

MEMORANDUM



St. Patrick's Parish: GIG Parking Lot Design

Concept Plan Presentation - Meeting Notes

January 26th 1:30 pm (via Teams Videoconference)

Attendees

Eric Derstine, Landscape Architect, EDG (note taker)
Brian Uhlenbrock, Landscape Architect, EDG
Scott Menningen
Jared Bartley
Brenna Davis
Brandy Burmeister, Dioceses of Cleveland

Discussion Topics

The following is a summary of topics discussed at the meeting:

1. Slide 1 – Brief introduction
2. Slide 2 of presentation – Brian U reviewed the stormwater calculations that were submitted in the NEORS D GIG grant. Noted we would come back to it later to compare results to concept plans
3. Slide 3 Existing Side – Brian U focused on project area (parking lot)
4. Slide 4 – Concept Plan A (Permeable Pavers)
 - Brian U reviewed all concepts of concept plan A, presented each element labeled
 - Noted that an edge would need to be installed between parking lot drive aisle and parking stalls (not shown on concept but accounted for in cost opinion)
 - Noted that bioretention basin in plan is feasible, but would have minimal impact on stormwater control
 - Brandy asked questions about how pavers worked, Brenna noted she will send Brady a training video from NEORS D that she attended that explains BMP concepts
 - Brian explained installation of pavers (base course, underdrain, catch basin to existing storm line that acts as “last resort” when system is at capacity)
 - Brian noted BMP stands for best management practice. This would be permeable pavers, underground chambers, bioretention, any practice that removes stormwater from CSO.
 - Scott noted that building along Br4dge Ave does have a basement (design should be mindful of that to ensure no water stays on foundation/gets in basement. i.e. – curb)
5. Slide 5 – Concept Plan B (Underground Chambers and Bioretention Basin)
 - Brian U reviewed all concepts of concept plan B, presented each element labeled
 - Noted that UC (underground chambers) would not be visible, however bioretention would be, which is important for grant application. Could put signage up, would “green-up” Bridge Ave.

MEMORANDUM



- Brandy asked if UC attaches to existing storm lines. Brian confirmed it will.
 - Scott said a lot of salt in parking lots, will that be a factor?
 - Brian – It will be a challenge. Want to prevent plowing into bioretention basin (salt, sediment) will clog system and need to be corrected.
 - Scott noted they don't plow unless 4" but they do salt more – wants to make sure this design can handle that
 - Brian noted pavers will need maintenance (to be swept)
 - Brandy asked how is grant selected and given.
 - Brian – \$300k is max and we will ask for max – application has a lot of questions and factors that get scored. They include: Costs/gal removed, total gal removed. More removed from system, better for the application
6. Slide 6 & 7 – Concept Plan Stormwater Calcs – Brian reviewed the stormwater calculations of both concepts and how they compare to the original application.
 7. Slide 8 – Concept A Costs – Brian presented costs, noted higher price of pavers, could VE cheaper pavers (unilock)
 8. Slide 9 – Concept B Costs – Brian presented costs
 9. Costs Conversation
 - Brian noted NEORSD want projects to happen, so they want to see that the church can afford it
 - Brandy said the church may want to do sewer camera right now so they know if we need to do additional work (therefore do it before construction so potentially remove it from the costs).
 - Brian promoted this idea – Noted it gives us a lot more answers and helps with cost opinion and contractors will know what we are getting into. Brian also noted not to reply on contingency as funds, but as a safety-net
 - Brandy also commented how a couple additional square feet of work would quickly eat up the contingency. Noted the contingency could be higher
 - Scott asked if we can we make this plan conditional upon NEORSD ensuring its SSW is clear – Brian said no, its owner responsibility to ensure its taken care of.
 10. General Conversation About Presentation
 - Brian noted we want to do proof rolls on asphalt – will need to remove soft soils if we have any on site – like Brady was saying – this is the type of stuff that eats up contingency
 - Scott commented – in an effort to lower costs, can we scale back the gallons removed per year (as long as it remains within the # given in the grant)? Will that help with pricing?
 - Brian response – yes that is a possibility. We could do portions of permeable pavement and portions of asphalt, but NEORSD will only fund items related to items directly for gallons removed. They'd pay for BMPs, trees and plantings, but sidewalks and plazas they would not
 - Scott noted he is worried about salt and plowing – is there a sensible area not develop so we can plow snow into it? Maybe have an area not permeable or reduce the bioretention basin to have a place for snow.
 - Brian noted when we bid out, prices will be effected (bid in late spring, contractors will have worked lined up so their prices will be higher)

MEMORANDUM



- Brandy asked if contractors costs were more reasonable/predictable? Brian said they are a little better, but still some uncertainty. Noted our cost opinion numbers referenced the EDG Montessori project from last year.
- Brian asked St Patrick's to provide feedback to EDG in 2 weeks, Scott thought that might be a bit tight, so Brian asked for feedback by end of February
- Brian wants application in sooner than September to ensure time if NEORSD has questions or concerns.
- Brian noted we will submit DD (design docs) to NEROSD, get comments, address them and put it in the application (pre-approved design-wise) – if awarded, we will put that into full construction docs for bid
- Brandy asked what are church's obligations? Brian said NEORSD will want to see it done next construction season (2025). NEROSD is flexible with extensions, but want things sooner rather than later.

Upcoming Meetings

No meetings scheduled, but St. Patrick's will provide feedback to EDG by end of February. EDG will work on DD beginning of March

DISCLAIMER: This is a summary of the meeting and is based upon the written notes and memory of individuals. The notes are intended to capture only the main points made in the meeting, and they reflect comments on work-in-progress. The notes do not imply a specific opinion or commitment on the part of any individual or organization represented at the meeting. Please submit any questions or revisions to buhlenbrock@envdesigngroup.com.