

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 21, 2005
Ellis Building – Koger Center
9:00 am

Tony Park, Vice Chairperson, called meeting to order at 9:05 pm.

Committee Members present:

David Bright	Linda Jamison	Tony Park
John Buss	John Kraynak	Tammy Peters
Rodney Cassidy	Jack Kostrzewa	Bonnie Pfuntner
Jim Davis	Mark Llewellyn	Ed Ringe
Ben Fusaro	Phil Maher	Wayne Tedder
Shelonda Gay	Sean McGlynn	Michael Wright
Hilda Gilchrist	Jerry Oshesky	Ray Youmans
Theresa Heiker	Maribel Nicholson-Choice	

Bold names indicate committee members

I. Agenda Modifications

Mr. Maher provided the committee with the revised Blueprint 2000 Master Plan.

II. Information Items

Item #1: Acquisition for Capital Circle Southeast

Phil Maher gave a brief overview of the agenda item. Jerry Oshesky stated that they have a resolution coming before the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) for the acquisition of parcels for Capital Circle Southeast. He stated that there are thirteen parcels south of Tram Road required for the transition of this project. The Blueprint 2000 right-of-way acquisition policy requires that staff take a resolution to the board identifying the parcels prior to starting the acquisition process.

Theresa Heiker asked if there has been any discussion with the landowners. Mr. Oshesky answered no, they had just finished the right-of-way map. Jim Davis stated that according to how the real estate policies are setup, once the board approved the parcel they would not have to go back to the board for the acquisition.

Item #2: Conservation Easement: Thompson Property (Headwaters of the St. Marks River)

Dave Bright stated that the Sensitive Lands Working group and Blueprint 2000 prioritized, in 2004, approximately 9,000 acres in the eastern part of Leon County for fee simple or, conservation easement acquisition for the protection of the headwaters of the St. Marks

River. We have been notified that few of the parcels, owned by Lex Thompson are available. Mr. Thompson has had discussions with the Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWFMD) regarding the property. He currently has a timber contract on these parcels. Blueprint is trying to acquire the conservation easement at the value of the timber contract.

Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Thompson's parcels fall within the area covered by the agreement with the NFWFMD. The NFWFMD has been in negotiations to purchase the property from Mr. Thompson for several months. The standard acquisition timeframe for the District to acquire property is approximately 6 months. Mr. Thompson has previously stated he would not wait and that the timber would be harvested as soon as possible. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint, with the NFWFMD, is trying to acquire this priority 1 parcel. Blueprint only has seven priority 1 parcels at this time.

Mr. Davis stated that the contract, which has been reviewed by Debra Schiro, includes a sizeable refundable deposit and appraisal of the property. He stated that the contract price is \$200,000 for 132 acres for a conservation easement over the entire parcel. He mentioned that if the property is appraised above the \$200,000.00, then Mr. Thompson would be paid 30% of the increase amount. He further stated that if the appraisal is greater than \$400,000, Mr. Thompson is entitled to an amount not less than 75% of the appraisal value. Mr. Davis stated that if the property were appraised below \$200,000, then staff would negotiate the price with Mr. Thompson. He stated that the value of the timber on the parcel is approximately \$1,500.00 per acre. Michael Wright asked what Mr. Thompson could do with the property once Blueprint purchased the conservation easement. Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Thompson could still develop the parcel and place one residence per 40 acres.

If Mr. Thompson did sale the property to Blueprint then the NFWFMD could reimburse Blueprint. Blueprint staff has not ruled out NFWFMD coming on board with their 50% after the fact. If the NFWFMD did not choose to participate, Blueprint staff would seek matching funds from The Florida Community Trust. There was further discussion of the details of the negotiations the NFWFMD and Mr. Thompson.

No motion needed information item only

Consent Items

Item #3.: August 30, 2004 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Theresa Heiker stated there was an issue with page 6 item 9 issues A. She stated that the minutes reflected that "Mr. Ed Ringe stated that Leon County's Lake Munson Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contract required Lake Munson be converted to XP-SWMM". Ms. Heiker further stated she could not remember how that came up but there was not a requirement for the Lake Munson model to be converted. Mr. Davis stated that they would strike this from the August 2004 minutes.

The motion was made by Michael Wright and seconded to accept the changes to the August 2004 TCC minutes. It passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion/Action

Item #4: Redefining the role the Technical Coordinating Committee

Maribel Nicholson-Chase stated because of the regulations of the Sunshine Law it is necessary to redefine the role of Blueprint's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). She stated that the bylaws would be changed to rules of procedure to more accurately reflect that the TCC is a fact-finding body to provide professional advice and technical expertise to the Blueprint 2000 staff director. She further stated that because of the Sunshine Laws members of the committee who worked together could not discuss any issues relating to Blueprint 2000 projects without the meeting being publicly noticed.

Michael Wright asked if the TCC would adopt the changes. Mr. Davis stated that the IA would adopt the redefining roles; this was for their recommendation only. He stated that the changes involved issues regarding the sunshine law; instead of being a voting body, the TCC would become advisory body only. Mr. Davis would chair all meetings, the committee would still make recommendations and comments to the IA and they would still receive minutes of the meetings, but there would be no voting. The motion was made and seconded. It passed unanimously.

Item#5 Capital Cascade Trail Master Plan

Mark Llewellyn, of the Genesis Group, presented the slideshow, from the November 30, 2004 public workshop, of the staff recommended concepts for each segment. Mr. Jim Davis discussed the public workshop which many people from the community attended. He stated that the attendees shared their ideas and opinions on the concepts, some were very definitive ideas for the trail or park but the majority liked all alternatives. The further stated that the community was adamant that that staff ensure *something* was done. Subsequent to that meeting Blueprint staff met with several community groups throughout the area to learn their positions as well. The information was reviewed and, where they could, Blueprint staff incorporated these desires and recommendations into one of the alternatives for each segment.

Jim Davis stated that they used the EECC report as their baseline document, for all segments. The project report for Franklin Boulevard, segment one, was more specific. He stated that the EECC struggled with section one the most, and they recommended a four lane divided highway with bike lanes and sidewalks on each side. He stated that staff saw a need for a continual trail network. They tried to see what they could do to create a multi-use trail. The compromise was the 10-ft inside lane and a 13-ft shared outside lane. He further stated that this concept doesn't have the four-foot necessary for dedicated bike lane; it does however, provide additional space for bikes, above and beyond what is there now, along with two box culverts, approximately 10 x 10 each. There are provisions for landscape easements along

edges, or at least landscaping for owners to plant at their will. A question was asked about the existing right of way, which is 80-ft.

Another question was asked about the shared trail 10-foot and 13-foot shared outside lane, and what they are trying to accommodate there. Mr. Davis stated that they are attempting to accommodate the commuter cyclist who might want to use the shared 13-foot lane and the recreational cyclist who will most likely want to use the multi-use trail. Also, he clarified that they must have four feet for a stripped bike lane. It was stated that a motorist would not likely share the lane with a cyclist; the motorist would instead move over to the next lane. It was asked if they were satisfied with not having a dedicated bike lane. Staff responded that while it would be preferred, the multi-use lane accommodates the need. Additionally, the shared outside lane provided a “cushion” for cyclists. Mr. Bright responded that as a previous bike/ped coordinator, it was clear that he would strive to have more width, but they are also trying to provide some green between the sidewalk and outside lane. Additionally, the community requested to have a wide trail on this segment, so they would have a consistent trail throughout. Mr. Bright stated that with parents pushing strollers, etc, it would become very congested, and that they could reduce the multi-use trail and add some additional feet to the road for bike lanes (which is what the bike/ped committee recommended). However, it was a matter of having only 80 feet of right of way and it was a trade-off, 13 feet vs. 10,11, or 12 feet and having a large sidewalk. Mr. Davis again added that this was a compromise.

Another issue was raised about landscaping between the curb and sidewalk and that nothing would grow in the 2.5 foot allotted, nothing would survive or be maintained. Additionally, the 9-foot median raised concerns and what happened with the median at the turn lanes. Mr. Davis added that the median “goes away” at that point. A question was asked if the multi-use trail was reduced to 8 foot, would that give the extra foot needed for each outside lane to have a stripped dedicated bike lane. Mr. Davis stated that Jennifer Carver (the MPO bike/ped Coordinator) would not argue over the bike lane issue because it was more than what was there currently.

A comment was made that multi-use trails were inherently less safe than bike lanes because of the intersection conflicts. It was added that this was because people do not pay attention- because people do not look to the right at intersections to make a right turn; but that is where cyclists maybe coming from. The intersections of the trail would be treated as a travel lane. It was stated that the bike/ped committee preferred the recommendation to the current situation, but they also wanted it “done right” and the bike trail and shared use lanes would not provide safety to those in the community who are “hard-core” travelers. Mr. Davis reiterated the bottom line was the trade-off between which lane would actually receive more use, a dedicated bike lane or the multi-use trail. Mr. Davis listed the many different uses the families in the area will most likely want to pursue along the trail: roller-blade’s, cycling, walking, etc, will be better provided for by the 10 foot trail, rather than to a dedicated bike lane. He added that the Capital Cascade Council enthusiastically supports the wider multi-use trail, and select members of the EECC preferred this concept and felt it was an

improvement on what they originally proposed. Mr. Davis stated his preference was that the multi-use should be 12 foot wide.

Mr. Michael Wright asked about the landscaping, and what the minimum width was for landscaping, for something to grow. The response was four foot was needed for a tree, but seven or eight foot was preferred. The goal for him was to have more landscaping, and therefore more separation between the curb and sidewalk. Mr. Wright stated that his preference would be five foot for landscaping on one side, with 0 on the other, to allow for things to grow and avoid a maintenance nightmare. It was added that if the 5 feet were on the trailside, it would make it more comfortable for users. However, purchasing right of way is not part of the equation, they have to stay within the 80 foot. It was also added that a new residential project was being constructed in the area, boosting the number of potential users.

A committee member brought up that having a trail was, and has been, a central tenet of this project, along with transportation, but that reducing the trail for “accessory” amenities like the dedicated bike lanes is not necessary. An example of Killearn cyclists was given; although it was certainly not ideal, people cycle there without any bike lanes. The idea to move the landscaping to one side completely was seconded, because people do not like being right up against traffic. The idea to take out the extra cushion of three feet on the outside lane was raised, but most supported leaving it at 13-foot, not widening to 14-foot. A question was asked on whether there was a gutter in the plan, the answer was no. There would be vertical storm sewer inlets along the way. It was added that flexible pavement was not ideal because the pavement would become eroded, creating potholes.

Additional details were discussed, but it was advised to steer clear of designing the Greenway in this meeting, to instead look at the overall picture. Safety issues were top priority. An issue was raised by Wayne Tedder on the language in the Comp Plan, requiring dedicated bike lanes, and if the multi-use trails will satisfy.

Right of way was looked at extensively by Blueprint, it was not affordable initially, and the cost has increased since then. Mr. Davis stated that approximately 10 million dollars would be needed to acquire additional right of way. The decision was made to reallocate the funds for downstream where it could be spent on more suitable water quality projects.

Theresa Heiker was concerned about the capture of storm water from the cross streets which have a substantial effect on the flooding, and would those plans create improvements. Ms. Heiker felt that after discussions with staff, a single box culvert would be sufficient to pass the flow of water on Franklin, and the second would be used to provide storage for the peak flows. Mr. Davis stated that was essentially correct, but that the second box culvert would provide some conveyance. Ms. Heiker’s concern was that the second culvert represented a storage facility that would have maintenance hazards due to the confined space, utility crossings and limited access. Her significant concern was putting storage of this type within this right of way. She believed there were other solutions that need to be considered. She was informed that these concerns could be addressed in the design process.

Mr. Davis noted there was substantial work to be completed regarding storm water issues. He reiterated that these were concepts only, and all the details will be worked out at a later design process. A committee member stated they were not ready to move with the concepts as they stood, the major comparative things that have done yet been done to answer questions on whether one culvert or two is needed. Tony Park added that he does not support storage in the box culverts. The question was asked approximately how much capacity we could get from one box culvert. Mr. Llewellyn stated his analyses show that a single box culvert could convey the 25-year storm water. It was suggested that not enough time has been allowed for iterative modeling analysis, for this specifically and in general.

It was suggested that perhaps it would be better to have a single 12 foot culvert rather than two 10-foot culverts to handle with a 30-year storm, after all, the biggest problem was flash flooding. Mr. Davis reminded the committee that staff started with essentially a blank piece of paper, and this was still preliminary work. This is the first step in a multi-step process.

A committee member stated that underground storage was NOT preferred. Mr. Llewellyn stated that there were limitations to any of the options; a special concern was flooding at South Monroe. Mr. Davis added that the ultimate solution was to rebuild Lake Leon and catch the water upfront, but he recognized that there were parameters.

It was stated that there was a lot of discussion between the Science Advisory Committee that perhaps a combination open ditch/box culvert was still possible, and that the Citizens Advisory Committee concurred with that. However, Mr. Davis said that it was unrealistic because of the turn lanes; the stream would have to be underground anyway. Mr. Davis felt that, because of the limited right of way, it was impossible to leave any of the stream open. Mr. Davis felt that this was not a good option due to aesthetics additionally trail users would be better served by landscaping than the preservation of the stream. A question was asked about a small state owned green piece on the concept, due to large quantities of green space, could this area could be used for residential space? The response was that the area was quite small, however, current urban development was occurring on smaller pieces of land.

Phil Maher stated that there had been discussion with the State of Florida, not about that piece of property, but about used of their property is segment 2 for storm water and accommodation for their parking. Mr. Llewellyn stated that this was right of way and not part of Management Services property.

Tony Park asked if Mr. Davis would take questions on each segments. Mr. Davis stated that he would.

Citizens to be heard

Sean McGlynn, representing himself and local residents (Segment 1)

Mr. McGlynn stated that he had live on Franklin Boulevard all his life, and his grandparents

before him. No one is more concerned about the flooding than him. He would like to see a permanent solution. The stream does not flood the road, it's the dip that floods the road (at Park and Franklin). If the culverts under the bridges were fixed, and the dip in the road, the stream could carry the flow of water. Other people have said that the solution lies beyond the basin; there is not a holding pond or retention pond or rate control anywhere in that stream valley. He said they needed storage at Leon and needed to start at the beginning. (He presented an article from the Feb 7, 2000 issue of the Tallahassee Democrat where it stated that the people of Franklin Boulevard would have a river-walk.) The stilling ponds should be at the beginning. He recommended everyone buy a copy of *Between Two Rivers* and read Julie Hauserman's essay, 'Florida's Lost Waterfall.'

Hilda Gilchrist, Landscape PE Arc. W C.O.T.P.W Engineering

Ms. Gilchrist stated that the existing 80-foot right away in red (see attached map) She stated for comparison, the multi-use trail on Blairstone road was eight feet. That is useable by families therefore the extra foot could be use on landscape She would like to see the separation on both sides. The issues that have been mentioned with the 60% median there is a alternative which means that curbs there that allow water to flow in the low point or water that swale trees could grow in a swale it would be more apparent this way having swales this would keep up with the characteristic please keep in mind the fact that this is a flooding area. So I would like for you to consider that in regards of the underground culvert systems, whatever size that might be, 12x12, 14x14 whatever it end up being 16x10 in the median I think the issue could be worked out in deed the if only way we could convey water which I agree would be the last resort and that in improvement, but to end up with under ground is there not a way to engineer the under ground culvert system faculty of cleaning, by taking the double culvert over and create a wall that's allows pedestrian to have control access much narrow culvert. so that is times up.

Ben Fusaro

Mr. Fusaro stated that he came up with the modified design and the concept that Mr. Davis was talking about with minor changes. The last separation of the first flush of water was where most of the toxins and pollution would be it would use pipes. They could be separated from the side the first flush could carry out flow through the pipes that stop the polluted water in to the ditch it's much easy to clean pipes that culverts, than dilution culverts. He did not care how large the box culverts were he felt it would not work. He suggested they leave the stream as it was. He further stated he did not think they needed turn lanes.

Mr. Davis responded they tried to come up with a comprised solution; this was not the perfect solution because segment one was the most difficult because it was such a constrained area. He further stated that Blueprint staff was concerned with the water flow in the box culverts. They would like to reduce the box culvert to a size that they think is the minimum that provided no options in the future. With divide out the whole road way again, we have not talk about is blocking street here.

Mr. Wright asked if the budget included utilities re-location. Mr. Davis stated that it did. Mark Llewellyn stated that all utilities would go under ground.

Ms. Linda Jamison, of the Big Bend Sierra Club, advocated for the stream also. She read a portion of their policy on flood plains, which is published nationally. "In flood protection, emphasis should be placed not on structural controls, but on floodplain management, including flood proofing ... and zoning for compatible uses to control future development. To maximize environmental benefits, floodplains should be utilized for wetlands, agriculture, parks, greenbelts, groundwater recharge, buffer zones for protection of in stream uses, and other uses compatible with the flood hazard. Structural devices should not be used where they would encourage development in floodplains." (Sierra Club Conservation policy on water can be found at <http://www.sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/water.asp>) Ms. Jamison further stated 50-80 % of the water in St. Augustine Branch comes from the 341 acres north of Tennessee Street. Understanding this is outside of Blueprint's boundaries, but it is imperative to address it in order to move forward in a viable fashion with plans for segment 1. Human interference destroyed the natural wetlands surrounding the old Lake Leon. Sierra Club advocates restoration of wetlands, as they are natural flood mitigates keeping excess water near the source of origin. Pervious surfaces need to be installed in that area to reduce the runoff load into St Augustine Branch. They hope that the time would be dedicated for a scientific search for an integrated solution, anything less would only be a band-aid. The article and essay were copied for distribution to the members.

Mr. Davis quickly reviewed the recommended concept for all segment.

Mr. Davis stated that staff met with the CAC and went through each of the segments. They had concerns with Segment one and did not recommend it. Their issue was that the solution must include storage and water treatment off site, to include Leon High School. The CAC thoroughly and completely endorse the staff recommendations.

Mr. Davis continued with segment two; this incorporated the desire citizens expressed the 2004 public workshop Mr. Wright asked what were the plans for the under-ground culvert. Mr. Davis stated there were no changes.

Theresa Heiker state that the there are some budget concerns. She stated that she didn't think that this was a project was solely funded by Blueprint and that it was her understanding that the community would be involved, the city, the county and the school board as well as other government entities would provide assistance. She further mentioned that there were also grants available. She stated that in the discussion of the water quality analysis she specifically requested that the TNDL concept be addressed. There was discussion of requirements of the EPA and well as other studies that were previously conduct that need to be addressed in the preferred concepts that were provided to the committee. Ms. Heiker stated that she would be uncomfortable recommending approval of this concept without this data being incorporated. There was lengthy discussion of the specific areas of concern.

Mr. John Buss stated that he agreed with Ms. Heiker; this should be transferred to segment three because it would be the under ground area. The committee felt that it was not ready for review. They need more information is not there to truly evaluate these concept.

Ms. Jamison expressed concern for the karst area on behalf of Sierra Club, with regards to the remediation site. She questioned how a sinkhole, for example, would be handled during the clean up process. Mr. Davis replied that Koren Taylor was the project manager for the City, which is the entity responsible for the remediation; she would be the person to elaborate on that scenario. He did state that he was aware of borings and attempts to identify areas that would be sensitive to that possibility. All groups involved with the remediation process would be sensitive to the possibility and exercise due diligence to ensure that does not happen. If it does, however, it would be repaired.

Hilda Gilchrist expressed more concern about the pedestrians she felt that they needed only one plaza and limited construction on the green space. She stated a site analysis should be performed to determine the “In” places that are pleasant to be in and preserve them. (Please see the attached article Tallahassee Democrat)

Ruth Horton, Railroad Square manager, accepted whatever needed to be done when the EECC put the budget together they did envision construction as segments 1,2,3,4. Blueprint recommendation was to build 2,3,1,4. Segment 4 would not be done anytime soon, but if funds came available they would proceed with segment 4, they support segment 2,3,4,1

This was our staff recommendation. Mr. Davis quoted: “ **the biggest enemies of a good plan was a perfect plan.**” Staff is trying to find the perfect plan. He stated if the TCC saw short falls help staff repair them instead of trying to find a way to kill the project. They needed to move it along. We do not need to study these for 10 years.

There was lengthy discussion of various water quality issues raised by Mr. John Buss, Ms. Theresa Heiker, Mr. Tony Park and various other members of the committee.

Michael Wright moved that based on the committee’s recommendation that concept was not ready to be forwarded to the Intergovernmental Agency until various technical questions were addressed. The motion was seconded. The segment was not approved

Item# 6 Blueprint 2000 Revised Master Plan

Phil Maher presented this item to the committee. Mr. Maher stated that the Master Plan Blueprint being presented was the propose master plan presented to the IA at their September 20, 2004.

A question was posed regarding available resources and the totals in the columns of the Master Plan. John Buss asked if all projects netted interest and how it was determined

whether to pay interest or not. Jim Davis explained that the IA approved a year ago, that if any entity received money early, interest was paid on that project.

With the varying directions and fiscal restraints, Mr. Maher stated is unable to incorporate all the recommendations without further guidance. There are number of conflicting issues that need to be resolved prior to further development of the master plan. The following are several of the questions that need to be resolved:

1. Is Capital Cascade Trail (segment 1 thru 4) a higher fund priority than completing Capital Circle from HWY 20 to Springhill Road? Is this segment of Capital Circle dependent upon additional external funding?
2. Should dollars be placed on all segments of the roadway or should the goal be completing as many segments of the roadway as possible at the expense of other segments?
3. For budget purposes should the 230-foot typical section with meandering sidewalks be incorporated in all segments of Capital Circle (see attachment 2)?
4. Is the adopted strategy of “dollars follow production” one that Blueprint should continue to pursue?
5. Should the sensitive land projects continue to be fully funded as currently presented?
6. Is it critical that all the additional storm water retrofit and greenways cost associated with Capital Circle Northwest and Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (\$ 22,968,656) coincide with the construction of the roadway? Are all or part of these retrofit and greenway funds available for reallocation to other like projects?
7. Are the City and County water quality funds remaining, after the \$10 million allocation each, available for relocation to other water quality projects?
8. Should funds currently slated for the construction of Hwy 90 to Hwy 20 be diverted to other projects anticipating SIS funding in the future?

Mr. Maher stated that based on the committee’s recommendation, the above questions need to be addressed by the IA before any further work was completed on the Master Plan. The committee noted this statement as a motion and it passed unanimously.

Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Tony Park, Vice Chairman, adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:10 pm