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## Executive Summary

The SR 45 (US 41) at Bonita Beach Road Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Study evaluated capacity, safety, and multi-modal improvements at the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection, in the City of Bonita Springs, Florida. The proposed improvements will modify the signalized configuration of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection to be a partial displaced left turn (PDLT), with the northbound and southbound left turn movements to crossover and be located outside of the opposing traffic flow. This configuration will allow the northbound and southbound left turning movements to operate in the same signal phase or simultaneously as the northbound and southbound through movements. To accommodate the partial displaced left turn configuration and facilitate the relocation of northbound and southbound turning vehicles, two new signalized "crossover" intersections will be added along US 41 approximately 675 ' south and 460 ' north of Bonita Beach Road. The southbound and eastbound left turn movements are proposed to have three lanes each, and the eastbound and westbound right turn movements are proposed to have two lanes each. Intersection improvements will also be supported by an enhanced Northwest Quadrant Roadway and a new Northeast Quadrant Roadway.

The purpose of the Location Hydraulics Report is to address base floodplain encroachments resulting from the roadway improvements evaluated in the US 41 at Bonita Beach Road PD\&E Study for FDOT District 1. In accordance with Executive Order 11988 "Floodplain Management," U.S. DOT Order 5650.2 "Floodplain Management Protection," and Federal-Aid Policy Guide 23 CFR 650A, Floodplains must be protected. The intent of these regulations is to avoid or minimize highway encroachments within the 100-year (base) floodplains and to avoid supporting land use development incompatible with floodplain values.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), northern portions of the proposed quadrant roadways lie within Zone AE of the 100 -year floodplain. The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of the site has been determined to be at the elevation of 9.0 feet NAVD upstream of the bridge over the Imperial River and 10.0 feet NAVD downstream of the bridge.

It was concluded that the project will have approximately 8.20 ac -ft of transverse floodplain impacts based on the proposed improvements to the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection and for the proposed quadrant roadways. According to the Lee County Flood Insurance Study (FIS) the floodplain within the limits of this study are under tidal influence; therefore, it was determined that the floodplain encroachment is classified as "minimal." Minimal encroachments on a floodplain occur when there is a floodplain involvement but impacts on human life, transportation facilities, and natural and beneficial floodplain values are not significant and can be resolved with minimal efforts. Please refer to Section 4 for additional information.

In conclusion, the following floodplain statement is a slightly modified version of statement Number 4 in the FDOT PD\&E Manual (Part 2, Chapter 13 "Floodplains") tailored for this project:
"The proposed structures and stormwater management systems will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to significantly increase. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change

## SR 45 (US 41) at Bonita Beach Road PD\&E Study

FM No. 444321-1-22-01
in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or in emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant."

### 1.0 Project Overview

Initiated in November 2019, this Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Study has been conducted to assess various intersection alternatives for US 41 at CR 865/Bonita Beach Road. This Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) documents the project's purpose and need, the alternatives developed, the process of selecting the preferred alternative, and presents the preliminary design analysis for the preferred alternative. CR 865 will be referred to as Bonita Beach Road throughout the remainder of this report.

### 1.1 Project Description

The US 41 at Bonita Beach Road Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Study evaluated capacity, safety, and multi-modal improvements at the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection, in the City of Bonita Springs, Florida. The study area limits extend along US 41 from Foley Road to just south of the Imperial River bridge, a distance of approximately 0.9 miles. Additionally, the study area extends along Bonita Beach Road from Windsor Road to Spanish Wells Boulevard, a distance of approximately 0.8 miles.

US 41 is a north-south principal arterial roadway running parallel to Interstate $75(1-75)$ and facilitates movement of regional and local traffic (including truck traffic) along Florida's west coast. Bonita Beach Road is an east-west minor arterial roadway providing a connection to l-75 and is one of two east-west connections between the Lee County mainland and coastal communities and barrier island tourist destinations and beaches to the west. US 41 is a state roadway maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 1, while Bonita Beach Road is maintained by the Lee County. Both US 41 and Bonita Beach Road are designated as emergency evacuation routes.

US 41 within the project limits is a six-lane divided roadway with $5^{\prime}$ on-street bicycle lanes and $5^{\prime}$ sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. Bonita Beach Road is a four lane divided roadway with 5 ' sidewalks on both sides but no on-street bicycle facilities.

The US 41 at Bonita Beach Road intersection of is currently a signalized intersection with two exclusive left turn lanes and an exclusive right turn lane in each approach. Aside from the main intersection, there is currently one other signalized intersection along US 41 at the Center of Bonita Springs (Tuffy Auto/Advanced Auto Parts). There are three additional signalized intersections along Bonita Beach Road at the Center of Bonita Springs, Arroyal Road, and Spanish Wells Boulevard.

The existing US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection has two high volume left turn movements, those being eastbound to northbound and southbound to eastbound. To partially address these heavy movements, the City of Bonita Springs conducted the "Network Enhancement Alignment Study - Quadrant Plan" in May 2017. From this, the City will be designing and building a two-lane quadrant roadway connecting Bonita Beach Road at Windsor Road to US 41 at the Center of Bonita Springs. This Northwest Quadrant Roadway is currently in design by the City and anticipated to be built ahead of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection improvements.
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The proposed improvements will modify the signalized configuration of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection to be a partial displaced left turn (PDLT), with the northbound and southbound left turn movements to crossover and be located outside of the opposing traffic flow. This configuration will allow the northbound and southbound left turning movements to operate in the same signal phase or simultaneously as the northbound and southbound through movements. To accommodate the partial displaced left turn configuration and facilitate the relocation of northbound and southbound turning vehicles, two new signalized "crossover" intersections will be added along US 41 approximately 675' south and 460 ' north of Bonita Beach Road. The southbound and eastbound left turn movements are proposed to have three lanes each, and the eastbound and westbound right turn movements are proposed to have two lanes each.

As noted above, a Northwest Quadrant Roadway is being constructed by the City of Bonita Springs. As part of the PD\&E study's proposed improvements, the US 41 and the Center of Bonita Springs intersection is proposed to be changed from a standard signalized intersection to a "thru-cut" intersection. A thru-cut intersection restricts through movements from the minor street typically due to operational and/or geometric conditions. In this case, the west leg is being widened from two lanes to five lanes (four eastbound approach lanes and one westbound receiving lane) and the east leg is being widened from two lanes to four lanes (two westbound approach lanes and two eastbound receiving lanes). This creates skew issues for any east/west through movements and creates operational constraints that are alleviated by the thru-cut intersection configuration. Tying into the new east leg is a Northeast Quadrant Roadway proposed between US 41 and Arroyal Road, northeast of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection. This will be a new three-lane roadway with two lanes eastbound and one lane westbound.

Along US 41 in the northbound direction, a $6^{\prime}$ sidewalk is proposed from Foley Road to Springs Plaza (Sta. 232+50) and a 12' shared-use path is proposed from Springs Plaza to just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. $271+00$ ). In the southbound direction, a $12^{\prime}$ shared-use path is proposed from just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 271+00) to Bonita Funeral Home (Sta. 231+00) and a 6' sidewalk is proposed from Bonita Funeral Home to Foley Road. Along both sides of Bonita Beach Road, the sidewalks will be widened to 12' shared-use paths from the Center of Bonita Springs to Arroyal Road. Signalized marked crosswalks will be maintained on every leg of the PDLT, including the channelized right turn lanes. Signalized marked crosswalks will also be provided on every leg of each signalized intersection along US 41 and Bonita Beach Road within the study area. The project location is shown in Figure 1 and the study area is shown in Figure 2.


Figure 1 | Project Location


Figure 2 | Study Area
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### 1.2 Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to address the deficient operational capacity of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection to relieve existing congestion and accommodate projected future traffic demand. The project's secondary goals are to 1) Enhance regional and local mobility; 2) Enhance safety conditions; and 3) Improve multimodal access. The need for these improvements is described in this section.

### 1.2.1 Transportation Demand/Capacity

The US 41 at Bonita Beach Road intersection experiences chronic congestion. As population and employment growth are expected to continue within this area of Lee County, the intersection's congestion is anticipated to increase. Based on 2019 traffic counts taken, the existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) ranges from 39,000 to 53,000 along US 41 and was 30,000 along Bonita Beach Road. Based on future growth projections to a 2050 design year, the AADTs are forecast to range from 60,000 to 78,000 along US 41. The future 2050 AADT forecast along Bonita Beach Road is 39,000 .

The existing (2019) mid-day traffic analysis for the US 41 at Bonita Beach Road intersection shows that six of the 12 movements operate at Level of Service (LOS) of F, with one of those being overcapacity (volume-to-capacity >1.0). The existing (2019) PM traffic analysis for the intersection shows that seven of the 12 movements operate at Level of Service (LOS) of F , with two of those being overcapacity. In the future 2050 condition, the no-build intersection operates at LOS $F$ with an overall average vehicle delay between 85 and 92 seconds. While there are a similar number of LOS F movements between the existing and future no-build, latent demand is expected to increase by nearly 30 percent. The future no-build intersection is serving approximately the same amount of traffic volume as the existing condition but with the increased volumes, there are more vehicles in the overall network not being served.

### 1.2.2 Safety

Crash records were obtained for both US 41 and Bonita Beach Road within the study area, as described below:
US 41 from Foley Road (MP 0.540) to the Imperial River bridge (MP 1.482); and
Bonita Beach Road from 400' west of Windsor Road to 450' east of Spanish Wells Boulevard.
Crash data was obtained for the most recent five-year period on record (2018 through 2022). The crash data was obtained from the University of Florida's Signal Four (S4) Analytics crash database for US 41 and Bonita Beach Road. The safety analysis was performed for the most recent five years of crash data (January 1, 2018 - December 31, 2022). Supplemental crash data from previous years (2014 to 2017) and January 1, 2023 to June 30, 2023 were also analyzed to verify crash trends and patterns.

Figure 3 displays a summary of crash frequency by year along with the respective severities from 2014 to 2022. There was an increase in crashes between 2014 and 2017, but there has been a decrease in crashes between 2017 and 2019 before an approximate 30 percent drop in crashes due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. The number
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of crashes have stayed relatively constant in 2021 and 2022. There were 163 crashes per year on average between 2014 to 2017. However, there were 146 crashes per year on average in the study area between 2018 to 2022, not including 2020 (a 10 percent decrease). The fatal crash in 2019 involved a vehicle striking a pedestrian on US 41 just south of Bonita Beach Road, and the fatal crash in 2021 involved an angle crash at the intersection of US 41 at Foley Road/Shanna Lane.


Figure 3: Crashes per Year (Entire Study Area)
Forty three percent of the total study area crashes were located within the intersection influence area of US 41 and Bonita Beach Road. Figure 4 displays a summary of crash frequency by year along with the respective severities from 2018 to 2022. There was a total of 298 reported crashes during this period, 65 injury crashes ( 22 percent), and one fatal crash (in 2019). As displayed in Figure 4, there were an average of 60 crashes per year at the intersection.

Figure 5 displays the crashes at the intersection by type and severity for the five-year study period. The highest crash type observed was rear end, comprising 59 percent of the total crashes. Sideswipe crashes ( 13 percent) and left turn ( 8 percent) were the second and third highest crash types. These trends are consistent with the overall study area. The fatal crash in 2019 occurred when a vehicle struck a pedestrian crossing US 41.
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Figure 4: Crashes per Year (US 41 and Bonita Beach Road Intersection)


Figure 5: Crashes by Type and Severity (US 41 and Bonita Beach Road Intersection: 2018 to 2022)
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A crash rate analysis was performed for the US 41 at Bonita Beach Road intersection. Note that as 2020-2022 average crash rates are not yet available, crash rate analyses were limited to 2018 and 2019 data. Based on the analysis, the study intersection experienced higher than average crash rates in both 2018 and 2019 when compared to both Statewide and Districtwide average crash rates.

US 41 and Bonita Beach Road are designated emergency evacuation routes for both the Florida Division of Emergency Management and Lee County. Providing parallel service to I-75, US 41 plays an important role in facilitating north-south traffic during incidences and emergency evacuation periods (particularly within southwest Florida). Bonita Beach Road also serves a critical role during emergency evacuation periods as it connects US 41 and I-75 (facilities of the state evacuation route network) and provides one of two connections for residents and tourists between the barrier islands/tourist destinations to the west and mainland of Lee County.

### 1.2.3 Modal Interrelationships

While sidewalks are present on both sides of US 41 and Bonita Beach Road, the only bicycle facilities present in the study area are 5' marked bicycle lanes along both sides of US 41. Two LeeTran bus routes (Routes 150 and 600) operate along US 41 and Bonita Beach Road. In addition to the two bus routes, LeeTran has partnered with Uber to provide ULTRA On-Demand Transit service in the Bonita Springs area. With LeeTran's ULTRA On-Demand Transit service is a deluxe mini-bus available seven days a week from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM. ULTRA On-Demand Transit allows riders to request a ride as needed, with curb to curb service.

Due to the presence of these facilities/services and the surrounding urban environment, heavy pedestrian and bicycle traffic exists in the area (as observed during field reviews conducted for the project).

The Office of Greenways and Trails (OGT) and the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) have identified trail opportunities in the vicinity of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road study intersection. The Coastal Loop Trail is a spur loop from the Southwest Coastal Regional Trail, which is part of the larger FDOT Shared-Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail Program. This is a planned loop trail that begins at the Southwest Coastal Regional Trail in Bonita Springs, travels along Bonita Beach Road to the barrier islands, then travels through Fort Myers Beach and southern Fort Myers before connecting back to the Southwest Coastal Regional Trail east of US 41 in Fort Myers. Through discussions with Lee County MPO, no future funding has been dedicated for Coastal Loop Trail improvements in the vicinity of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection as per the date of this report.

### 1.2.4 System Linkage

US 41 serves as a critical arterial in facilitating the north-south movement of regional and local traffic (including truck traffic) as it runs parallel to I-75 along Florida's west coast. Similarly, Bonita Beach Road serves as a major east-west local roadway within Lee Countr, linking US 41 and I-75 and providing access (as one of two connections) between the mainland of Lee County and coastal communities/tourist destinations to the west (i.e., barrier islands and beaches).

The City of Bonita Springs performed the Network Enhancement Alignment Study, also known as the "Quadrant Plan", in May 2017. The purpose of the Quadrant Plan is to develop an expanded roadway network between
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Bonita Beach Road with US 41 that improves the area's mobility, maintains a high-quality environment for the community, and minimizes impacts to the natural environment. The City is moving forward with design and construction for a northwest quadrant roadway.

### 1.3 Alternatives Analysis Summary

### 1.3.1 Prior Grade Separated Alternative

During the preliminary alternatives analysis efforts in 2020, a single point diamond interchange (SPDI) was one of two alternatives being considered (along with the PDLT). The SPDI alternative assumes the northbound and southbound through lanes on US 41 are elevated over Bonita Beach Road. Turning movements for US 41 and Bonita Beach Road occur at a single intersection underneath the US 41 overpass. To allow access to local businesses, through movements on the US 41 ramps were allowed. The US 41 overpass begins between the two access points for Springs Plaza on the south side of Bonita Beach Road and ends north of the Crown Lake Boulevard intersection to the north. Access to any minor streets along the US 41 ramps are maintained as intersections with the US 41 ramps only.

The SPDI alternative was reviewed as part of the Stage 1 Intersection Control Evaluation. During this evaluation, a new development was approved with their primary access to US 41 occurring at the Center of Bonita Springs signalized intersection via the northwest quadrant roadway. The overpass' ramps would tie-in to US 41 north of this location and convert the Center of Bonita Springs intersection into a right-in/right-out configuration. With this new development needing full access to US 41 at the Center of Bonita Springs, the SPDI alternative was removed from consideration and an enhanced at-grade traffic signal was reviewed (as discussed in the next section).

### 1.3.2 Intersection Alternatives

Two intersection alternatives were developed to support the US 41 at Bonita Beach Road purpose and need:

- Alternative A - Enhanced Traffic Signal (Figure 6)
- Widens US 41 to eight lanes from Foley Road to the southern end of the Imperial River bridge.
- Provides additional turn lane improvements to the existing signalized intersection.
- Alternative B - Partial Displaced Left Turn (Figure 7)
- Northbound and southbound left turn movements are relocated to the outside of the opposing flow of traffic, allowing the northbound and southbound left turning movements to operate in the same signal phase as the northbound and southbound through movements.
- Two new signalized "crossover" intersections are proposed along US 41 approximately 675' south and 460' north of Bonita Beach Road to allow left turning vehicles to cross to the other side of the opposing flow.
- The southbound and eastbound left turn movements are proposed to have three lanes each.
- The eastbound and westbound right turn movements are proposed to have two lanes each.
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The intersection alternatives were developed using design provisions from the FDOT Design Manual (FDM). Each of the proposed intersection alternatives were applied along US 41 from Sta. 221+19 to Sta. 271+81 and along Bonita Beach Road from Sta. 254+57 to Sta. 300+33.


Figure 6: Alternative A - Enhanced Traffic Signal
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Figure 7: Alternative B - Partial Displaced Left Turn
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### 1.3.3 Other US 41 Improvements (Outside of Main Intersection)

### 1.3.3.1 Alternative A - Enhanced Traffic Signal

For Alternative A, US 41 is proposed to be modified based on the following:

- Adding a fourth travel lane in each direction and reducing the lane widths to 11':
- Additional northbound travel lane will start just north of Foley Road (Sta. 223+50) and end at the driveway for the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 270+00).
- The additional southbound travel lane will start at Sta. 265+00 (halfway between the Imperial River Boat Ramp driveway (Sta. 270+00) and the US 41/Center of Bonita Springs intersection (Sta. $260+00$ )) and end at the Foley Road intersection (Sta. 222+75).
- A 12' shared-use path is proposed on both sides of US 41 in lieu of the on-street bicycle facilities:
- In the northbound direction from Springs Plaza (Sta. 232+50) to just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 271+00).
- In the southbound direction from just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 271+00) to Bonita Funeral Home (Sta. 231+00).
- A 7' on-street buffered bicycle lane is proposed on the south end of the corridor:
- In the northbound direction from Foley Road (Sta. 222+75) to just north of Springs Plaza (Sta. $234+50$ ).
- In the southbound direction from Bonita Funeral Home (Sta. 231+00) to Foley Road (Sta. 222+75).
- A 6 ' sidewalk is proposed on the south end of the corridor:
- In the northbound direction from Foley Road (Sta. 222+75) to Springs Plaza (Sta. 232+50).
- In the southbound direction from Bonita Funeral Home (Sta. 231+00) to Foley Road (Sta. 222+75).

A graphic depiction of the roadway features for Alternative A is shown in Figure $\mathbf{8}$ below.

## SR 45 (US 41) at Bonita Beach Road PD\&E Study

FM No. 444321-1-22-01


Figure 8: Alternative A US 41 Roadway Features
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### 1.3.3.2 Alternative B - Partial Displaced Left Turn

For Alternative B, the northbound and southbound left turn movements will be relocated outside of the opposing flow of traffic. This configuration will allow the northbound and southbound left turning movements to operate in the same signal phase as the northbound and southbound through movements. To accommodate the Alternative B configuration and facilitate the relocation of northbound and southbound turning vehicles, two new signalized "crossover" intersections will be added along US 41 approximately 675' south and 460' north of Bonita Beach Road (as shown in Figure 7). The following features detail the improvements proposed as part of the new "crossover" intersections:

- Between Foley Road (Sta. 222+75) and southern "crossover" intersection (Sta. 239+00):
- Three $11^{\prime}$ northbound and southbound through lanes.
- Between southern "crossover" intersection (Sta. 239+00) and US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection (Sta. 246+00) (described from right side to left side across US 41 and shown in Figure 9):
- Exclusive $11^{\prime}$ northbound right turn lane.
- Three $11^{\prime}$ northbound and southbound through lanes.
- Dual 11' northbound exclusive left turn lanes positioned outside of the southbound through lanes.
- Dual $11^{\prime}$ eastbound to southbound exclusive right turn lanes positioned outside of the northbound left turn lanes.
- Between US 41/Bonita Beach Road intersection (Sta. 246+00) and northern "crossover" intersection (Sta. 251+00) and (described from right side to left side across US 41):
- Dual $11^{\prime}$ westbound to northbound exclusive right turn lanes positioned outside of the southbound left turn lanes.
- Triple $11^{\prime}$ southbound exclusive left turn lanes positioned outside of the northbound through lanes.
- Three $11^{\prime}$ northbound and southbound through lanes.
- Exclusive 11' southbound right turn lane.
- Between northern "crossover" intersection (Sta. 251+00) and US 41/Center of Bonita Springs intersection (Sta. 260+00):
- Four 11' northbound through lanes.
- Three $11^{\prime}$ southbound through lanes.
- Between US 41 and Center of Bonita Springs intersection (Sta. 260+00) and the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 266+50):
- Four 11' northbound through lanes (outside lane drops at the Imperial River Boat Ramp).
- Three 11 ' southbound through lanes (a fourth "auxiliary" lane begins at Sta. 265+00 that drops into the triple southbound left turn lanes).
- A 12 ' shared-use path is proposed on both sides of US 41 in lieu of the on-street bicycle facilities:
- In the northbound direction from Springs Plaza (Sta. $232+50$ ) to just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 271+00).
- In the southbound direction from just north of the Imperial River Boat Ramp (Sta. 271+00) to just south of Access Road (Sta. 237+00).
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- A 7' on-street buffered bicycle lane is proposed on the south end of the corridor:
- In the northbound direction from Foley Road (Sta. 222+75) to just north of Springs Plaza (Sta. 234+50).
- In the southbound direction from just south of Access Road (Sta. 237+00) to Foley Road (Sta. $222+75)$.
- A $6^{\prime}$ sidewalk is proposed on the south end of the corridor:
- In the northbound direction from Foley Road (Sta. 222+75) to Springs Plaza (Sta. 232+50).
- In the southbound direction from just south of Access Road (Sta. 237+00) to Foley Road (Sta. $222+75)$.
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Figure 9: Alternative B US 41 Roadway Features
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### 1.4 Description of Preferred Alternative

### 1.4.1 Preferred Intersection Control Alternative

The purpose of this project is to address the deficient operational capacity of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection to relieve existing congestion and accommodate projected future traffic demand. The project's secondary goals are to 1) Enhance regional and local mobility; 2) Enhance safety conditions; and 3) Improve multi-modal access.

Alternatives A (Enhanced Traffic Signal) and B (PDLT) were presented at the Alternatives Public Workshop conducted virtually on Monday April 3 and in-person on Tuesday April 4, 2023. Following the workshop, feedback was gathered from members of the public for both alternatives. The majority of public comments received expressing support for Alternative B, PDLT. Alternative B was favored as it does not add through lanes along US 41, was viewed as being more operationally efficient, and provided better pedestrian and bicyclist safety. These alternatives were also presented to the Lee County MPO on June 16, 2023 and the public support for the PDLT alternative was documented with the MPO Board.

Discussions were held with FDOT District 1 after the Alternatives Public Workshop and it was determined Alternative B - PDLT best aligns with the purpose and need of the project and was selected as the preferred alternative. The following bullets summarize how the PDLT recommendation meets the primary and secondary purpose and need goals noted above:

- Transportation Demand/Capacity
- In the 2050 future build condition, the average network delay for vehicles traveling through the PDLT is approximately 50 percent less than the No-Build Alternative.
- The number of vehicles served by the PDLT in 2050 is approximately 20 percent higher than the No-Build Alternative.
- The PDLT is anticipated to improve average vehicle delay by over 45 seconds in both the 2050 mid-day and PM peak hours when compared to the No-Build Alternative.
- Safety
- Using the predictive safety analysis methods provided in the FDOT Safety Performance for Intersection Control Evaluation (SPICE) Tool, the PDLT intersection is predicted to decrease total and fatal/injury crashes by over 10 percent vs the No-Build Alternative over the 20 year life cycle from 2030 to 2050.
- Increase the volume of residents and tourists from coastal communities that can be evacuated during an emergency event by improving intersection operations of two major evacuation routes.
- Enhance access to facilities of the state evacuation route network.
- Improve response times (due to enhanced access) to emergency events and incidences.
- Modal Interrelationships
- Sidewalks in the study area are proposed to be widened to 12 ' shared-use paths along both sides of US 41 and Bonita Beach Road.


## SR 45 (US 41) at Bonita Beach Road PD\&E Study

FM No. 444321-1-22-01

- These shared-use paths will improve pedestrian/bicycle access and circulation by modifying/limiting opportunities for conflicts between automobiles and pedestrians/bicyclists.
- The 12 ' shared-use path improvements proposed as part of the PDLT would help further enhance the future vision of the Coastal Loop Trail in the study area.
- Additional median and concrete traffic separators are included in the PDLT concept to provide pedestrian refuge areas and better facilitate non-motorist crossings.
- The PDLT will also enhance the performance and reliability of transit service operating along US 41 and Bonita Beach Road by reducing delays at the intersection.
- System Linkage
- Improve the viability of US 41 as a regional alternative facility to $\mathrm{I}-75$ by reducing travel delay.
- Enhance east-west access between two primary north-south transportation corridors (US 41 and I-75) as well as between the mainland of Lee County and coastal communities/tourist destinations to the west.
- Enhance freight mobility and access within the area as US 41 is designated as regional freight mobility corridor (Tier 1 Regional Freight Corridor) in the Lee County 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.
- The proposed PDLT improvements will support local system linkage planning efforts by providing a Northeast Quadrant Roadway connecting US 41 to Arroyal Road.


### 1.4.2 Preferred Alternative Features

The following highlights the key improvement elements within the US 41 at Bonita Beach Road intersection area for Alternative B:

### 1.4.2.1 US 41

The proposed roadway/intersection improvements discussed in Section 1.3.1 and 1.3.3.2 were brought forward as part of the preferred alternative design. Outside of the main US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection and "crossover" locations, additional intersection improvements are included as part of the preferred alternative:

- Signalization and turn lane improvements at the intersection of US 41 and Foley Road (Sta. 222+75).
- Modified "thru-cut" signalized intersection at US 41 and Center of Bonita Springs (Sta. 260+00) as shown in Figure 10:
- A thru-cut intersection restricts through movements from the minor street typically due to operational and/or geometric conditions. In this case, the west leg is being widened from two lanes to five lanes (four eastbound approach lanes and one westbound receiving lane) and the east leg is being widened from two lanes to four lanes (two westbound approach lanes and two eastbound receiving lanes).
- Dual southbound left turn lanes are also proposed in the new thru-cut configuration.
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Figure 10: US 41/Center of Bonita Springs "Thru-Cut" Intersection

### 1.4.2.2 Bonita Beach Road

The following roadway improvements are proposed along Bonita Beach Road as part of the preferred alternative:

- Three 11' travel lanes in each direction from the Center of Bonita Springs (Sta. 266+50) to Arroyal Road (Sta. 286+25). The third eastbound through lane drops at the Spanish Wells Boulevard signal.
- Widening the sidewalk to be a $12^{\prime}$ shared-use path on both sides from the Center of Bonita Springs (Sta. $266+50$ ) to Arroyal Road (Sta. 286+25).

At intersections along Bonita Beach Road, the following features are included are part of the preferred alternative:

- Bonita Beach Road at Center of Bonita Springs (Sta. 266+50):
- Develop a third 11' eastbound travel lane departing intersection.
- Bonita Beach Road at Arroyal Road (Sta. 286+25):
- One additional 11' eastbound through lane (will be a shared through/right configuration).
- Develop a third $11^{\prime}$ westbound travel lane departing intersection.
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- The southbound approach will be modified to include two southbound left turn lanes and one southbound shared through/right turn lane.


### 1.4.2.3 Quadrant Roadway System

A new Northwest Quadrant Roadway from Bonita Beach Road at Windsor Road (Bonita Beach Road Sta. 260+00) to US 41 at the Center of Bonita Springs (US 41 Sta. 260+00) will be constructed by the City of Bonita Springs before the preferred alternative is planned to be constructed at the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection. The following features describe the Northwest Quadrant Roadway improvements as shown in Figure 11:

- Intersection of Bonita Beach Road and Windsor Road (Bonita Beach Road Sta. 260+00):
- An eastbound displaced left turn to the Northwest Quadrant Roadway with a new crossover intersection just west of Windsor Road.
- The southbound approach from Windsor Road will be widened to two lanes.
- An exclusive westbound right turn lane will be added.
- Along Windsor Road:
- Two southbound lanes and one northbound lane.
- 6' sidewalk on the west side and 12 ' shared-use path on the east side of the roadway.
- Along New Roadway between Windsor Road and the Northwest Corner of the Center of Bonita Springs Shopping Plaza:
- One $11^{\prime}$ travel lane in each direction.
- 4' paved shoulders in each direction.
- $6^{\prime}$ sidewalk on the west side and 12 ' shared-use path on the east side of the roadway.
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Figure 11: Northwest Quadrant Roadway - Proposed City Alignment
The design concept for the City's Northwest Quadrant Roadway ties in at the existing US 41/Center of Bonita Springs intersection and is not making any improvements to this intersection. In the future condition, this intersection will not have enough capacity to accommodate the forecasted traffic demand, necessitating additional turn lane improvements on the intersection's west leg. As part of the preferred alternative, the Northwest Quadrant Roadway is being modified from the northwest corner of the Center of Bonita Springs Shopping Plaza to US 41. These changes are described below and shown in Figure 12:

- Northwest Corner of the Center of Bonita Springs Shopping Plaza to US 41:
- Roadway is widened to develop a center median with varying width.
- One $11^{\prime}$ travel lane in each direction.
- 6' sidewalks on each side of the roadway.
- 7' buffered bicycle lanes in each direction.
- New $11^{\prime}$ westbound left turn lane into Center of Bonita Springs behind the Old Time Pottery building.
- West Leg at US 41 Intersection:
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- One 11' eastbound right turn lane.
- Three $11^{\prime}$ eastbound left turn lanes.
- One 11 ' westbound receiving lane.


Figure 12: Northwest Quadrant Roadway - West Leg at US 41
Tying into the east leg of this intersection is a Northeast Quadrant Roadway proposed between US 41 and Arroyal Road, intersecting at Arroyal Road and Carolina Street. This will be a new three-lane roadway with two lanes eastbound and one lane westbound, as shown in Figure 13. The lane configuration at the US 41 intersection is discussed below:

- One $11^{\prime}$ westbound left turn lane.
- One 11' westbound right turn lane.
- Two 11' eastbound receiving lanes.
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Figure 13: Northeast Quadrant Roadway - East Leg at US 41
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### 2.0 Data Collection

The design team collected and reviewed data from the following sources:

- FDOT Drainage Manual, January 2024
- FDOT Drainage Design Guide, January 2024
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel Nos. 12071C0658G, Effective Date 11/17/2022, in Lee County, Florida.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle Maps
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soils Survey of Lee County, Florida, 1984
- Field Reconnaissance (April 2019)
- Existing Permit Databases (SFWMD)
- 1-ft LIDAR Data Source: Lee County, 2007
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### 3.0 Existing Drainage Conditions

### 3.1 Topography \& Hydrologic Features

Topography throughout the project is relatively flat with a very gradual downhill slope from the study limit's southern end to the north. Roadway elevations begin at 13.0 feet and decrease to 12.0 feet. All elevations mentioned in this report are in reference to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD) unless otherwise stated. Where information was available only in the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD), it was converted to NAVD using the conversion NAVD = NGVD - 1.38 feet. Please refer to the USGS Quadrangle Map, Figure 2 in Appendix A. The study is just south of the Imperial River, Waterbody ID (WBID) 3258EB - Imperial River (Marine Segment), which is an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW) and the project's ultimate outfall. There is a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Dissolved Oxygen (DO) and Total Nitrogen (TN) for the Imperial River.

There are three existing drainage crossings within the study limits. There is a double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert (CBC) underneath US 41 south of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection which conveys a large drainage ditch from US 41's west side to the ditch along US 41's east side. There is a single $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime} \mathrm{CBC}$ underneath Bonita Beach Road east of the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection conveying the ditch north to the Arroyal Mall Pond. There is a $24^{\prime \prime}$ outfall pipe crossing underneath US 41 from the Center of Bonita Springs treatment pond into the Arroyal Mall Pond. An additional crossing will be necessary underneath the proposed Northeast Quadrant Roadway to maintain conveyance of the outfall ditch from the Arroyal Mall Pond to the Imperial River.

Initial coordination with the City of Bonita Springs indicated a flooding concern at the homes and road systems west of Beaumont Road and upstream of the double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ CBC under US 41. Preliminary calculations, discussed in section Section 4.1, indicate that the concrete box culvert extension will not adversely impact the stages within the ditch upstream. It is anticipated that the flooding issues are due to issues outside of the study limits, which will need to be verified during final design.

### 3.2 Soils Data and Geotechnical Investigations

The soil survey of Lee County, Florida (dated 1984) published by the USDA NRCS has been reviewed within the project vicinity. USDA Soil Survey Geographic database (SSURGO) data was also obtained from NRCS to create a project limits' soils map using GIS ArcMap. The project vicinity soil survey map is illustrated in Figure 3 of Appendix A.

Table 3-1: USDA NRCS Soil Survey Information for Lee County

| Soil <br> No. | USDA Soil Name | Seasonal High Ground Water |  | HSG | Soil Classification |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Depth* } \\ \text { (feet) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Duration (months) |  | Depth (inches) | Unified | AASHTO |
| 36 | Immokalee Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes | 0.5-1.5 | Jun-Nov | B/D | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-9 \\ 9-36 \\ 36-55 \\ 55-80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SP-SM } \\ \text { SP, SP-SM } \\ \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ \text { SM, SP-SM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}-2-4, \mathrm{~A}-3 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-2-4, \mathrm{~A}-3 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 106 | Daytona Sand- <br> Urban Land <br> Complex, 0 to 5 <br> Percent Slopes | 3.5-5.0 | Jun-Oct | A | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 5-36 \\ 36-47 \\ 47-80 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SP-SM, SP } \\ & \text { SP, SP-SM } \\ & \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ & \text { SP, SP-SM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ \mathrm{~A}-3 \\ \mathrm{~A}-2-4, \mathrm{~A}-3 \\ \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| Soil <br> No. | USDA Soil Name | Seasonal High Ground Water |  | HSG | Soil Classification |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Depth* <br> (feet) | Duration (months) |  | Depth (inches) | Unified | AASHTO |
| 123 | Myakka Fine Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes | 0.5-1.5 | Jun-Nov | A/D | $\begin{gathered} 0-6 \\ 6-20 \\ 20-36 \\ 36-80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ & \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ & \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ & \text { SP-SM, SM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A-3, A-2-4 \\ & A-3, A-2-4 \\ & A-2-4, A-3 \\ & A-3, A-2-4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 124 | Myakka Fine Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 1 Percent Slopes | 0.0 | Jul-Oct | A/D | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 5-25 \\ 25-39 \\ 39-80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SM, SP-SM } \\ \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ \text { SM } \\ \text { SM, SP-SM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} A-2-4 . A-3 \\ A-3, A-2-4 \\ A-2-4 \\ A-3, A-2-4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 131 | Pompano Fine Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes | 0.3-1.5 | Jul-Oct | A/D | $\begin{gathered} 0-4 \\ 4-80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SP-SM, SM } \\ & \text { SM, SP-SM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A-2-4, A-3 \\ & A-3, A-2-4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 134 | Satellite Fine Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes | 1.5-3.5 | Jun-Nov | A | $\begin{gathered} 0-3 \\ 3-65 \\ 65-80 \end{gathered}$ | SP-SM, SM <br> SP-SM, SM <br> SM, SP-SM | $\begin{aligned} & A-2-4, A-3 \\ & A-3, A-2-4 \\ & A-2-4, A-3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 136 | Valkaria Fine Sand- <br> Urban Land Complex, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes | 0.3-1.5 | Jul-Oct | A/D | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 5-16 \\ 16-51 \\ 51-80 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SM, SP-SM } \\ & \text { SM, SP-SM } \\ & \text { SM, SP-SM } \\ & \text { SM, SP-SM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \\ & \mathrm{~A}-3, \mathrm{~A}-2-4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 145 | Gator Muck, Ponded-Urban Land Complex, 0 to 1 Percent Slopes | 0.0 | Jun-Dec | C/D | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-18 \\ 18-36 \\ 36-55 \\ 55-80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PT } \\ \mathrm{CL}, \mathrm{SC}, \mathrm{SM} \\ \mathrm{SC}, \mathrm{SC}-\mathrm{SM}, \mathrm{SM} \\ \mathrm{SP}-\mathrm{SM}, \mathrm{SM} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline A-8 \\ A-4, A-7-6, A-6 \\ A-4, A-2-4, A-6 \\ A-2-4, A-3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

*Seasonal High Ground Water Table: Depth is referenced below existing grade, except where indicated as " + ".
The soils encountered along the project limits are mostly Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) A/D, B/D, and C/D. Group A soils have low runoff potential and high infiltration rates even when thoroughly wetted. They consist chiefly of deep, well to excessively drained sand or gravel and have a high rate of water transmission. Group B soils have moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet and consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained, or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. Group C soils have low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of soils with a layer that impedes downward movement of water and soils with moderately fine to fine texture. Group D soils have high runoff potential. They have very low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of clay soils with a high swelling potential, soils with a permanent high water table, soils with a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and shallow soils over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very low rate of water transmission. If a soil is assigned to a dual HSG, the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for un-drained areas. Soils are only assigned a dual class if they are group $D$ in their natural condition. According to the Soil Survey, there are 7 different soil types located along the project limits within Lee County. Table 3-1: USDA NRCS Soil Survey Information for Lee County summarizes and lists the soil types and relevant information. The ground water depth varies from $0^{\prime}$ to $5^{\prime}$ along the project per the NRCS Soil Survey information.
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### 3.3 Floodplains/Floodways

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate map (FIRM) for Lee County (Map No. 12071C0658G) dated November 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, 2022 indicates that portions of the study area are within Zone AE floodplains (Flood El. 10.0 feet NAVD). The floodplain area within the study limits is tidally influenced and will not require compensation for impacts anticipated from the proposed study per coordination with SFWMD. The Imperial River is considered a regulatory FEMA floodway; however, the proposed improvements considered for this study will not impact the roadway or bridge at the river.
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### 4.0 Proposed Drainage Conditions

The project limits' stormwater runoff will be collected and conveyed via curb and gutter to the recommended pond alternative for each basin. The various pond alternatives consist of dry retention ponds, wet detention ponds, and dry linear swales. Additional information regarding the proposed stormwater management is included in the Pond Siting Report, under a separate cover.

### 4.1 Cross Drain Analysis

There are three existing cross drains within the study limits that will need to be extended to accommodate the proposed improvements to the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection. There is a double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert underneath US 41, located south of the intersection, and a $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert underneath Bonita Beach Road, located east of the intersection. Additionally, there is a $24^{\prime \prime}$ crossing underneath US 41 acting as the pond outfall from the Center of Bonita Springs Treatment Pond into the Arroyal Mall Pond, which will need to be extended to accommodate the turn lane. The two cross drains accommodate the ditch system, which conveys runoff from offsite areas to the Arroyal Mall Pond. Preliminary cross drain analysis have been performed in HY-8 using available permit information. The proposed extensions, including the enclosure of the large ditch north of Bonita Beach Road found minimal impacts to the ditch's upstream stages. Please see Appendix C - Cross Drain Analysis and Floodplain Impact Calculations for the cross-drain analysis. During design, existing cross drains will be required to be video inspected to determine their condition and if they are eligible for extension or will need to be replaced.

The proposed Northeast Quadrant Roadway bisects the existing Arroyal Mall Pond outfall ditch. A cross drain underneath the proposed roadway will be required to maintain the outfall conveyance system. Review of the existing permit information and field review determined the outfall ditch to be approximately $10^{\prime}$ wide and $4^{\prime}$ deep with $1: 1$ side slopes. To maintain the capacity of the swale the proposed cross drain has conservatively been sized to be a $10^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert.

### 4.2 Floodplain Compensation

According to the Lee County FIS, the Imperial River within the study limits is under tidal influence. Per coordination with SFWMD, floodplain compensation is not required for floodplain impacts within tidal limits. However, compensation volume will be available and can be provided within the expanded FDOT stormwater pond as it will be hydraulically connected to the 100-year floodplain. Compensation is provided between the normal water elevation and the 100-year floodplain elevation. The expanded Pond North provides 8.96 ac -ft of compensation volume. Please see Appendix B - Basin Maps for a graphic of the pond's proposed expansion.

### 4.3 Longitudinal And Transverse Floodplain Impacts

The 100-year floodplain impacts can be categorized as transverse impacts - impacts resulting from filling the floodplain areas within the project limits to construct the quadrant roadways, including floodplains associated with wetland systems and depressional areas.
The transverse impacts cannot be avoided since the proposed roadway locations lie within the floodplain extent. The floodplain impact area was quantified based on the FEMA FIRMs and established 100-year base flood elevation, and the existing ground elevations were established from 1-foot LiDAR contours. The SHW elevations
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were estimated using permit data and NRCS soils data. To be conservative, it was assumed that any fill from the proposed improvements would extend higher than the base flood elevation.

According to the FEMA FIRMs, portions of the Northwest Quadrant Roadway and Northeast Quadrant Roadway proposed as part of the intersection improvements lie within Zone AE of the 100-year floodplain. The floodplain's BFE within the study limits ranges from elevation 9.00 NAVD to elevation 10.00 NAVD upstream and downstream of the Imperial River bridge. Study area volumetric floodplain impacts were computed by estimating the volume to be filled between the higher of either the SHW table or existing ground elevation and the 100-year flood elevation. This was done by measuring the existing ground area that lies at a contour elevation (using data obtained from LiDAR) and multiplying by the height differential to the 100-year flood elevation. The site's Seasonal High Water (SHW) table elevation was estimated at elevation ranges from elevation 3.60 feet NAVD to 4.00 feet using SHW information taken from available permit information. The study was determined to have $8.20 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ of floodplain impacts.

### 4.4 Project Classification

The encroachment areas for this site is classified as "minimal." Minimal encroachments on a floodplain occur when there is a floodplain involvement but the impacts on human life, transportation facilities, and natural and beneficial floodplain values are not significant and can be resolved with minimal efforts. Normally, these minimal efforts to address the impacts will consist of applying the Department's drainage design standards and following the Water Management District's procedures to achieve results that will not increase or significantly change the flood elevations and/or limits.

### 4.5 Risk Evaluation

There is no change in flood "risk" associated with this project. The encroachments will not have a significant potential for interruption or termination of transportation facilities needed for emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. In addition, no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values are anticipated and no significant impacts to highway users are expected.

### 4.6 PD\&E Manual Requirements With Minimal Encroachment

Chapter 13 Floodplains of the FDOT's PD\&E Manual, Part 2, defines four categories of encroachments as they pertain to base floodplain involvement: significant, minimal, none, and no involvement; and also lists the report criteria corresponding to these encroachment categories. The FDOT has different requirements based on the category of encroachment. The proposed project was determined to have minimal encroachments and, as a result, the requirements for this category are listed as follows:

## General description of the project, including location, length, existing and proposed typical sections, drainage basins, and cross drains.

Refer to Section 1 of this report for general project information and Sections 3 and 4 of this report for existing and proposed drainage basin descriptions. There is an existing cross drain under US 41 and Bonita Beach Road, a double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert, and an existing cross drain underneath Bonita Beach Road, a 10’ x $7^{\prime}$ concrete box culvert. These cross drains will require extensions due to the proposed improvements to the intersection of
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the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road. There is an existing $24^{\prime \prime}$ crossing underneath US 41 , acting as the pond outfall from the Center of Bonita Springs treatment pond into the Arroyal Mall Pond. The outfall pipe will need to be extended to accommodate the turn lane improvements and widening at the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection. An additional proposed crossing will be required underneath the Northeast Quadrant Roadway to maintain the outfall conveyance from the Arroyal Mall Pond. To match the existing ditch's capacity the proposed culvert has been sized to be $10^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$.

## Determination of whether the proposed action is in the base floodplain.

The US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection study's quadrant roadways will encroach on the Zone AE 100-year floodplain as established by the most recent FEMA maps dated 11/17/2022.

The history of flooding of the existing facilities and/or measures to minimize any impacts due to the proposed project improvements.

The floodplains within the study limits are associated with the Imperial River, which is under tidal influence at the project location. Floodplains within tidal influence do not require cup for cup compensation. However, the proposed expansion to the existing FDOT Pond North is located within the floodplain limits and will provide floodplain compensation, mitigating the study area's storage loss.

Initial coordination with the City of Bonita Springs indicated a flooding concern at the homes and road systems west of Beaumont Road and upstream of the double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ CBC under US 41. Preliminary calculations show that the Concrete Box Culvert extension underneath US 41 will not adversely impact the stages within the ditch upstream and it is anticipated that the flooding issues are due to issues outside of the study limits, but will need to be verified during the final design.

Determination of whether the encroachment is longitudinal or transverse, and if it is a longitudinal encroachment an evaluation and discussion of practicable avoidance alternatives.

The project's transverse floodplain impacts occur due to filling floodplain areas to construct the Northwest Quadrant Roadway and Northeast Quadrant Roadway for the US 41 and Bonita Beach Road intersection improvements. Impacts will be minimized by utilizing the maximum allowable embankment slopes during construction. The proposed site location is constrained to occupy land within the floodplain. There are no economically feasible avoidance alternatives.

The practicability of avoidance alternatives and/or measures to minimize impacts.
The project will take every effort to minimize floodplain impacts resulting from constructing the proposed project's fill. The maximum allowable embankment slope will be used within the floodplain area to minimize the floodplain impacts.

## Impact of the project on emergency services and evacuation.

The cross drains within the project limits will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition, and backwater elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, there will be no significant
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change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or in emergency evacuation routes.

Impacts of the project on the base flood, likelihood of flood risk, overtopping, location of overtopping, backwater.

The cross drains within the project limits will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk or overtopping. Due to the proximity to the Gulf of Mexico, the floodplain is tidally influenced.

Determination of the impact of the proposed improvements on regulatory floodways, if any, and documentation of coordination with FEMA and local agencies to determine the project's consistency with the regulatory floodway.

The Imperial River is a regulatory floodway; however, the proposed improvements will be outside of the floodway limits.

The impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values, and measures to restore and preserve these values (this information may also be addressed as part of the wetland impact evaluation and recommendations).

The proposed project will not have adverse impacts to floodplain areas as the study area's floodplain is tidal.
Consistency of the project with the local floodplain development plan or the land use elements in the Comprehensive Plan, and the potential impacts of encouraging development within the 100-year base floodplain.

The project will remain consistent with local floodplain development plans. The project will not support base floodplain development that is incompatible with existing floodplain management programs.

Measures to minimize floodplain impacts associated with the project, and measures to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values impacted by the project.

The project will take every effort to minimize floodplain impacts resulting from constructing the proposed project's fill. The maximum allowable embankment slope will be used within the floodplain area to minimize the floodplain impacts.

A map showing project, location and impacted floodplains. Copies of applicable maps should be included in the appendix.

Please see Appendix A for project figures and maps.

Results of any and all project risk assessments performed.
The cross drains within the study limits will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk.
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### 5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The project will result in an insignificant change in the capacity to carry floodwater. This change will cause minimal increases in flood heights and flood limits. The proposed structures should be hydraulically equivalent to or greater than the existing structures, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, the project will not affect existing flood heights or floodplain limits. This project will not result in any new or increased adverse environmental impacts. There will be no significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that these encroachments are not significant.

## APPENDIX A

Exhibits








## APPENDIX B

Basin Maps






## APPENDIX C

Cross Drain Analysis and Floodplain Impact Calculations

Inwood Consulting Engineers
3000 Dovera Drive, Suite 200, Oviedo,
3000 Dovera Drive, Suite 200, Oviedo, FL 32765
(407) 971 -8850 - (407) 971-8955 (fax)
$\qquad$

## US 41 at CR 865 (Bonita Beach Road) PD\&E Study

TABLE - CROSS DRAIN FLOOD DATA SHEET - EXISTING VS. PROPOSED

| Structure Number | Approximate Location | Design Flood (50-yr Storm Event) |  |  |  |  | Base Flood (100-yr Storm Event) |  |  |  |  | Overtopping Flood |  |  |  | Greatest Flood (500-yr Storm Event) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing (A) |  | Proposed (B) |  | B-A | Existing (A) |  | Proposed (B) B-A |  |  | Existing (A) |  | Proposed (B) |  | Existing (A) |  | Proposed (B) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { B-A } \\ \hline \text { Stage }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | Stage (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Discharge } \\ \text { (cfs) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Stage (ft) |  |
| CD-1 | STA 240+50 (Under US 41) | 64.55 | 9.83 | 64.55 | 9.83 | 0.00 | 88.10 | 9.85 | 88.10 | 9.85 | 0.00 | 814.66 | 14.00 | 778.98 | 14.00 | 142.79 | 9.93 | 142.79 | 9.94 | 0.01 |
| CD-2 | STA 279+00 (Under Bonita Beach Rd) | 64.55 | 9.83 | 64.55 | 9.84 | 0.01 | 88.10 | 9.85 | 88.10 | 9.87 | 0.02 | 787.48 | 14.00 | 750.28 | 14.00 | 142.79 | 9.93 | 142.79 | 9.97 | 0.04 |


| Cross Drain Upsizing Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure <br> Number | Existing Pipe Size | Proposed Pipe Size | Proposed Change |  |
| CD-1 | Double 8' $\times 4^{\prime} \mathrm{CBC}$ | Double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime} \mathrm{CBC}$ | Extend |  |
| $\mathrm{CD}-2$ | Single $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime} \mathrm{CBC}$ | Single $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime} \mathrm{CBC}$ | Extend |  |

## Peak Flow Calculations in Canal

| Storm Event | Probability | Probability\% | Peak Flow <br> (cfs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 0.04 | 4 | 41.00 |
| 50 | 0.02 | 2 | 64.55 |
| 100 | 0.01 | 1 | 88.10 |
| 500 | 0.002 | 0.2 | 142.79 |

* $50-\mathrm{YR}$ and $500-\mathrm{YR}$ Peak Flow Found by plotting the $25-\mathrm{YR}$ and $100-$ YR storm events (See Adjacent) and Trend line equation $(y==-33.98 \ln (x)+88.1)$ was used to find the value for the $50-\mathrm{YR}$ and $500-\mathrm{YR}$ storm.

25-YR and 100-YR Peak Flow determined from existing permit information found in Appendix F.


## HY-8 Culvert Analysis Report

## Crossing Discharge Data

Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow
Minimum Flow: 64.55 cfs
Design Flow: 88.10 cfs
Maximum Flow: 142.79 cfs
Table 1 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4'

| Headwater <br> Elevation (ft) | Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Culvert 1 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 3}$ | 64.55 | 64.55 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 3}$ | 72.37 | 72.37 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 80.20 | 80.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 5}$ | 88.10 | 88.10 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 6}$ | 95.85 | 95.85 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | 103.67 | 103.67 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 8}$ | 111.49 | 111.49 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 9}$ | 119.32 | 119.32 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 0}$ | 127.14 | 127.14 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 2}$ | 134.97 | 134.97 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 3}$ | 142.79 | 142.79 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4 4 . 0 0}$ | 814.66 | 814.66 | 0.00 | Overtopping |

Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4'

## Total Rating Curve

Crossing: $\mathrm{Dbl} 8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$


## Culvert Data: Culvert 1

Table 2 - Culvert Summary Table: Culvert 1

| Total Disch arge (cfs) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Culve } \\ & \text { rt } \\ & \text { Disch } \\ & \text { arge } \\ & \text { (cfs) } \end{aligned}$ | Head water Elevat ion (ft) | Inle t Cont rol Dep th (ft) | Outl <br> et <br> Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Fl <br> ow <br> Ty <br> pe | Nor <br> mal <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Criti <br> cal <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Out <br> let <br> De <br> pth <br> (ft) | Tailw ater Dept $h(f t)$ | Outl et Velo city (ft/s ) | Tailw ater Veloc ity (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.83 | 1.30 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.22 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 0.92 | 0.80 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.01 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $72.37$ | 9.83 | 1.40 | $5.23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 0.99 | 0.86 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.13 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.84 | 1.50 | $5.24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.06 | 0.92 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.25 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.85 | 1.60 | $5.24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.13 | 0.98 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.38 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.86 | 1.69 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.25 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.20 | 1.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.87 | 1.78 | $5.26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.26 | 1.09 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.62 | 0.00 |


| $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.88 | 1.87 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.27 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.32 | 1.15 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.74 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 119.3 | 119.3 | 9.89 | 1.96 | 5.29 | 4- | 1.38 | 1.20 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.86 | 0.00 |
| 2 cfs | 2 cfs |  |  | 0 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 127.1 | 127.1 | 9.90 | 2.04 | 5.30 | 4- | 1.44 | 1.25 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.99 | 0.00 |
| 4 cfs | 4 cfs |  |  | 2 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 134.9 | 134.9 | 9.92 | 2.11 | 5.31 | 4- | 1.50 | 1.30 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 2.11 | 0.00 |
| 7 cfs | 7 cfs |  |  | 5 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 142.7 | 142.7 | 9.93 | 2.18 | 5.32 | 4- | 1.56 | 1.35 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 2.23 | 0.00 |
| 9 cfs | 9 cfs |  |  | 9 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |

## Culvert Barrel Data

Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert
Inlet Elevation (invert): 4.60 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 4.30 ft
Culvert Length: 165.00 ft , Culvert Slope: 0.0018

Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Culvert 1
Performance Curve
Culvert: Culvert 1



## Site Data - Culvert 1

Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 4.60 ft
Outlet Station: 165.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 4.30 ft
Number of Barrels: 2

## Culvert Data Summary - Culvert 1

Barrel Shape: Concrete Box
Barrel Span: 8.00 ft
Barrel Rise: 4.00 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in

Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: 1:1 Bevel Headwall ( $\mathrm{Ke}=0.2$ )
Inlet Depression: None
Tailwater Data for Crossing: Dbl 8' x $4^{\prime}$

Table 3 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4')

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{6 4 . 5 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 3 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 8 . 1 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 . 8 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 6 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 4 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 9 . 3 2}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 7 . 1 4}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 9 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 2 . 7 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |

Tailwater Channel Data - Dbl 8' x 4'
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 9.80 ft

Roadway Data for Crossing: Dbl 8' x $4^{\prime}$
Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 200.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 14.00 ft

Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 165.00 ft

Crossing Discharge Data
Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow

Minimum Flow: 64.55 cfs

Design Flow: 88.10 cfs

Maximum Flow: 142.79 cfs

Table 4 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed)

| Headwater <br> Elevation (ft) | Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Culvert 1 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 3}$ | 64.55 | 64.55 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 72.37 | 72.37 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 80.20 | 80.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 5}$ | 88.10 | 88.10 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 6}$ | 95.85 | 95.85 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | 103.67 | 103.67 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 9}$ | 111.49 | 111.49 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 0}$ | 119.32 | 119.32 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 3}$ | 127.14 | 127.14 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 4}$ | 134.97 | 134.97 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 0 0}$ | 142.79 | 142.79 | 0.00 | 1 |

Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed)
Total Rating Curve
Crossing: Dbl $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ (Proposed)


## Culvert Data: Culvert 1

Table 5 - Culvert Summary Table: Culvert 1

| Total | Culve | Head | Inle | Outl | Fl | Nor | Criti | Out | Tailw | Outl | Tailw |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Disch | rt | water | t | et | ow | mal | cal | let | ater | et | ater |


| arge <br> (cfs) | Disch arge <br> (cfs) | Elevat ion <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ty } \\ & \text { pe } \end{aligned}$ | Dep th (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dep } \\ & \text { th } \\ & (\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ | De <br> pth <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dept } \\ & \text { h(ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Velo city (ft/s ) | Veloc ity <br> (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.83 | 1.30 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.22 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.01 | 0.80 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.01 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.84 | 1.40 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.23 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.09 | 0.86 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.13 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.84 | 1.50 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.24 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.17 | 0.92 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.25 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.85 | 1.60 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.25 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.24 | 0.98 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.38 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.86 | 1.69 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.26 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4- \\ & \text { FFf } \end{aligned}$ | 1.32 | 1.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| 103.6 | 103.6 | 9.87 | 1.78 | 5.27 | 4- | 1.39 | 1.09 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.62 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 111.4 | 111.4 | 9.89 | 1.87 | 5.28 | 4- | 1.46 | 1.15 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.74 | 0.00 |
| 9 cfs | 9 cfs |  |  | 6 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 119.3 | 119.3 | 9.90 | 1.96 | 5.29 | 4- | 1.52 | 1.20 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.86 | 0.00 |
| 2 cfs | 2 cfs |  |  | 9 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 127.1 | 127.1 | 9.91 | 2.04 | 5.31 | 4- | 1.59 | 1.25 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 1.99 | 0.00 |
| 4 cfs | 4 cfs |  |  | 2 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 134.9 | 134.9 | 9.93 | 2.11 | 5.32 | 4- | 1.66 | 1.30 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 2.11 | 0.00 |
| 7 cfs | 7 cfs |  |  | 6 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 142.7 | 142.7 | 9.94 | 2.18 | 5.34 | 4- | 1.72 | 1.35 | 4.0 | 5.50 | 2.23 | 0.00 |
| 9 cfs | 9 cfs |  |  | 1 | FFf |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |

## Culvert Barrel Data

Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert
Inlet Elevation (invert): 4.60 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 4.30 ft
Culvert Length: 220.00 ft ,
Culvert Slope: 0.0014

Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Culvert 1


Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: Culvert 1
Crossing - Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed), Design Discharge - 88.1 cfs
Culvert - Culvert 1, Culvert Discharge - 88.1 cfs


## Site Data - Culvert 1

Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 4.60 ft
Outlet Station: 220.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 4.30 ft
Number of Barrels: 2

## Culvert Data Summary - Culvert 1

Barrel Shape: Concrete Box
Barrel Span: 8.00 ft
Barrel Rise: 4.00 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in

Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: 1:1 Bevel Headwall ( $\mathrm{Ke}=0.2$ )
Inlet Depression: None
Tailwater Data for Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed)

Table 6 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed))

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{6 4 . 5 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 3 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 8 . 1 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 . 8 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 6 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 4 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 9 . 3 2}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 7 . 1 4}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 9 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 2 . 7 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.50 |

Tailwater Channel Data - Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed)
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 9.80 ft

Roadway Data for Crossing: Dbl 8' x 4' (Proposed)
Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 200.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 14.00 ft

Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 220.00 ft

Crossing Discharge Data
Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow

Minimum Flow: 64.55 cfs

Design Flow: 88.10 cfs
Maximum Flow: 142.79 cfs

Table 7 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: 10' x 7'

| Headwater <br> Elevation (ft) | Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Culvert 1 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 3}$ | 64.55 | 64.55 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 3}$ | 72.37 | 72.37 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 80.20 | 80.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 5}$ | 88.10 | 88.10 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 6}$ | 95.85 | 95.85 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | 103.67 | 103.67 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 8}$ | 111.49 | 111.49 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 9}$ | 119.32 | 119.32 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 0}$ | 127.14 | 127.14 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 2}$ | 134.97 | 134.97 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 3}$ | 142.79 | 142.79 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 0 0}$ | 787.48 | 787.48 | 0.00 | Overtopping |

Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: 10' x $7^{\prime}$
Total Rating Curve
Crossing: $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}$


## Culvert Data: Culvert 1

Table 8 - Culvert Summary Table: Culvert 1

| Total | Culve | Head | Inle | Outl | Fl | Nor | Criti | Out | Tailw | Outl | Tailw |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Disch | rt | water | t | et | ow | mal | cal | let | ater | et | ater |


| arge <br> (cfs) | Disch arge (cfs) | Elevat ion <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ty } \\ & \text { pe } \end{aligned}$ | Dep th (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dep } \\ & \text { th } \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | De <br> pth <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dept } \\ & \text { h (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Velo city (ft/s ) | Veloc ity <br> (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.83 | 1.66 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.52 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.14 | 1.09 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.11 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.83 | 1.79 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.53 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.23 | 1.18 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.25 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $80.20$ <br> cfs | 9.84 | 1.91 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.54 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.31 | 1.26 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.38 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.85 | 2.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.54 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.39 | 1.34 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.52 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.86 | 2.16 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.55 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.47 | 1.42 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.65 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.87 | 2.27 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.56 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { t } \end{aligned}$ | 1.55 | 1.49 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.79 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.88 | 2.39 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.57 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { t } \end{aligned}$ | 1.63 | 1.57 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.92 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 119.3 \\ & 2 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119.3 \\ & 2 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.89 | 2.50 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.59 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { t } \end{aligned}$ | 1.70 | 1.64 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.06 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 127.1 \\ & 4 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 127.1 \\ & 4 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.90 | 2.60 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.60 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { t } \end{aligned}$ | 1.78 | 1.71 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.19 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 134.9 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134.9 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.92 | 2.71 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.61 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { t } \end{aligned}$ | 1.85 | 1.78 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.33 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 142.7 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 142.7 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.93 | 2.81 | $5.63$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1.92 | 1.85 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.46 | 0.00 |

## Culvert Barrel Data

## Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert

Inlet Elevation (invert): 4.30 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 4.00 ft
Culvert Length: 130.00 ft ,
Culvert Slope: 0.0023

Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Culvert 1


Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: Culvert 1
Crossing - 10' x 7', Design Discharge - 88.1 cfs
Culvert - Culvert 1, Culvert Discharge - 88.1 cfs


## Site Data - Culvert 1

Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 4.30 ft
Outlet Station: 130.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 4.00 ft
Number of Barrels: 1

## Culvert Data Summary - Culvert 1

Barrel Shape: Concrete Box
Barrel Span: 10.00 ft
Barrel Rise: 7.00 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in

Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: 1:1 Bevel (45o flare) Wingwall (Ke=0.2)
Inlet Depression: None
Tailwater Data for Crossing: $10^{\prime}$ x $7^{\prime}$

Table 9 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: 10' x 7')

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{6 4 . 5 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 3 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{8 8 . 1 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 . 8 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 6 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 4 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 9 . 3 2}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 7 . 1 4}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 9 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 2 . 7 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |

Tailwater Channel Data - 10' x 7'
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 9.80 ft

Roadway Data for Crossing: 10' x 7'
Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 1500.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 14.00 ft

Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 130.00 ft

Crossing Discharge Data
Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow

Minimum Flow: 64.55 cfs

Design Flow: 88.10 cfs

Maximum Flow: 142.79 cfs

Table 10 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: 10' x 7' (Proposed)

| Headwater <br> Elevation (ft) | Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Culvert 1 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 64.55 | 64.55 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | 72.37 | 72.37 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 5}$ | 80.20 | 80.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | 88.10 | 88.10 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 8}$ | 95.85 | 95.85 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 8 9}$ | 103.67 | 103.67 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 0}$ | 111.49 | 111.49 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 2}$ | 119.32 | 119.32 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 4}$ | 127.14 | 127.14 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 9 5}$ | 134.97 | 134.97 | 0.00 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 0 0}$ | 142.79 | 142.79 | 0.00 | 1 |

Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: 10' x 7' (Proposed)
Total Rating Curve
Crossing: 10' x 7 ' (Proposed)


## Culvert Data: Culvert 1

Table 11 - Culvert Summary Table: Culvert 1

| Total | Culve | Head | Inle | Outl | Fl | Nor | Criti | Out | Tailw | Outl | Tailw |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Disch | rt | water | t | et | ow | mal | cal | let | ater | et | ater |


| arge <br> (cfs) | Disch arge (cfs) | Elevat ion <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Cont <br> rol <br> Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ty } \\ & \text { pe } \end{aligned}$ | Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | Dep <br> th <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { De } \\ & \text { pth } \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dept } \\ & \text { h(ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Velo city (ft/s ) | Veloc ity <br> (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.55 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.84 | 1.78 | $5.53$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.77 | 1.09 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.11 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.37 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.84 | 1.92 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.54 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 1.92 | 1.18 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.25 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.85 | 2.06 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.55 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.05 | 1.26 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.38 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 9.87 | 2.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.56 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.19 | 1.34 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.52 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.85 \\ & \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.88 | 2.32 | $5.57$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.32 | 1.42 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.65 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.89 | 2.44 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.59 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.45 | 1.49 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.79 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111.4 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.90 | 2.56 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.60 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.57 | 1.57 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 1.92 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 119.3 \\ & 2 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119.3 \\ & 2 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.92 | 2.68 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.62 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.70 | 1.64 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.06 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 127.1 \\ & 4 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $127.1$ | 9.94 | 2.80 | $5.63$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.82 | 1.71 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.19 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 134.9 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134.9 \\ & 7 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.95 | 2.91 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.65 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- } \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 2.94 | 1.78 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.33 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 142.7 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 142.7 \\ & 9 \mathrm{cfs} \end{aligned}$ | 9.97 | 3.02 | $5.67$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3- \\ & \text { M1 } \\ & \mathrm{t} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3.06 | 1.85 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5.80 | 2.46 | 0.00 |

## Culvert Barrel Data

## Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert

Inlet Elevation (invert): 4.30 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 4.00 ft
Culvert Length: 500.00 ft ,
Culvert Slope: 0.0006

Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Culvert 1


Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: Culvert 1

Culvert - Culvert 1, Culvert Discharge - 88.1 cfs


## Site Data - Culvert 1

Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 4.30 ft
Outlet Station: 500.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 4.00 ft
Number of Barrels: 1

## Culvert Data Summary - Culvert 1

Barrel Shape: Concrete Box
Barrel Span: 10.00 ft
Barrel Rise: 7.00 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in

Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: 1:1 Bevel Headwall ( $\mathrm{Ke}=0.2$ )
Inlet Depression: None
Tailwater Data for Crossing: 10' x 7' (Proposed)

Table 12 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: 10' x 7' (Proposed))

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{6 4 . 5 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 3 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{8 8 . 1 0}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 . 8 5}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 6 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 4 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 9 . 3 2}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 7 . 1 4}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 9 7}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 2 . 7 9}$ | 9.80 | 5.80 |

Tailwater Channel Data - 10' x 7' (Proposed)
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 9.80 ft

Roadway Data for Crossing: 10' x 7' (Proposed)
Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 1500.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 14.00 ft

Roadway Surface: Paved

Roadway Top Width: 130.00 ft
$\qquad$

US 41 at CR 865 (Bonita Beach Road) PD\&E Study

| Floodplain Impact Area 1 Calculations - Northwest Quadrant Roadway |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELEV. <br> (ft) | AREA <br> (ac) | AVG <br> AREA <br> (ac) | Delta D (ft) | Delta storage (ac-ft) | Sum Storage (ac-ft) |
| $10.00 \quad 100-\mathrm{yr}$ (Zone AE) | 1.80 |  |  |  | 4.20 |
|  |  | 1.40 | 3.00 | 4.20 |  |
| 7.00 Ground El. | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |



US 41 at CR 865 (Bonita Beach Road) PD\&E Study

| Floodplain Impact Area 1 Calculations - Northeast Quadrant Roadway |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELEV. <br> (ft) | AREA <br> (ac) | AVG <br> AREA <br> (ac) | Delta <br> D <br> (ft) | Delta storage (ac-ft) | Sum <br> Storage <br> (ac-ft) |
| 9.00 100-yr (Zone AE) | 1.48 |  |  |  | 4.00 |
|  |  | 0.74 | 5.40 | 4.00 |  |
| 3.60 SHWT | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 |



Date:
Poject Number:

| Floodplain Compensation Area 1 Calculations - Pond North Expansion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELEV. <br> (ft) |  | AREA <br> (ac) | AVG <br> AREA <br> (ac) | Delta <br> D <br> (ft) | Delta storage (ac-ft) | Sum Storage (ac-ft) |
| 6.50 | Ground El. | 3.54 |  |  |  | 8.96 |
|  |  |  | 3.09 | 2.90 | 8.96 |  |
| 3.60 | SHWT | 2.64 |  |  |  | 0.00 |



# APPENDIX D 

FEMA FIS Information

## LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA <br> AND INCORPORATED AREAS

| COMMUNITY NAME | COMMUNITY <br> NUMBER |
| :--- | :---: |
| BONITA SPRINGS, CITY OF | 120680 |
| CAPE CORAL, CITY OF | 125095 |
| ESTERO, VILLAGE OF | 120260 |
| FORT MYERS, CITY OF | 125106 |
| FORT MYERS BEACH, TOWN OF | 120673 |
| LEE COUNTY, | 125124 |
| UNINCORPORATED AREAS | 120402 |



REVISED:
DECEMBER 7, 2018

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Table 16: Coastal Transect Parameters (continued)

|  |  | Starting Wave Conditions for the 1\% Annual Chance |  | Starting Stillwater Elevations (ft NAVD88) Range of Stillwater Elevations (ft NAVD88) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flood Source | Coastal <br> Transect | Significant Wave Height $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{ft})$ | Peak Wave Period $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{p}}$ (sec) | 10\% Annual Chance | 4\% Annual Chance | 2\% Annual Chance | 1\% Annual Chance | 0.2\% Annual Chance |
| Gulf of Mexico | 379 | 7.7 | 9.0 | $\begin{gathered} 4.7 \\ 4.4-4.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.0 \\ 6.4-7.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.9 \\ 7.9-8.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.7 \\ 9.6-10.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.8 \\ 14.0-14.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 380 | 8.9 | 8.3 | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 4.3-4.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.8 \\ 6.1-6.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.6 \\ 7.6-8.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.4 \\ 9.2-10.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.4 \\ 13.5-14.6 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 381 | 8.8 | 8.4 | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 4.3-4.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.8 \\ 6.1-6.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.6 \\ 7.6-8.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.4 \\ 9.2-10.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.4 \\ 13.4-14.4 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 382 | 9.1 | 8.5 | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \\ 4.3-4.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.5 \\ 6.1-6.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.5 \\ 7.6-8.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.4 \\ 9.2-10.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.3 \\ 13.3-14.4 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 383 | 8.9 | 8.9 | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \\ 4.2-4.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.4 \\ 5.9-6.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.4 \\ 7.3-8.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.3 \\ 9.1-10.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.3 \\ 12.5-14.3 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 384 | 9.0 | 9.2 | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \\ 4.2-4.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.6 \\ 6.0-6.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.5 \\ 7.4-8.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.3 \\ 9.0-10.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.3 \\ 12.7-14.3 \end{gathered}$ |
| Gulf of Mexico | 385 | 9.2 | 9.1 | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \\ 4.2-4.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.7 \\ 6.0-6.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.5 \\ 7.5-7.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.3 \\ 9.1-9.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.3 \\ \text { 12.7-13.8 } \end{gathered}$ |



NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM Figure 9. Transect Locator Map



# APPENDIX E 

Correspondence

TO: Patrick Bateman, P.E. - FDOT Project Manager

FROM: Renato Chuw, P.E.

RE: 444321-1; US 41 at Bonita Beach Road Intersection PD\&E Study - FDOT Drainage Methodology Meeting

CC: Brent Setchell (FDOT), Nicole Monies (FDOT), Jack Freeman (Kittelson), Travis Hills (Kittelson), Zach Evans (Inwood), Jason Houck (Inwood)

The meeting was held via TEAMS on July 13, 2023, at 3:00 pm and adjourned at 4:00 pm. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the drainage approach for this PD\&E Study with FDOT District Drainage and Permitting staff. A summary of the meeting discussion is below:

- Introduction of attendees started, followed by a brief overview of the project. The project is a PD\&E study by FDOT District One to evaluate intersection improvement alternatives for US 41 at Bonita Beach Road (BBR) in Lee County.
- The improvements are to relieve existing congestion at the intersection and meet project travel demands in the future. Two intersection alternatives were evaluated (a signalized intersection and a partial Displaced Left Turn - DLT lane). The partial DLT alternative is the recommended preferred option and is currently under review for approval by FDOT Management. The partial DLT concept was shared in the meeting via a KMZ in Google Earth.
- In the existing condition, US 41 consists of 6 travel lanes with curb and gutter and closed drainage systems. Bonita Beach Road consists of 4 travel lanes with curb and gutter and closed drainage systems.
- The Imperial River is an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW); therefore, a 50\% additional water quality treatment will be required. The WBID is also impaired for nutrients (a TMDL exists for Dissolved Oxygen and Total Nitrogen). A nutrient loading analysis will be performed.
- Stormwater runoff from US 41 is treated in an FDOT pond north and east of US 41. The six-laning for BBR was permitted in the past; however, the County withdrew plans to move forward with six-laning the road. Other permits exist for the developments surrounding the intersection.
- The NW quadrant of the intersection consists of a new roadway connection between US 41 and Bonita Beach Road via Windsor Road. The City of Bonita Springs (with RK\&K as their design consultant) is designing portions of this new roadway connection with the intent that the PD\&E study will widen the roadway in the future at its US 41 connection. Preliminary parcels shown as potential locations for pond sites were shared via a KMZ in Google Earth. A triangular (remnant) parcel was shown as a possible pond site for the basin for the NW quadrant roadway and BBR west of the intersection. This parcel is portrayed as this time not having plans for future development. The area to the west of the new roadway is planned for development. Coordination with RK\&K is occurring to discuss if the City plans to use the triangular remnant parcel for their stormwater needs.
- Inwood indicated that a preliminary sizing on the remnant triangular parcel was able to accommodate the treatment/attenuation for the NW quadrant roadway and the net new improvements on BBR west of the intersection. FDOT asked if the City submitted a permit to SFWMD for this new roadway. Kittelson indicated that it is believed that the roadway plans are between $30 \%$ to $60 \%$ phase and that a permit hasn't been applied for yet. This will be verified with RK\&K.
- There are three existing cross drains on the project. A single $10^{\prime} x 7^{\prime} C B C$ under US 41 south of the intersection, a double $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ CBC under BBR east of the intersection, and a single $24^{\prime \prime}$ RCP under US 41 north of the intersection that provides the outfall of the existing Center of Bonita Springs pond to the existing Arroyal Mall pond.
- A large canal exists east of the intersection that drains regional areas south of US 41 and surrounding developments by the intersection. The two existing box culverts convey the canal under US 41 and BBR. This canal discharges to the existing Arroyal Mall pond.
- The NE quadrant of the intersection will be improved with the DLT alternative. The improvements will have some encroachments into the Arroyal Mall pond and the existing canal. During the study, the minimization of impacts on the pond will be evaluated with the potential use of walls. The current canal will be enclosed with a box culvert along the NE quadrant segment. FDOT asked if the existing control structure of the Arroyal Mall pond would be impacted or modified. Inwood mentioned that the encroachments will slightly reduce the pond capacity, but as the study progresses and stormwater alternatives are investigated, the goal will be to maintain existing peak stages in the pond. Modifications to the existing control structure may be required.
- The outfall for the Arroyal Mall pond is north through an existing ditch between two businesses, then runs alongside the west side of the existing FDOT pond, turns west just south of The Lock Up Storage Facility and then turns north along the existing swale adjacent to US 41 and crosses under the bridge for the Imperial River Boat entrance side street, ultimately to the Imperial River (see picture below). The new roadway connection between Arroyal Road / Carolina St to US 41 will block this outfall pattern, necessitating a new cross drain underneath.
- FDOT asked if there were any existing easements for the ditch between the two businesses for the outfall of the Arroyal Mall pond. If there are no easements, we may need to consider to allow maintenance of the outfall ditch.

- The existing FDOT pond that treats US 41 contains a diversion berm. A few options were discussed to obtain more capacity in the pond to treat the improvements on US 41. One option is to eliminate the diversion berm and relocate the inflow and outflow of the ponds to keep the maximum flow path in the pond. FDOT asked if there were any uses for the diversion berm other than to maximize the flow path. Inwood indicated that the pond is fenced and does not provide any access to the public. The other option is expanding the pond to the parcel/lots adjacent west. The parcel immediately north of the Advanced Auto Parts store is owned by the City of Bonita Springs.
- FDOT indicated that the PSR evaluation matrix and cost comparison would show which option would be preferable for increasing capacity in the existing FDOT pond.
- Initial discussions with the City indicated flooding concerns at the homes west of Beaumont Rd and south of BBR. In addition, flooding concerns were brought up upstream of the double $8^{\prime} x 4^{\prime} C B C$. Improvements to the box culvert system and canal will need to consider these concerns.
- Pond Siting Report approach and methodology
- One pond site per basin is to be evaluated. FDOT indicated that because this is a PD\&E project, this approach is acceptable
- Three basins were determined. Efforts to identify preliminary parcels for pond sites have started. Using/expanding the existing FDOT Pond and evaluating the triangular remnant parcel for the NW quadrant roadway were discussed. East of the intersection, a pond site was shown; however, Inwood indicated that it was the only parcel with no development, and further investigation is ongoing for this basin. Taking this runoff to the existing FDOT pond may be difficult since a pipe system would need to cross the canal/box culvert or be routed through local streets.
- Will evaluate regional stormwater options (ELA/WATERSS). The Arroyal Mall pond already acts as a regional stormwater system and will remain for this study.
- Water quality treatment will be provided for the net new impervious. Initial discussions with SFWMD during the proposal phase of the study indicated this was acceptable. This will be verified during the pre-application meeting set with SFWMD on July 26, 2023.
- Compensating treatment will be evaluated where it is advantageous.
- Location Hydraulics Report and floodplain approach and methodology
- A preliminary analysis of the cross drains will be performed.
- FEMA floodplains associated with the Imperial River are located on the project. The river is tidal, and SFWMD indicated during the project proposal phase that floodplain compensation would not be required; however, this will be discussed and verified with SFWMD during the preapplication meeting on July 26, 2023.


## Meeting Minutes

3000 Dovera Drive, Suite 200, Oviedo, FL 32765 I P: 407-971-8850 I F:407-971-8955 I www.inwoodinc.com

## ACTION ITEMS:

1. FDOT TO INCLUDE PROJECT IN AGENDA FOR SFWMD JULY MEETING (COMPLETED)
2. SET COORDINATION MEETING WITH RK\&K TO DISCUSS REMNANT PARCEL FOR STORMWATER NEEDS ON NW QUADRANT (SET UP FOR AUGUST 3RD AT 9:00 AM)
*****END OF MEETING****

NOTE: THE ABOVE REFLECTS THE WRITER'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONTENTS OF THE MEETING. IF ANY MISINTERPRETATION OR INACCURACIES ARE INCLUDED, PLEASE CONTACT RENATO CHUW AT (407) 971-8850 OR RCHUW@INWOODINC.COM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOR RESOLUTION AND REVISIONS IF NECESSARY.

DATE: July 27, 2023

TO: Patrick Bateman, P.E. - FDOT Project Manager

FROM: Zach Evans, P.E.

RE: 444321-1; US 41 at Bonita Beach Road Intersection PD\&E Study - SFWMD Meeting

CC: Brent Setchell (FDOT), Nicole Monies (FDOT), Patrick Bateman (FDOT), Melissa Roberts (SFWMD), Angelica Hoffert (SFWMD), Richard Batewell (SFWMD), Jack Freeman (Kittelson), Renato Chuw (Inwood), Jason Houck (Inwood), Ben Shepherd (Inwood)

FDOT's monthly pre-application meeting with SFWMD was held via TEAMS on July 26, 2023, at 10:00 am. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the drainage criteria and approach for this PD\&E Study with SFWMD staff. A summary of the meeting discussion is below:

- The meeting started with an introduction of the project team followed by a brief overview of the project. The project is a FDOT District One PD\&E study to evaluate intersection improvement alternatives for US 41 at Bonita Beach Road (BBR) in Lee County.
- Two intersection alternatives were evaluated (a signalized intersection and a partial Displaced Left Turn DLT). The partial DLT alternative is the recommended preferred option. The partial DLT concept was shared in the meeting via a KMZ in Google Earth.
- US 41 consists of 6 travel lanes with curb and gutter and closed drainage systems. Bonita Beach Road consists of 4 travel lanes with curb and gutter and 6 travel lanes from the Center of Bonita Springs entrance to Arroyal Road, and closed drainage systems.
- US 41 north and south of the intersection is treated within an FDOT pond north of the intersection located near the Imperial River east of US 41. Treatment and attenuation is provided within the pond before discharging to roadway swales, flowing to the Imperial River.
- Bonita Beach Road east of the intersection discharges directly to the concrete box culvert underneath the roadway, which flows to the Arroyal Mall Pond. The Arroyal Mall Pond is controlled by a weir structure north of Crown Lake Blvd, which outfalls to a ditch system flowing to the Imperial River.
- West of the intersection Bonita Beach Road is collected and conveyed to the Windsor Road swale, which outfalls north to the Imperial River.
- The Imperial River is the ultimate outfall for the project and is an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW); therefore, a $50 \%$ additional water quality treatment will be required. The WBID is also impaired for nutrients (a TMDL exists for Dissolved Oxygen and Total Nitrogen). A nutrient loading analysis will be performed.
- The proposed roadway improvements will include new quadrant roadways NW and NE of the intersection. The NW quadrant roadway will initially be built by the City of Bonita Springs. This project is only widening the NW quadrant's US 41 approach leg to accommodate future traffic.
- The NW quadrant roadway will provide a connection between US 41 and Bonita Beach Road via Windsor Road. The City of Bonita Springs is designing portions of this new roadway connection and a triangular pond in a remnant parcel created by the new road. Our intent is to evaluate if this pond can serve the stormwater requirements for the PD\&E study.
- A large canal exists east of the intersection draining regional areas south of US 41 and surrounding developments by the intersection. The two existing box culverts convey the canal under US 41 and BBR. This canal discharges to the existing Arroyal Mall pond.
- The intersection's NE quadrant will be improved with the DLT alternative. The improvements will encroach into the Arroyal Mall pond and the existing canal. During the study, the minimization of impacts on the pond will be evaluated with the potential use of walls. The current canal will be enclosed with a box culvert along the NE quadrant segment. Inwood mentioned that the encroachments will slightly reduce the pond capacity. SFWMD indicated pre vs post conditions for the Arroyal Mall pond must be met.
- Stormwater alternatives will be investigated including: (1) evaluating if the Arroyal Mall pond can be expanded to increase capacity, (2) route stormwater from Bonita Beach Road away from the Arroyal Mall pond to other proposed stormwater treatment alternatives. Ultimately, the goal will be to maintain existing peak stages in the Arroyal Mall pond.
- SFWMD stated clear documentation of the volumetric impacts to the pond and exhibits of the drainage areas routed away from the culvert will need to be provided to ensure no negative impacts to the stormwater facility will occur.
- The existing FDOT pond that treats US 41 contains a diversion berm. Alternatives were discussed to obtain more capacity in the pond to treat the improvements on US 41. One option is to eliminate the diversion berm and relocate the inflow and outflow of the ponds to keep the maximum flow path in the pond. The other option is expanding the pond to the parcel/lots adjacent west.
- Inwood stated the approach for water quality treatment will be to provide for the net new impervious. An additional $50 \%$ treatment volume will be provided to meet OFW Criteria. Nutrient Loading analysis will be provided due to the adopted TMDL for the basin.
- The improvements associated with the PD\&E study will modify both the Arroyal Mall pond and the existing FDOT US 41 permits.
- FEMA floodplains associated with the Imperial River are located on the project. The Imperial River is tidal within the project limits and Inwood asked if floodplain compensation would be required. SFWMD stated that documentation would need to be provided that this area was tidal, but compensation would not be required for floodplain impacts.
- Inwood asked if pre vs post attenuation would be required for the project due to the tidal condition of the Imperial River. SFWMD stated that the existing permit for the US 41 pond meets the pre vs post attenuation criteria and should be followed for this study. Approved discharges to the Imperial River should also be met.


## *****END OF MEETING****

NOTE: THE ABOVE REFLECTS THE WRITER'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONTENTS OF THE MEETING. IF ANY MISINTERPRETATION OR INACCURACIES ARE INCLUDED, PLEASE CONTACT ZACH EVANS AT (407) 971-8850 OR ZEVANS@INWOODINC.COM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOR RESOLUTION AND REVISIONS IF NECESSARY.

## DATE: August 3, 2023

TO: Patrick Bateman, P.E. - FDOT Project Manager

FROM: Renato Chuw, P.E.

RE: 444321-1; US 41 at Bonita Beach Road Intersection PD\&E Study - Coordination with City's design consultant (RK\&K) regarding NW quadrant roadway and stormwater pond

CC: Brent Setchell (FDOT), Nicole Monies (FDOT), Matt Feeney (City of Bonita Springs), Joel Langaney (City of Bonita Springs), Dave Hill (Bowman), Jack Freeman (Kittelson), Joseph Baan (RK\&K), Zach Evans (Inwood)

A coordination meeting with RK\&K (the City of Bonita Springs' design consultant for the NW quadrant roadway connection Windsor Road at Bonita Beach Road to US 41) was held to discuss the design status of the roadway and the proposed stormwater management. In attendance were: Patrick Bateman (FDOT), Jack Freeman (Kittelson), Travis Hills (Kittelson), Joseph Baan (RK\&K), and Renato Chuw (Inwood). A summary of the meeting discussion is below:

- The meeting started with introducing the project team and a brief overview of the project. Inwood indicated FDOT District One is conducting a PD\&E study for the intersection of US 41 and Bonita Beach Road to evaluate intersection improvement alternatives. Kittelson is the prime consultant for the PD\&E study, and Inwood is assisting in the drainage evaluation.
- This meeting aimed to inquire about the status of the City's quadrant roadway design project connecting Bonita Beach Road to US 41 via Windsor Road and behind the Center of Bonita Springs Plaza.
- RK\&K mentioned that the design is moving towards $60 \%$ completion, with plans submitted to the City in October 2023. A pre application meeting with SFWMD will be held during the week of August 7 - 11 to discuss the City's project and permit requirements.
- Kittelson indicated that 30\% design CADD files by RK\&K were provided on March 10, 2023. Kittelson requested if updated design files for the roadway alignment can be provided to the PD\&E study team. A request will be sent to RK\&K.
- RK\&K indicated that a CSI (Continuous Flow intersection) is proposed at Bonita Beach Road and Windsor Road intersection. This was shown in $30 \%$ plans of May 2023. RK\&K mentioned that the design CADD files provided to Kittelson early in the year were likely $15 \%$ design-level files.
- Kittelson asked if the horizontal alignment of the roadway behind the Publix stayed the same as what was provided to the team earlier of has it moved. RK\&K indicated that the alignment has not significantly changed at that location.
- The roadway design by the Windsor Road and Bonita Beach Road intersection was updated to minimize impacts to the existing Windsor Road swale. The goal is to maintain the swale's drainage pattern. Compensatory treatment is proposed, with minor improvements at the intersection being untreated to the existing swale. Instead, the remnant parcel will collect and treat the existing Windsor Road pavement in the proposed pond. Inwood indicated some information was obtained for the existing swale during the permit research and will share that with RK\&K.
- The City is designing the pond in the remnant parcel to treat and attenuate the runoff for the NW quadrant roadway from the Bonita Beach Road intersection to just west of Tuffy Auto Center at the US 41 and NW quadrant roadway's NW corner.
- RK\&K indicated that they will maximize the pond usage in the remnant parcel due to having to meet several drainage criteria and constraints, such as OFW (Imperial River), pre vs. post attenuation, and nutrient loading. The design intent is for the pond to be a dry pond to meet the nutrient loading requirements. Underdrains underneath the pond bottom are proposed to draw down the water table and maximize the storage capacity in the pond. RK\&K indicated the design of the pond is still ongoing and that more design information will be available in October when plans are submitted. It was suggested to reconvene in the future to get an update on the design of the roadway and the pond.
- The PD\&E study proposes to add more impervious to the quadrant roadway as it ties to US 41 and beginning at the curve alignment. RK\&K indicated that it does not think the pond will have extra capacity for the additional improvements to the roadway per the study. However, RK\&K indicated that if the FDOT was able to convince SFWMD that attenuation was not required when direct discharging to the tidal Imperial River, some additional capacity might be available. A possible alternative discussed for the study is to evaluate if the Tuffy Auto Center parcel at US 41's NW corner and the NW quadrant roadway would be a viable pond site location for the FDOT project since the roadway improvements will impact the parcel. Inwood indicated that would be a possibility and could be investigated further.
- RK\&K indicated that a segment of the proposed roadway is a rural-type typical section to provide cost savings to the City by implementing a roadside swale for drainage conveyance instead of a close drainage system. Kittelson mentioned the PD\&E study initial concept shows the roadway with curb and gutter, noting that more room will be available to expand the pond.
- RK\&K mentioned their current design shows two accesses to the Center of Bonita Springs Plaza (Old Time Pottery), and that access from the new roadway to the plaza should be preserved with the PD\&E concept. The proposed accesses have not yet been discussed with the shopping center.


## Action Items

1. RK\&K to provide latest design CADD files for the quadrant roadway
2. Inwood to share permit information for the existing Windsor Swale and Bonita Beach Road
[^0]
## APPENDIX F

Existing Permit Information
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[^0]:    *****END OF MEETING****
    NOTE: THE ABOVE REFLECTS THE WRITER'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONTENTS OF THE MEETING. IF ANY MISINTERPRETATION OR INACCURACIES ARE INCLUDED, PLEASE CONTACT RENATO CHUW AT (407) 971-8850 OR RCHUW@INWOODINC.COM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOR RESOLUTION AND REVISIONS IF NECESSARY.

[^1]:    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    an may apee vom.
    
    
    
    
    
    

