase costs considerably. Preserving and enhancing the vegetation in this area might be used as mitigation for some unavoidable impacts of the ramp on existing mangroves. This area should be enhanced and preserved and might be used for canoe and kayaks and could also serve as a natural area to preserve habitat for wildlife.
3. Based on the bathymetry provided I have done a calculation of the required dredge amount to allow a 50' wide ramp and 50' wide access way to the deep water. To dredge this area to a minimum of four feet at mean low tide would require 1222 cubic yards of dredge. A channel of 50 feet is way more than adequate to allow for safe passage of boats both in and out. The previous estimate of 4000 cubic yards obviously allows for dredging a much larger surrounding area than is really needed. While it might be nice to dredge a larger area, it is definitely not required to have a functional ramp.
4. I have reviewed the Opinion of Probable cost and prepared a more reasonable alternate based on the reduced dredge quantity and some potential savings in other areas. The following items illustrate how these proposed savings could be realized.
  - a. Based on my experience, I think the number for mobilization would be closer to \$25,000.
  - b. After looking at the current property condition I believe that clearing and grubbing could be done for \$16,500.
  - c. I reviewed the preliminary layout and made some revisions to reduce the paved area while still maintaining the same number of parking spaces. Typical parking spaces were longer than necessary at 75' and I shortened these to a more reasonable 60' resulting in



some paving savings. These spaces were shown only 8' wide on the existing plan and I widened them to a more reasonable 12'. Normal car parking spaces are 9 to 10' in width, thus 8' trailer spaces would not work. This actually increased paving quantity. After making these changes, I simply tightened up the design and did away with some wasted space and was ultimately able to reduce paved area to around 14500 square yards compared to around 17000 square yards in the current plan. This results in reduction in stabilization, asphalt and base.

- d. Since no facilities are shown that would require sewer and fire protection is really only needed at the ramp area I have reduced the estimated cost of water service, eliminated the cost of sewer and reduced the number of fire hydrants to one.
- e. I deleted the \$\$48,000 for concrete curb entirely. Typically you would not find curb and gutter on a facility such as this. I would compare this development most closely to Anclote Park where you do not find curb and gutter.
- f. I also deleted the cost of lighting. The power company will install night watcher fixtures, which are fine for such a facility. The park would also probably be closed at dark anyway so a lot of expensive lighting is really not required.
- g. The cost of Dredge and Disposal is also reduced to reflect my quantity estimate, as previously mentioned.

These changes result in a final cost of \$997,614. I believe that there are other areas where Value Engineering the project can realize additional savings but I have not had time to explore those in detail. If I were to undertake the project as a private developer, I would expect to complete it for significantly less.

Copies of the revised sketch plan for paving and the bathymetry showing where dredge is proposed are included. The layout plan shows the City's consultant's layout in color with my reduced size layout overlaid in black lines. This is simply a working document used to estimate the potential savings and certainly would need refinement. The dredge calculation simply shows the area to dredge and how my estimate was developed.