

































Appendix I

SWFWMD Resource Regulation Division Pre-Application Meeting Notes City of North Port – Flooding Alternatives PreApp Southwest Florida Water Management District, November 2018

THIS FORM IS INTENDED TO FACILITATE AND GUIDE THE DIALOGUE DURING A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING BY PROVIDING A PARTIAL "PROMPT LIST" OF DISCUSSION SUBJECTS. IT IS NOT A LIST OF REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTAL BY THE APPLICANT. FILE SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT NUMBER: **RESOURCE REGULATION DIVISION** PRE-APPLICATION MEETING NOTES PA 406256 Date: 11/27/18 Time: 1:30 Project Name: City of North Port - Flooding Alternatives PreApp District Engineer: David Kramer, Steve Lopes, Jezabel Pagan Garcia, Terese Power District ES: Al Gagne Elizabeth Wong, Dave Jayroe, Dave Deloach Attendees: County: Sarasota Sec/Twp/Rge: Numerous including Total Land Acreage: ROW 3, 4, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 29, 30/39/21 **Project Acreage:** 100+ acres Prior On-Site/Off-Site Permit Activity: Significant permitting history (ERP, WCP and WUP) within watershed(s). **Project Overview:** Cooperatively funded project by and between the City of North Port and the SWFWMD to mitigate flooding throughout the City. Improvements may include, but may not be limited to: Construction of a parallel storage and conveyance system along Myakkahatchee Creek within I-75 0 and Jockey Club areas. Attenuation structure located close to northern City boundary that would back flows and maximize 0 flood storage within County and District owned conservation properties. Various culvert and open conveyance upgrades. 0 Environmental Discussion: (Wetlands On-Site, Wetlands on Adjacent Properties, Delineation, T&E species, Easements, Draw down Issues, Setbacks, Justification, Elimination/Reduction, Permanent/Temporary Impacts, Secondary and Cumulative Impacts, Mitigation Options, SHWL, Upland Habitats, Site Visit, etc.) Hydrographic modeling will be required in order to show that the project will not have an adverse effect on • wetlands and surface waters. Provide the limits of jurisdictional wetlands and surface waters. • Provide appropriate mitigation using UMAM for impacts, if applicable. • Demonstrate elimination and reduction of wetland impacts. • • Maintain minimum 15 foot, average 25 foot wetland conservation area setback or address secondary impacts. Determine SHWL's at pond locations, wetlands, and OSWs. • Determine normal pool elevations of wetlands. • Determine 'pop-off' locations and elevations of wetlands. • As of October 1, 2017, the District will no longer send a copy of an application that does not qualify for a State Programmatic General Permit (SPGP) to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If a project does not qualify for a SPGP, you will need to apply separately to the Corps using the appropriate federal application form for activities under federal jurisdiction. Please see the Corps' Jacksonville District Regulatory Division Sourcebook for more information about federal permitting. Please call your local Corps office if you have questions about federal permitting. Link: http://www.saj.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Source-Book/ Site Information Discussion: (SHW Levels, Floodplain, Tailw ater Conditions, Adjacent Off-Site Contributing Sources, Receiving Waterbody, etc.) Where relevant, document/justify SHWE's at pond locations, wetlands, and OSWs. • Discussed possible benefits of obtaining input/coordination with FDOT. • Minimum flows and levels of receiving waters shall not be disrupted. • Contamination issues need to be resolved with the FDEP. Check FDEP MapDirect laver for possible contamination points within/adjacent to the project area. FDEP MapDirect Link •

• There do appear to be several District data collection sites including, but not limited to, Site ID's 770430, 710465, and 711760 that may be eventually be impacted by proposed construction. Contact the District's

Data Steward at <u>Data.Maps@watermatters.org</u> under the subject line "PRIORITY ERP Data Evaluation" to coordinate relocation of District data collection site.

Water Quantity Discussions: (Basin Description, Storm Event, Pre/Post Volume, Pre/Post Discharge, etc.)

- Big Slough Flood Reduction Study being performed by DeLoach Engineering for City. Local and regional flood alleviation alternatives in phases being investigated.
- A Conceptual ERP may be obtained to establish the baseline existing conditions and to demonstrate that
 proposed improvements will not cause adverse impacts.
- Conceptual could also evaluate improvements/reductions in flood stage resulting from initial phases of the project that future or later phases could rely on.
- Proposed improvements anticipated to include four possible main features:
 - New weirs or operable gates to impound/attenuate water upstream of I-75. Since this would involve stage increases on District lands, consistency with any Conservation Easements or other easements and approval from SWFWMD Lands Management would be needed.
 - Construction of a new bypass channel. It would need to be demonstrated that surrounding existing groundwater levels would not be adversely lowered (refer to Subsection 3.6, A.H.V.II).
 - Widening of Canal R-36, including associated culvert improvements.
 - Widening of conveyances in Dorothy Avenue area.
- Demonstrate that site will not impede the conveyance of contributing off-site flows.
- Provide documentation to support modeling tailwater conditions. Modeling must extend sufficiently upstream and downstream to assure no adverse stage increases upstream or downstream.
- The Big Slough Watershed Model will be used to demonstrate that proposed improvements will not increase flood stages up- or down-stream of the project area(s) based on Mean Annual, 10yr, 25yr and 100yr 24hr events.
- Please be aware that if there is credible historical evidence of past flooding or the physical capacity of the downstream conveyance or receiving waters indicates that the conditions for issuance will not be met without consideration of storm events of different frequency or duration, applicants shall be required to provide additional analyses using storm events of different duration or frequency than the 25-year 24-hour storm event, or to adjust the volume, rate or timing of discharges. [Section 3.0 Applicant's Handbook Volume II]

Water Quality Discussions: (Type of Treatment, Technical Characteristics, Non-presumptive Alternatives, etc.)

 It is anticipated that the project will not cause or contribute to pollutant loadings; please address with Application.

Sovereign Lands Discussion: (Determining Location, Correct Form of Authorization, Content of Application, Assessment of Fees, Coordination with FDEP)

- The project may be located within state owned sovereign submerged lands (SSSL). Be advised that a title determination will be required from FDEP to verify the presence and/or location of SSSL.
- If use of SSSL is proposed, authorization will be required. Refer to Chapter 18-21, F.A.C. and Chapter 18-20, F.A.C. for guidance on projects that impact SSSL and Aquatic Preserves.

Operation and Maintenance/Legal Information: (Ow nership or Perpetual Control, O&M Entity, O&M Instructions, Homeow ner Association Documents, Coastal Zone requirements, etc.)

• The permit must be issued to entity that owns or controls the property. City of North Port will be Applicant/permittee/O&M Entity.

Application Type and Fee Required:

- For Conceptual ERP:
- Provide/address Sections A, C, and E of the ERP Application.
- Consult the <u>fee schedule</u> for fee.

Other: (Future Pre-Application Meetings, Fast Track, Submittal Date, Construction Start Date, Required District Permits – WUP, WOD, Well Construction, etc.)

- An application for an individual permit to construct or alter a dam, impoundment, reservoir, or appurtenant work, requires that a notice of receipt of the application must be published in a newspaper within the affected area. Provide documentation that such noticing has been accomplished. Note that the published notices of receipt for an ERP can be in accordance with the language provided in Rule 40D-1.603(10), F.A.C.
- The plans and drainage report submitted electronically must include the appropriate information required under Rules 61G15-23.005 and 61G15-23.004 (Digital), F.A.C. The following text is required by the Florida

Board of Professional Engineers (FBPE) to meet this requirement when a digitally created seal is not used and must appear where the signature would normally appear:

ELECTRONIC (Manifest): [NAME] State of Florida, Professional Engineer, License No. [NUMBER] This item has been electronically signed and sealed by [NAME] on the date indicated here using a SHA authentication code. Printed copies of this document are not considered signed and sealed and the SHA authentication code must be verified on any electronic copies

DIGITAL: [NAME] State of Florida, Professional Engineer, License No. [NUMBER]; This item has been digitally signed and sealed by [NAME] on the date indicated here using a Digital Signature; Printed copies of this document are not considered signed and sealed and the signature must be verified on any electronic copies.

- Provide soil erosion and sediment control measures for use during construction. Refer to ERP Applicant's Handbook Vol. 1 Part IV Erosion and Sediment Control.
- Demonstrate that excavation of any stormwater ponds does not breach an aquitard (see Subsection 2.1.1, A.H.V.II) such that it would allow for lesser quality water to pass, either way, between the two systems. In those geographical areas of the District where there is not an aquitard present, the depth of the pond(s) shall not be excavated to within two (2) feet of the underlying limestone which is part of a drinking water aquifer. [Refer to Subsection 5.4.1(b), A.H.V.II]
- If lowering of SHWE is proposed, then burden is on Applicant to demonstrate no adverse onsite or offsite impacts as per Subsection 3.6, A.H.V.II. Groundwater drawdown 'radius of influence' computations may be required to demonstrate no adverse onsite or offsite impacts. Please note that new roadside swales or deepening of existing roadside swales may result in lowering of SHWE. Proposed ponds with control elevation less than SHWE may result in adverse lowering of onsite or offsite groundwater.

Disclaimer: The District ERP pre-application meeting process is a service made available to the public to assist interested parties in preparing for submittal of a permit application. Information shared at pre-application meetings is superseded by the actual permit application submittal. District permit decisions are based upon information submitted during the application process and Rules in effect at the time the application is complete.



Appendix J

North Port Big Slough Flood Reduction Study, Presentation to the North Port City Commission

DeLoach Engineering Science, PLLC., December 2018



Presentation to the North Port City Commission

December 6, 2018

Project Plan – Scope of Work

"Evaluate the feasibility and cost effectiveness of solutions to reduce flooding"

- City of North Port Department of Public Works, Agreement #2016-48
- Cooperatively funded by and between the City of North Port and the SWFWMD
- Part 1 localized along Myakkahatchee Creek within I-75 and Jockey Club areas
- Part 2 preliminary regional concepts to mitigate flooding throughout City

Project Plan – Using City of North Port's Existing Available Model



DeLoach Engineering Science water resources and civer engineering

Project Plan – Focus on Local Areas of Recurring Flooding, I-75 Area



DeLoach Engineering Science water resources and cive engineering

Project Plan – Focus on Local Areas of Recurring Flooding, Dorothy Avenue Area



Regional Improvements (e.g., Reduce Offsite Inflows at FPL Easement North of City)



Local/Regional Improvements (e.g., Bypass Construction)





Recommended Plan – Plan Components

Project Components	105B
Existing Condition*	х
Dorothy (Single Box Culvert)	-
Dorothy (Triple Box Culvert)	х
R-36 Improvements	х
Bypass (flowway, n = 0.040)	х
Bypass (wetland, n = 0.150)	-
Reduce Northern Inflows	х
Other Planned Improvements	-

* Existing Condition model updated from 2012 version



Recommended Plan – Plan Components and Engineer's Opinion of Probable Costs

	Existing		Phasing		"Full	Plan"	Best	BCR
Project Components	101	102	103	104	105	105B	106	106A
Existing Condition*	х	x	х	х	х	х	х	х
Dorothy (Single Box Culvert)	-	x	х	х	x	-	x	x
Dorothy (Triple Box Culvert)	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	-
R-36 Improvements	-	-	х	х	x	x	-	-
Bypass (flowway, n = 0.040)	-	-	-	х	x	x	x	-
Bypass (wetland, n = 0.150)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Reduce Northern Inflows	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	-
Other Planned Improvements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Combined Cost	\$ -	\$ 1,299,000	\$ 12,156,000	\$ 29,422,000	\$ 31,922,000	\$ 32,771,594	\$ 18,565,000	\$ 22,018,200
Estimated Annualized Cost		\$ 94,125	\$ 880,822	\$ 2,131,914	\$ 2,313,063	\$ 2,374,625	\$ 1,345,217	\$ 1,595,435

Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Cost (by Component)

Existing Condition	\$
Dorothy (Single Box Culvert)	\$ 1,299,000
Dorothy (Triple Box Culvert)	\$ 2,148,594
R-36 Improvements	\$ 10,857,000
Bypass (flowway, n = 0.040)	\$ 17,266,000
Bypass (wetland, n = 0.150)	\$ 20,719,200
Reduce Northern Inflows	\$ 2,500,000

Recommended Plan – Cost and Benefits

		Existing	Phasing		"Full Plan"		Best BCR		
Project Co	mponents	101	102	103	104	105	105B	106	106A
Existing C	ondition*	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	х
Dorothy (Sing	le Box Culvert)	-	x	x	x	x	-	x	х
Dorothy (Trip	le Box Culvert)	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	-
R-36 Impr	ovements	-	-	х	x	x	x	-	-
Bypass (flowv	vay, n = 0.040)	-	-	-	x	x	x	x	-
Bypass (wetla	ind, n = 0.150)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	-
Other Planned	Improvements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estima	ted Combined Cost	\$-	\$ 1,299,000	\$ 12,156,000	\$ 29,422,000	\$ 31,922,000	\$ 32,771,594	\$ 18,565,000	\$ 22,018,200
Estimate	ed Annualized Cost		\$ 94,125	\$ 880,822	\$ 2,131,914	\$ 2,313,063	\$ 2,374,625	\$ 1,345,217	\$ 1,595,435
	2.22			1.2			7.0	7.5	
	2.33-year	-	0.4	1.2	1.1	1./	7.8	7.5	7.4
Road Flood	5-year	-	0.6	1.9	11.5	12.2	12.9	10.8	9.4
Reduction	10-year	-	0.3	2.7	16.8	18.0	18.3	14.8	11.9
(miles)	25-year	-	0.5	2.8	17.9	20.5	20.7	15.9	12.8
	50-year	-	0.6	2.5	18.3	20.9	21.1	16.7	13.8
	100-year	-	0.6	2.6	21.9	24.4	24.5	20.3	17.4
	2.33-year	-	68	113	807	854	863	811	/91
Parcels	5-year	-	84	91	960	1024	1138	968	836
Reduction	10-year	-	49	98	1022	1125	1161	996	891
(touch)	25-year	-	58	90	1002	1138	1161	984	858
	50-year	-	66	152	1073	1175	1207	1012	865
	100-year	-	88	167	1170	1313	1313	1133	1000
	2.33-year	-	0	39	232	233	234	230	223
Parcels	5-year	-	0	31	402	405	405	398	362
Reduction	10-year	-	0	15	515	538	538	505	427
(centroid)	25-year	-	0	16	513	539	542	503	381
	50-year	-	0	27	510	563	562	480	366
	100-year	-	5	30	505	556	558	482	372
Estimated	Annualized Reposit		¢ 25.216	¢ 102.196	ć 1 990 07F	¢ 1.060.357	¢ 1077743	¢ 1 942 122	¢ 1 626 207
Estimated	it/Cost Ratio (RCD)		÷ 25,210	÷ 195,180	÷ 1,005,575	÷ 1,500,257	÷ 1,5//,/42	⇒ 1,042,132 1 27	÷ 1,050,307
Est. Benej	in cost nutio (BCR)		0.27	0.22	0.69	0.65	0.65	1.57	1.05

I-75 Area - Scenario 105B, Mean Annual Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B			
Existing C	ondition*	×		
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)			
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	×		
R-36 Impr	ovements	×		
Bypass (floww	ray, $n = 0.040$)	×		
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)			
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	x		
Other Planned	Improvements	1 -		
Estimat	ed Combined Cost	\$ 32,771,594		
Estimate	d Annualized Cost	\$ 2,374,625		
	2.33-year	7.8		
A CONTRACTOR OF A	5-year	12.9		
Road Flood	10-year	18.3		
Reduction	25-year	20.7		
(miles)	50-year	21.1		
	100-year	24.5		
	2.33-year	863		
Barcola	5-year	1138		
Paduction	10-year	1161		
(touch)	25-year	1161		
(touch)	50-year	1207		
	100-year	1313		
	2.33-year	234		
Parcels	5-year	405		
Reduction	10-year	538		
(centroid)	25-year	542		
(centroid)	50-year	562		
		558		

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

1,977,742

0.83



Dorothy Avenue Area - Scenario 105B, Mean Annual Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B			
Existing C	ondition*	×		
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)			
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	×		
R-36 Impr	ovements	×		
Bypass (floww	ray, $n = 0.040$)	×		
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)	8		
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	x		
Other Planned	Improvements	ALC: NOT AL		
Entimate	ad Combined Cost	¢		
Estimat	ed Combined Cost	\$ 32,771,594		
LStimute	a Announzed Cost	\$ 2,3/4,023		
	2.33-year	7.8		
Dead Flood	5-year	12.9		
Road Flood	10-year	18.3		
(miles)	25-year	20.7		
(miles)	50-year	21.1		
	100-year	24.5		
	2.33-year	863		
Descale	5-year	1138		
Parcels	10-year	1161		
(house)	25-year	1161 1207		
(touch)	50-year			
	100-year	1313		
	2.33-year	234		
Parcols	5-year	405		
Reduction	10-year	538		
(controid)	25-year	542		
(centroid)	50-year	562		
	224/11/1	558		

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ 1,9 Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR) 0.8

\$ 1,977,742 0.83



I-75 Area - Scenario 105B, 10-Year Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B	
Existing C	ondition*	×
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)	
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	x
R-36 Impr	ovements	×
Bypass (floww	ay, n = 0.040)	×
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)	8
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	x
Other Planned	Improvements	1 - 1
Estimat Estimate	ed Combined Cost ed Annualized Cost	\$ 32,771,594 \$ 2,374,629
	2.33-year	7.8
Road Flood	5-year	12.9
Roduction	10-year	18.3
(miles)	25-year	20.7
(miles)	50-year	21.1
	100-year	24.5
	2.33-year	863
Barcols	5-year	1138
Paduction	10-year	1161
(touch)	25-year	1161
(couch)	50-year	1207
	100-year	1313
	2.33-year	234
Parcels	5-year	405
Reduction	10-year	538
(centroid)	25-year	542
	TOURS	567
(centroid)	50-year	302

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ 1, Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR) 0.

efit \$ 1,977,742 CR) 0.83



Dorothy Avenue Area - Scenario 105B, 10-Year Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B			
Existing C	ondition*	×		
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)			
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	×		
R-36 Impr	ovements	×		
Bypass (floww	ay, n = 0.040)	×		
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)			
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	×		
Other Planned	Improvements			
Estimat Estimate	ed Combined Cost d Annualized Cost	\$ 32,771,594 \$ 2,374,625		
	2.33-year	7.8		
Road Flood	5-year	12,9		
Roduction	10-year	18.3		
(milos)	25-year	20.7		
(nimes)	50-year	21.1		
	100-year	24.5		
	2.33-year	863		
Parcels	5-year	1138		
Reduction	10-year	1161		
(touch)	25-year	1161		
(couch)	50-year	1207		
	100-year	1313		
	2.33-year	234		
Parcels	5-year	405		
Reduction	10-year	538		
(centroid)	25-year	542		
(centroid)	50-year	562		
		558		

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

\$ 1,977,742 0.83



I-75 Area - Scenario 105B, 100-Year Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B			
Existing C	ondition*	×		
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)			
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	×		
R-36 Impr	ovements	×		
Bypass (floww	ay, $n = 0.040$)	×		
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)			
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	×		
Other Planned	Improvements	-		
Estimat Estimate	ed Combined Cost d Annualized Cost	\$ 32,771,594 \$ 2,374,625		
	2.33-year	7.8		
Road Flood	5-year	12.9		
Roduction	10-year	18.3		
(milos)	25-year	20.7		
(nimes)	50-year	21.1		
	100-year	24.5		
	2.33-year	863		
Parcels	5-year	1138		
Peduction	10-year	1161		
(touch)	25-year	1161		
(couch)	50-year	1207		
	100-year	1313		
	2.33-year	234		
Parcels	5-year	405		
Reduction	10-year	538		
(centroid)	25-year	542		
(centrola)	50-year	562		
	100	558		

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

nefit \$ 1,977,742 BCR) 0.83



Dorothy Avenue Area - Scenario 105B, 100-Year Storm Event Flood Reduction

Project Co	105B	
Existing C	ondition*	x
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)	
Dorothy (Tripl	e Box Culvert)	×
R-36 Impr	ovements	×
Bypass (floww	ray, $n = 0.040$)	×
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)	
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	×
Other Planned	Improvements	-
Estimat	ed Combined Cost	\$ 32,771,594
Estimate	d Annualized Cost	\$ 2,374.625
		1 414
	2.33-year	7.8
Road Flood	5-year	12.9
Road Flood	10-year	18.3
(milos)	25-year	20.7
(nimes)	50-year	21.1
	100-year	24.5
	2.33-year	863
Parcels	5-year	1138
Paduction	10-year	1161
(touch)	25-year	1161
(touch)	50-year	1207
	100-year	1313
	2.33-year	234
Parcels	5-year	405
Reduction	10-year	538
(centroid)	25-year	542
(centroid)	50-year	562
	1.1.1	

Estimated Annualized Benefit \$ Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

fit \$ 1,977,742 R) 0.83



Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

0.83

North Port Big Slough Stormwater Management Master Plan – Apply for SWERP Conceptual Approval

Project Co	mponents	105B	Project Co	mponents	106		
Existing C	ondition*	×	Existing Condition* Dorothy (Single Box Culvert)		x	Elsion Ave	
Dorothy (Singl	e Box Culvert)	4			x	a de a a construir de	
Dorothy (Triple	e Box Culvert)	x	Dorothy (Tripl	Dorothy (Triple Box Culvert)		and the second s	
R-36 Impr	ovements	x	R-36 Impr	ovements	tel la	Tropicaire Bird	
Bypass (floww	ay, n = 0.040)	x	Bypass (floww	vay, n = 0.040)	x	B Ulman Ave g B	
Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)	-	Bypass (wetla	nd, n = 0.150)		Discare Bird	
Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	x	Reduce Nort	hern Inflows	~	Brista Ave	
Other Planned	Improvements	+	Other Planned	Improvements	×		
Estimat Estimate	ed Combined Cost	32,771,594 2,374,625	Estimat Estimate	ted Combined Cost	5 18,565,000 5 1,345,217	Teda Are Det	
1	2.33-year	7.8		2.33-year	7.5		
	5-year 12.9	a state	5-year	10.8			
Road Flood 10-year	18.3	Road Flood	10-year	14.8	The second		
(miles)	25-year	20.7	(miles)	25-year	15.9		
(miles)	50-year	21.1	(miles)	50-year	16.7		
	100-year	24.5		100-year	20,3	W Price Blug	
	2.33-year	863	1	2.33-year	811	A Can be can be can be a can b	
Descale	5-year	1138	Descela	5-year	968		
Parcels	10-year	1161	Parceis	10-year	996	Transformer Bred White Bird	
(touch)	25-year	1161	(touch)	25-year	984	A Representation of the second s	
(touch)	50-year	1207	troncity	50-year	1012	BMP Plan Elements	
	100-year	1313		100-year	1133	Cheapro Are	
	2.33-year	234		2.33-year	230	Widen Channel and Increase Conveyance in the Dorothy Avenue Area	
	arcels 5-year 405	rcels 5-year 405 10-year 538	405	Parcels	5-year	398	Widen Channel and Increase Conveyance along R-36
Parcels			Farceis	10-year	505		
Parcels	10-year	538	Reduction				
Parcels Reduction (ceptroid)	10-year 25-year	538	Reduction	25-year	503	Construct Bypass Channel	
Parcels Reduction (centroid)	10-year 25-year 50-year	538 542 562	Reduction (centroid)	25-year 50-year	503 480	Construct Bypass Channel Reduce Offsite Inflows	

1.37

Est. Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR)

DeLoach Engineering S water resources and civer enge cience engineering