




Punta Gorda

CITY OF PUNTA GORDA ADA TRANSITION PLAN FINAL REPORT Hector House Plaza

October 4, 2017

Prepared For:
City of Punta Gorda
326 West Marion Avenue
Punta Gorda, Florida, 33950



CONTENTS

1.0	Location Map	1
1.1	Building Description	1
2.0	Process Overview	2
2.1	Published Standards	2
2.2	Building Assessment Overview	2
3.0	Assessment Process	3
4.0	Findings and Deficiencies	3
4.1	General	3
4.2	Parking.....	4
4.3	Accessible Route	4
	Recommendations	5
4.4	Benches.....	6
	Assessments.....	6
	Recommendations	6
5.0	Implementation and Financial Plan	7
5.1	Development of Improvement Costs	7
5.2	Development of the Implementation and Financial Plan.....	9
5.3	Funding Plan for Needed Improvements	10



1.0 LOCATION MAP



Figure 1-1 - Location Map

1.1 BUILDING DESCRIPTION

The Hector House Plaza is located at 227 Taylor Street, in downtown Punta Gorda. It contains a parking lot and a small urban plaza.



2.0 PROCESS OVERVIEW

2.1 PUBLISHED STANDARDS

As indicated in our project proposal, the findings for each facility assessed under the project will be provided in the form of an Accessibility Assessment Report, or AAR. This AAR conforms to ASTM E2018-01 - Standard Guide for Property Assessments: Baseline Property Condition Assessment Process standards.

The AAR is intended to identify defects or deficiencies in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), and Florida Accessibility Code (FAC), as well as any other code deemed applicable and to recommend necessary improvements that could improve accessibility of the assessed facilities by individuals with disabilities. Our assessment is based on spaces, areas, elements, or features that can or could be accessed by the general public. Attention to equipment or work spaces not allocated for use by individuals with disabilities has not been evaluated. Nevertheless, where work areas that may allow individuals with disabilities to be employed are identified by the facility member interviewed during the introductory stage of the assessment are identified, these areas have been assessed and any deficiencies noted are reported herein.

The date the facility was constructed or renovated is important to determine so that applicable standards can be applied during the assessment process. ADAAG became enforceable in January 1992 with a revision becoming enforceable in 2012. The FAC has had various revisions over the years. As such, if a facility was constructed prior to the ADA, only components of that facility that are/have been modified since the adoption of the ADA and FAC are required to be accessible. This AAR reports deficiencies according to ADAAG and FAC standards as appropriate to the condition assessed.

2.2 BUILDING ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

An informal interview with our points of contact for the facility, Cherry Prewitt & Mitchell Austin, were conducted prior to performing the physical assessment of the alley and surrounding elements. They provided an overview of the facility's occupancy, use, and history which established the spaces and elements frequented by the general public and which must meet the minimum accessibility requirements.

The pre-interview process is used to determine and document information relevant to each facility's use in order to determine applicable regulatory standards to apply to the assessment of the facilities. Use and occupancy information is critical in determining compliance with accessibility standards and must be established prior to the physical assessments.



3.0 ASSESSMENT PROCESS

A facility walk-thru and assessment of site and building elements for compliance with applicable accessibility standards was conducted on June 14, 2016. The assessment was conducted by Tindale Oliver staff, certified as Accessibility Inspectors.

The facility survey addressed each accessible element and space within and external to the building and included applicable elements such as path-of-travel (accessible route), parking, curb ramps, signage, benches, drinking fountains, ramps, and all other occupiable spaces and elements covered by the ADAAG.

The survey included physical measurements and counts for components or systems. Survey findings were collected and recorded on Tindale Oliver's custom made, Android based, ADA compliance checklist application. Photographs were taken with the tablet of each area of the facility for familiarization and later reference to illustrate deficiency findings. The digital data and photographs were then uploaded to a database on our secure servers for backup. Where appropriate, photographs have been included in this AAR to illustrate issues or deficiencies where necessary.

The facility survey consisted of non-intrusive visual observations, which allowed for a readily accessible and easily visible components and systems assessment of the facility which included measurements of space and clearance dimensions, slope, walkway widths, reach ranges, maneuverability measurements, etc.

4.0 FINDINGS AND DEFICIENCIES

4.1 GENERAL

The use and occupancy of the Hector House Plaza dictates egress requirements and accessible route requirements consistent with the ADAAG regulations. Because the general public does access the parking lot and plaza, and in the interest of establishing an accessibility compliance baseline condition report of the facility, a full accessibility assessment was conducted. Where deficiencies in compliance with ADAAG or FAC exist, descriptions of the deficiency, regulatory requirement(s) pertinent to the deficiency, a photograph or sketch illustrating the deficient element, and recommendations for remediation of the deficiency are listed below.



4.2 PARKING

Assessments

There are 27 total spaces within the Hector House Plaza parking lot. Two of these spaces are marked as being accessible. The parking spaces themselves are ADA compliant. However, there are barriers to accessibility along the accessible route leading to/from the parking spaces, as described in the following section.

4.3 ACCESSIBLE ROUTE

Assessments

Sections of the accessible route leading to and from the two accessible parking spaces have non-accessible cross and running slopes. Figure 4-1 shows locations with running slopes of approximately 6%. Figure 4-2 shows locations with cross slopes of approximately 3%.



Figure 4-1: Non-Accessible Running Slopes





Figure 4-2: Non-Accessible Cross Slopes

ADAAG 403.3 states, “The running (perpendicular) slope of a walking surfaces shall not be steeper than 5%. The cross (perpendicular) slope of a walking surface shall not be steeper than 2%.”

Recommendations

- The locations that have non-compliant running slope must be either resurfaced so that the cross slope does not exceed 5%, as specified in **ADAAG 403.3**, or
 - The section of the accessible route with a running slope greater than 5% must be retrofitted into an ADA compliant ramp, per **ADAAG 405**.
- The locations that have non-compliant cross slope must be resurfaced so that the cross slope does not exceed 2%, as specified in **ADAAG 403.3**.



4.4 BENCHES

Assessments

There are various benches within the Hector House Plaza, as shown below.



Figure 4-3: Non-Accessible Corss Slopes

ADAAG 903.2 states that “Clear floor or ground space shall be positioned at the end of the bench seat and parallel to the short axis of the bench.”

PROWAG R212.6 states that “At least 50 percent, but no less than one, of benches at each location shall provide clear space adjacent to the bench. The clear space shall be located either at one end of the bench.”

ADAAG 305.3/PROWAG R404 states that “The clear floor or ground space shall be 30 inches minimum by 48 inches minimum.”

Recommendations

- Either remove the non-accessible benches,
- Relocate the benches/obstruction to make at least one site of the benches accessible, or
- Add additional brick pavers to the side of the non-accessible benches to make them accessible.



5.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCIAL PLAN

In the previous sections, the improvements that are required to improve accessibility conditions at the facility were identified. The next step in the process is the development of an Implementation and Financial Plan for improvements. This was undertaken through the following efforts:

- preparing cost estimates for the required improvements;
- identifying funding that is available for the improvements; and
- reviewing the specific improvements in more detail and categorizing them into two separate groups. These include:
 - quick fix improvements; and
 - improvements that require more time, effort, and/or funding.

5.1 DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT COSTS

In order to develop the Implementation and Financial Plan, unit costs for each type of improvement were developed. These unit costs were based on recent experiences with other agencies and, when available, standard industry costs when local data was not available. **It is important to note that the unit costs include across-the-board assumptions that will need to be reviewed prior to the actual improvement being completed.**

Table 5-1 includes the unit costs for each type of improvement that were used to estimate the improvement costs. In addition, this table includes an estimate for the total number of items needing each type of improvement, as well as the total estimate of probable cost by improvement type.

Note that the costs included in the table below are planning level estimates, once the projects progress through design, the actual construction opinions of cost will become more refined. Also, the City does not have the funding to go out and make all of these improvements at one time, which would offer the most economy of scale. Therefore, cost estimates are reflective of multiple smaller phases that will be more conducive to the funding available.

Again, it should be noted that the estimates are intended to reflect the order-of-magnitude costs for the City's overall facility improvement needs over the timeframe of the plan; for specific projects nearing implementation, it may be necessary for the City to conduct a more detailed cost assessment.



Improvement	Cost		Approx. Amount	Approx. Cost	Priority	Quick Fix
Modify Accessible Route	\$50	sq ft	375	\$18,750	High	No
Additional Brick Pavers by Benches	\$25	sq ft	20	\$500	Low	No
Sub-Total Estimate				\$19,250		
<i>Mobilization</i>	\$1,000			\$1,000		
<i>Signed & Sealed Plans</i>	\$1,500			\$1,500		
<i>Survey/Design</i>	15%			\$2,900		
<i>Inspection</i>	5%			\$1,000		
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	10%			\$2,000		
Total Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates				\$27,700		

Table 5-1 Cost and Prioritization Table



5.2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCIAL PLAN

The Implementation and Financial Plan was developed to identify when the improvements should occur, based on the relative priority of the improvements and anticipated level of funding that will be available to address the improvements.

Due to the nature of the quick fix improvements, it is assumed that the majority of the identified quick fix improvements will be completed within the confines of the five-year plan, listed in the following section.

It would be ideal if Punta Gorda could take advantage of “piggy backing” needed improvements with other planned facility improvement and renovation projects. Under ideal circumstances, this would permit the City to benefit either because the project directly addresses some or all of the needed improvements, or the project allows the City to reduce its improvement costs due to the concurrent construction activities. It is not known at this time the amount of implementation costs that could potentially be saved by completing the improvements concurrent with planned projects. Therefore, potential cost savings through fund leveraging are not included in the Implementation and Financial Plan at this time. In the future, should the desire and ability to estimate the amount of costs that could be reduced through fund leveraging, the cost of the improvements for those impacted improvements may be adjusted.

To develop the plan, the prioritized list of improvements were incorporated into the Implementation and Financial Plan based on the amount of anticipated funding available each year for the improvements.

It should be stressed that the Implementation and Financial Plan will serve as a general guide for the planning of improvements and that several factors will influence the timing for implementation of specific improvements and the overall cost of the program, including:

- Opportunities for partnering with other jurisdictions or organizations on implementing improvements.
- Specific site conditions at individual locations, including landscaping, utilities, drainage, which can have a significant impact on the type of improvements required and the associated cost.
- Contracting opportunities, including awarding a unit-price contract for the implementation of improvements at multiple locations.
- Additional opportunities to relocate or consolidate individual amenities.

On an annual basis, the list of needed improvements will be reviewed against the funding that is available that year to develop a specific work program. As previously



mentioned, this will involve development of more detailed cost estimates based on a review of site conditions at individual locations.

5.3 FUNDING PLAN FOR NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

Table 5-1 presents an example of a phased implementation plan by listing the improvements with a proposed priority and their associated costs. It should be noted that the costs are estimates of probable cost, with the ultimate costs dependent upon how the work is undertaken, site conditions at individual locations, material and labor prices in future years, and potential right-of-way costs. The number of items that are consolidated, modified, relocated, or removed will also be an important variable, as well as the amount of work that will be the responsibility of other entities.

Due to the unknown level of funding currently available for accessibility improvements, current renovation schedule, and the completion of the quick-fix improvement list, the items recommended for improvement each year of the program do not necessarily have to be the highest ranking items on the priority list. However, as the improvement program progresses, high ranking items that were not initially improved should be included in future years.

It should be noted that the phased implementation plan is just a guide. The number of items improved each year and the specific locations chosen for improvement may vary due to such factors as the actual costs of the improvement. As such, the improvements will need to be reviewed and a work program developed specifying the improvements that will be undertaken on an annual basis. The improvements would be undertaken through task orders. It is envisioned that the effort could focus on implementation of improvements within specific sections of the facility or would occur with groups of similar improvements throughout the City, both of which could enable improvements to be implemented more quickly.

It should be stressed that this plan is presented as an overall guide to the implementation of improvements. City staff will need to review the needed improvements and the available funding on an annual basis to develop the annual improvement program.

