

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Friday, March 11, 2005
Ellis Building – Koger Center
9:00 am

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM.

Attendees: (TCC Members in Bold)

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Jim Davis | Myron Hayden | Jack Diestelhorst |
| David Bright | Jim Lee | Maribel Nicholson-Choice |
| Phil Maher | Richard Menasco | Mark Llewellyn |
| June O'Meara | Olu Sawyer | Doug Martin |
| Gabriel Menendez | John Kraynak | Bruce Richie |
| John Buss | Theresa Heiker | Wayne Tedder |
| Shelonda Gay | Debra Schiro | Jerry Oshesky |
| Tammy Peters | Ed Ringe | Ray Youmans |
| Angela Richardson | Jim Shepherd | |

I. Agenda Modifications

Phil Maher stated a revised copy of the January TCC minutes were distributed Wednesday, March 9, 2005; the original set did not include edits. John Buss asked if items were added from a previous tape or earlier meeting, specifically the Master Plan information. Mr. Maher explained that the Master Plan was summarized at the end of the January 21, 2005 meeting. He further stated that the information distributed and discussed was a revised Master Plan, which included a list of questions for the IA. The Committee recommended the IA address the issues prior to completion of the Master Plan. Mr. Buss also clarified, on behalf of Tony Parks that he was against *storage* in the boxed culverts not against the culverts themselves.

Mr. Buss further stated that Jim Davis's comment regarding the TCC trying to find ways to kill the project was taken out of context and he felt undue emphasis was placed on it.

II. Information Items

Item #1 - January 21, 2005 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

See agenda modifications.

Item #2 - Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study Status

Jim Shepherd, project manager for Capital Circle NW/SW (CCNW/SW), gave the report. HW Lochner is the consultant for the project. He explained that there are two parts to the project. The first part is the completion of the EPD&E study, completion of approximately 60% design plans, completion of the right-of-way (ROW) maps, and the submission of permits. This occurs within the first 24 months of the project. Part two

includes updates to the ROW maps and the approval of permits, which occurs during the 12 months following the 24 months. Mr. Shepherd indicated that the concept maps for the project were posted around the room. These maps showed the left, right and center concepts. He further explained that the maps were used in the PD&E Study to review and quantify impacts. He stated that the Alternatives Public Meeting was tentatively scheduled for May 2005. It would be conducted following direction from the CRTPA and the IA.

The proposed typical section for this project is similar to Capital Circle Southeast - 230' ROW, six-lanes, 36' median, and 5' and 10' sidewalks. Through Gum Swamp, a narrower typical section will be used to minimize the footprint/impacts. Several draft reports have been submitted including: geotechnical, traffic, environmental, etc. Copies of these reports have been provided to Bill Woolery, City of Tallahassee, and to Tony Parks or John Kraynak, Leon County.

Mr. Shepherd spoke of two innovative features being investigated for the project. The first innovative feature is the use of frontage roads at the north and south ends of the project to serve the businesses in those areas.

Wayne Tedder stated that Leon County recently rezoned some of the land in the north end of the project area from light industrial to residential, for an affordable housing development. Additionally, interest has been shown in a vested commercial plat, near Capital Circle south of Blountstown Highway, to turn it into a residential development. Mr. Shepherd stated he would coordinate with Mr. Tedder's office for additional details.

Gabe Menendez asked if the frontage road would be one-way or two-way. Mr. Shepherd stated two-way. Mr. Menendez asked why a frontage road was being considered on an arterial road. Mr. Shepherd responded that it would help traffic flow by minimizing access points. By concentrating traffic at specific median openings, it would also be conducive to adding signals in the future, when traffic demands become high enough. Jim Davis reminded the committee that frontage roads were part of the Blueprint concept.

Mr. Menendez stated that, for two-way operation, the separation between access points is vital. Otherwise, control of one intersection affects the control of the next intersection. This creates problems with congestion, particularly on side roads where the access points are in close proximity. Mr. Shepherd stated that the frontage road alternatives would be presented at the May 2005 Public Meeting. He stated that the construction of frontage roads could be used by business owners in potential claims of reverse condemnation. Blueprint 2000 staff has planned one-on-one meetings with the business owners following the public meeting to try to gain their support.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the second innovative feature involves potential improvements to Gum Swamp. Both short and long bridge concepts are being evaluated. Also, the possibility of redirecting the flow from Gum Creek into the swamp has been discussed. This would restore the swamp to a more natural setting. Regional ponds with park-like amenities are also under consideration.

Mr. Tedder stated that the area north of Orange Avenue and east of Capital Circle was labeled as an Educational Quadrant. To his knowledge, local and state government own all of the property in that quadrant. In his opinion, this intersection will become significant in the future. The intersection could become a viable direct access to the quadrant and could tie into an east/west corridor. Mr. Davis noted that was in the alternative considerations for CCSW. He also reminded the committee that based on Blueprint 2000's agreement with the Federal Highway Administration; the PD&E Study limits were required to extend to Orange Avenue. However, Blueprint 2000 staff planned to phase construct only to Blountstown Highway during this project. The in-house study currently being conducted for Capital Circle SW is an attempt to eliminate some of the alternatives that have been proposed to begin at Blountstown Highway. Mr. Davis also reminded the committee that at the January 21, 2005 IA meeting the Board said "...build that road down to Orange Avenue intersection" and they re-prioritized funding to ensure it would happen.

Mr. Davis called for questions or items of discussion regarding CCNW/SW; there were none.

III. Presentations/Discussions

Item # 3 - Scope of Services for Capital Circle SE (Tram to Woodville)

Doug Martin, project manager for Capital Circle Southeast (Tram to Woodville) (CCSE-T/W) stated that advertisements for design firms were on the street. The Scope of Services was derived from the standard scope of service process currently in use by the Florida Department of Transportation. The primary modifications to the Scopes of Services was to update the Agency name and specific issues related to delivery requirements and aesthetic design requirements to concur with the Multimodal Design Guidelines for Blueprint 2000. TCC members were invited to comment or offer suggestions.

Mr. Menendez noted that on page A-15, section 2.4 Permits, it was recognized that segment of CCSE runs through both the City and County and the request for delegation of authority, from one entity to another, be pursued. He did not feel that should be included in the Scope of Services but should be determined ahead of time. Mr. Tedder suggested it might have been generic language because he thought the whole segment was County property. Mr. Davis stated that the City of Tallahassee owned land at the intersection of CCSE and Woodville Highway. Following a discussion of possibilities he further stated the permitting agency would sort that out ahead of time.

Mr. Menendez also noted that on page A-43, section 8.2 Complete Permit Involvement Form, the Scope refers to permitting through City of Tallahassee. The decision regarding section 2.4 should be consistent and follow through in section 8.2.

Mr. Davis stated that if there were no further comments or objections the Committee members present were comfortable moving forward with the Scope, with the exceptions

of the two items mentioned above. Mr. Davis clarified that a quorum necessary for this decision because the Committee was not voting but simply reaching consensus. He further added that the Utility work was absent from the Scope due to the JPA process and would be included when complete.

Mr. Tedder commented on the ROW acquisitions at the intersection of Tram Road and CCSE; Comp Plans have been filed with the County that would change the land use designation for the southeast corner from rural to mixed use. This could significantly increase ROW cost for those parcels. The public hearing process would begin April 1, 2005 and possibly be effective by the end of the year. Mr. Tedder recommended Blueprint closely review the appraisals to determine what information they were based on. He further stated that County staff reviewed the area approximately one year ago; there was a rural enclave in that area. County staff intended to withdraw previously submitted amendments to not escalate the ROW cost of the residential parcels. Furthermore land use patterns should not be reviewed until the roadway project was complete. Mr. Bright asked if ROW acquisition would affect rezoning. Mr. Tedder stated if the land met the specified criteria the County Commission would be in an awkward position to approve. However, the Comp Plan Policy includes protection measures along that corridor that could be used to Blueprint's advantage. Due to previous and current efforts in preservation it could be used to not necessarily change the designation of the land. Debra Schiro asked if the residents were aware of the proposed changes to that intersection. Mr. Davis stated he would be surprised if they were not aware and that it was possibly a tactic to increase the purchase price. Mr. Davis asked Ray Youmans to clarify if the 230' corridor preservation extended through that intersection. Mr. Youmans confirmed that it did along Capital Circle but was less along Tram Road. He also acknowledged that there are 'corner clips' included therefore it was a significant amount of land. Mr. Davis established that Mr. Youmans would contact the landowners the week of March 21, 2005.

Item #4 - Capital Cascade Trail Status

David Bright stated that following the extensive discussions of Capital Cascade Trail at the January 2005 CAC and TCC meetings, the resulting agenda item which was moved forward to the IA did not request any action; it was solely to apprise them of the discussions at the CAC meeting and the significant issues from the TCC meeting, and the fact that staff was working toward a resolution. However, the Board did provide clear direction on all four segments by choosing one concept for each and revised the proposed construction phasing. The Board's direction is described below.

Segment 1 (Franklin Boulevard): The IA recommended the 4-lane roadway concept with underground box culvert conveyance. They indicated they wanted additional study by the City and County regarding supplementary off site storage capacity (Leon High School), and indicated the issues of the TCC related to stormwater velocities, box culvert used for storage, etc. needed to be addressed.

Segment 2 (Cascade Park): The IA recommended Concept E, with as flat and green a field as possible in the lower segment (versus the amphitheater); they

noted some concerns with putting the holding pond on the site of the contamination, and requested staff review this issue. Staff noted that the pond is to be lined and EPA may have a say in this issue.

Segment 3 (FAMU Way/Gaines Street) and Segment 4 (Gamble Street south to Munson Slough): The IA passed staff recommendation (Concept A and Concept C, respectively.)

Project Phasing: The IA passed a motion to move Segment 4 construction into Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. They also accepted a construction sequence of Segment 2, 4, 3, and 1. Additionally they stated, "Capital Circle NW/SW, I-10 to the Airport, is to be funded before Segment 1 of the Capital Cascade Trail."

As a result of several meetings with Blueprint staff, Genesis Group and the appointed TCC subcommittee (John Buss, Theresa Heiker, and John Kraynak (Rodney Cassidy did not attend)) to help resolve the concerns and provide direction on completion of the study, Genesis Group submitted documentation on the stormwater re-modeling for all four segments of Capital Cascade Trail. John Buss asked for clarification regarding the IA's selection of one concept for each segment. Mr. Bright confirmed that, and Mr. Davis stated the minutes from the January 31, 2005 IA meeting would soon be available detailing their discussion. Mr. Bright further stated the Board elected to implement the 4-lane option for Franklin Boulevard, but did not discuss in detail whether one or two box culverts would be used. They addressed more of the plan view versus what was beneath the road. It was noted that the issue with the two-box culverts was effectively determined by the County's position of not desiring to maintain a box culvert used for stormwater storage, as Tony Park stated at the January 21, 2005 meeting. Mr. Davis clarified that the IA approved a general concept subject to the additional engineering necessary to validate it. The IA also said they did not want to see Blueprint return to square one, to question each of the original EECC recommendations. Mr. Maher added that they also said not to look outside Blueprint's borders. Mr. Buss felt that Segment 3 was still weak or utilitarian, and for the record he would not campaign against the project, but would continue to voice his opinion on Segment 3 when asked. Mr. Menendez questioned if pond locations were identified and "locked down" by the IA. Mr. Davis stated no but staff should protect Railroad Square, they also agreed to underground culverts in front of the power sub-station. Mr. Davis further stated enough latitude remained to make the necessary modifications as defined by the engineering and stormwater requirements. He also felt the Board supported the overall concept.

Mr. Buss stated the Interlocal Agreement provides a process for making changes for projects listed in the Agreement. He asked where the Capital Cascade Trail project was in the list, by segment or totality? Mr. Maher stated the project list was broken into 2 tiers. Mr. Davis reminded Mr. Buss that a super-majority vote was required in this scenario to move a project from Tier 2 to Tier 1. Mr. Buss understood, but was seeking clarification that Segments 1, 2, and 3 construction were Tier 1 with Segment 4 as Tier 2. Blueprint staff clarified the statement by confirming that only the construction of Segment Four was Tier 2, and the right of way was currently in Tier 1.

Additionally, Mr. Buss asked if Segment 4 was included with the original engineering. Mr. Davis stated yes, from the concept development standpoint; since it was not anticipated to be constructed at that time it was decided that borings would be minimal. With the turn of events at the January 31, 2005 IA meeting, staff now needs more detail on Segment 4. Mr. Buss agreed that was necessary but wanted to ensure a factual approach that would not add un-attributable costs to the project. He further stated it seemed some of the work described in the Genesis letter was accounted for in the current contract. The PD&E included all four segments; he did not want Genesis to duplicate efforts given budget pressures. Mr. Bright acknowledged several sites were included possibly exceeding what was in the scope, particularly for archeological and historical data. Staff had not anticipated that much geotechnical work on Segment 4 so early in the process but nothing had been approved yet. Mr. Davis stated that staff would confirm with that with the contractor. Mr. Bright also mentioned the timing of the requests for additional geotechnical, archeological and historical study, and the possibility of postponing that work to early in the design phase. Mr. Buss stated he was originally surprised by the IA's decision but upon reflection realized that was the right way to proceed given the water quality issues faced by both the City and County.

Mr. Buss had some questions about side street storm sewer connections along Franklin Boulevard. He wanted to clarify that connections would be completed and inlets included but the project would not include side street storm sewer improvements. Mark Llewellyn stated the only exception would be at Park Avenue due to the likely reconstruction of the intersection for turn lanes. Theresa Heiker noted she had noticed problems along side streets due to insufficient captures. The issue raised was specific to inlet capture prior to Franklin Boulevard to prevent ponding in the new cross sections. Not simply the connection to the side streets but the assurance of stormwater capture ahead of Franklin Boulevard, possibly adding additional structures. Mr. Buss stated he understood her point but did not think that was part of the project. Ms. Heiker felt it should be included otherwise the ponding issue would not be resolved. Mr. Llewellyn interjected that Genesis staff would not attempt to model those inlets but once the project was in design phase it could possibly become a scope item that the TCC would need to address. Mr. Bright explained that every intersection would be redesigned and likely reconstructed during the construction of Segment 1 and that inlets could be provided possibly 25 feet or so prior to Franklin Boulevard.

Mr. Menendez mentioned the large transition area between College and Park Avenues. Mr. Davis stated it was considered in the scope for investigation during the design phase but at that time no decision had been made.

Mr. Buss reiterated that Segment 3 was too utilitarian, that it needed more surface water but he would accept the majority rule. He asked Mr. Llewellyn to clarify how significantly altered from the recommended direction was the alternatives analysis modeling sequence (page 9, section 5.d). Mr. Llewellyn stated it was the results of discussions with Jodie Cahoon and the meeting of the subcommittee. Mr. Buss clarified regarding Blueprint staffs' responsibility for compliance with scope requirement, (page 8

section 5.c) he was not “nit-picking” but felt that major parts of the Scope of Work had not been completed as of the January 21, 2005 meeting, in fact major gaps continued in subsequent meetings, i.e. TMDL regulations.

Theresa Heiker clarified that the sub-committee did not meet as a body. She noted that City Environmental staff was not listed as having met with Genesis staff. Mr. Llewellyn stated that City Environmental staff did not participate in the meetings despite the attempts to do so. Ms. Heiker wanted it noted that although Rodney Cassidy was a sub-committee member he did not participate in the meetings. John Buss reminded the committee that was during the City’s computer virus disaster and the meeting request or email may have been thwarted.

Ms. Heiker continued to ask questions regarding the design approach letter from Genesis Group, beginning with page 1, section 1.a regarding the request from the City to analyze the flows without the current restriction at Tennessee Street. Given that Tennessee is an FDOT roadway, have they been contacted or is it simply informational? Mr. Llewellyn responded that it was requested of Jodie Cahoon and was informational only. It was prospective of what might happen down stream if FDOT opened up those boxed culverts in the future. Ms. Heiker stated that during the EECC’s review of the project scope, they specifically discussed not looking at increasing the flow under Tennessee Street. John Buss stated that was not what the project was intending to do but merely to see what might happen to the flow if FDOT opened up the culverts. He further stated that facts were necessary to deny a permit request and now, during the modeling process, was the time to learn.

Jim Davis stated one of the ancillary potential benefits was to reduce frequency of flooding in the parking lot of Leon High School, which is occasionally caused by water backing up on Franklin. In the past there were discussion of increasing the size of the inlet on the north side of Mahan Drive when the stormwater system was capable of accepting it downstream. Is that in contradiction of what you just said? Ms. Heiker stated that unless different results have been shown through the modeling, currently there was too much water in the system and it was already incapable of handling the flows it was receiving. The consideration of the possibility of adding even more water to a system that is drastically over tasked is not something that should be given more than an acknowledgement that the alternative was ruled out. Mr. Buss stated that was not in the context of the request it was merely to quantify what the potential was, i.e. the system may need 30 acre feet more storage if the culvert under Tennessee was opened. It provided the information necessary to impede the ideas before they manifested into reality. Ms. Heiker stated if that was the intent it should have been listed with the bullet on Leon High School (LHS) flooding not with Franklin Boulevard box culvert. It showed a potential grading plan which, referencing the flooding at LHS, implies above grade storage would be provided on the athletic fields and would allow them to temporarily inundate. That is the only identified potential resolution to flooding at LHS. If the consideration was alternative storage to remove that, the consideration of the removal of the obstruction at Mahan should be listed as a LHS alternative as well. Mr. Llewellyn stated the hydraulic grade line south of Tennessee Street plus the box culvert

had a significant reduction in flooding at LHS. The combination of improvements of Franklin Boulevard and improvements on LHS would significantly reduce the flooding of the parking lots, without improvements under Tennessee Street. Theresa Heiker stated that based on Mr. Buss's comment of Ms. Cahoon's idea of using the removal of the flow restriction to quantify the structural impact on LHS consideration should only be referenced with relation to LHS flooding not the overall impact. Mr. Buss disagreed and suggested the addition of a sentence stating the purpose was to explain the constraints and quantify the impact that would be created, should that ever be proposed. He continued that it was not an attempt to resolve flooding problems at LHS and would provide an explanation as to why staff could not. Furthermore he did not want to see the City "roped" into expanding the project to solve the flooding problems at Leon. The problems at Leon are unfortunate, however, like the IA stated, there must be limits to projects. Ms. Heiker continued to argue that the entire bullet should be moved to section 1.b on Leon High School flooding.

Mr. Davis stated that the IA wished for dialog to continue between the City, County and the School Board to address issues at Leon High School and the "Segment Zero" concept. Ms. Heiker stated that there was an agenda item on the March 22, 2005 County Commission meeting to provide formal direction to County staff. Mr. Llewellyn asked for clarification from the committee regarding where they would like that bullet. Ms. Heiker stated that if it was apparently only relative to the LHS flooding, it made sense to include it in the discussion of LHS, however it was clearly extraneous to the project. Mr. Davis requested a copy of the County Commission Agenda when completed. Ms. Heiker agreed.

Regarding velocities in Segment 2 (page 3, section 2.a), greater than three feet per second (fps) in the primary channel would create a poor habitat issue. In those areas where three fps was occurring, there should be an expansion of the channel as a refuge for any macro invertebrates or any other species, or the locations should not be so extensive that it created a total loss of habitat. She did not expect to achieve nor was she seeking an across the board reduction below three fps.

Ms. Heiker continued with page 4, section 2.b regarding escape travel time evaluation for children. The pond grading would be accomplished in such a way as to direct anyone to a safe point during flood events rather than allow them to become isolated or forced to travel unsafe areas to exit the trail; flash flood warning signage and lights should also be included. City Parks and Recreation Department will maintain the trail, therefore the City Risk Manager should evaluate the associated risks. Mr. Buss interjected that the City Risk Manager should not adopt final authority because it would be a legal issue the attorney' must determine. Ms. Heiker suggested Mr. Llewellyn add a statement to that effect as a reminder to himself.

Regarding Segment 2 in general, Ms. Heiker noted that she and Mr. Llewellyn discussed the impact of the 20-foot water level rise and the potential for catastrophic failure impacting Monroe Street. At the southwest corner there was no substantial grade difference. There needed to be either fill or a wall because the roadway is at the level of

the channel crossing and would be subject to the full 20-foot rise. She asked if that was to be addressed in the grading plan? Mr. Llewellyn acknowledged that was identified in the grading plan. Ms. Heiker requested specifics regarding the southwest corner be added as a special concern, to the second bullet. Mr. Llewellyn agreed.

Ms. Heiker asked if CSX had been contacted regarding the modification of flows underneath their railroad. Mr. Llewellyn stated several documents have been submitted to CSX but currently communication has dwindled, however, he anticipated it escalating with the remediation. Ms. Heiker asked him to add that as a reference point.

Ms. Heiker sought clarification regarding the phrasing of “serious flooding” in Segment 3 (page 5 section 3.a) which was defined as “intended to include both nuisance and hazard flooding.” She asked if he was referring to both depth and duration? Was he supplementing the design approaches given to Genesis or simply asking them to quantify. John Buss replied that the scope of work stated to tabulate the depth of flooding on properties. Mr. Llewellyn stated it was an attempt to clarify structural versus yard flooding and the duration of the flooding. Mr. Buss indicated it might have stemmed from a request for tables, which showed depth of flooding, not merely that it flooded. Ed Ringe stated the scope also required staff to identify the duration of the flood. Ms. Heiker felt that was not clearly stated because the original design approach discussion was of lateral extent of serious flooding. It should be clarified that all flooding would be noted on the flood plain maps. She also assumed the intent of mapping or tabulation provided the priority or to what extent improvements would be constructed in Segment 3. The original statement is maximum extent possible. Mr. Llewellyn stated it was an attempt to identify the structures that flooded and were being acquired, as well as those which are beyond the proposed improvements. If they currently flood but were being acquired or if there was a stormwater facility proposed there also it was no longer an issue. Mr. Buss stated it was a relative way of looking at the alternatives.

Mr. Davis noted, given that the amount of the time that had been spent on the issue and that the majority of TCC attendees did not have input, he asked if it would be more suitable for a subsequent meeting of a sub-committee of the TCC to review and comment on the issues. Ms. Heiker questioned “isn’t it your intent to move forward?” Mr. Bright stated a few items remained; they could be completed, allow some people to return to work and the issues in the Genesis letter could be discussed in detail. Mr. Davis stated that would be the better approach if everyone were agreeable. The committee unanimously agreed.

Ms. Heiker continued that she needed Gabe Menendez to remain for a discussion regarding Segment 3. The City indicated a desire to review the ability to utilize the capacity being provided in Segment 3 for water quality enhancements for adjacent projects. She asked if it was intended to serve as the water quality facility for Gaines Street, Pinellas Street, Jackson Bluff Road and FAMU Way? Mr. Buss stated that might be described incorrectly, it was the result of Franklin Boulevard not being included. Mr. Llewellyn’s statement was made to increase the pervious area and would have to be mitigated off-line in a separate treatment facility. Additionally, projects adjacent to the

Capital Cascade Trail area could utilize those surfaces also. Mr. Buss stated if it included “outside” money that might be possible, however, that was not open for discussion because they said it could not be used for Capital Cascade improvements let alone adjacent projects.

Ms. Heiker asked at January 21, 2005 meeting where the treatment capacity would be provided for the new roadway. Her question was not answered to her satisfaction; furthermore, she felt Blueprint staff had the ability to determine the outcome prior to development of the project. All roadway improvements, which were being considered, would affect Segment 3, which was why she kept raising the question. Mr. Buss stated, based on his numbers, there was no excess capacity and if the City of Tallahassee decided to, with FAMU, expand one of the facilities in Segment Three it might be allocated to FAMU. If it was for the roadway it might be allocated for the roadway but for now the projects Blueprint was funding was not allocated to the adjacent projects. Ms. Heiker stated that was why she was concerned by the additional direction given to the consultant. Her understanding of the intent was improvements in the corridor were for enhancement of existing conditions and retrofit of existing facilities, which were not currently treated. She further stated there was no discussion of the capacity being used for another purpose and how the Genesis letter states, “uses this capacity being utilized in this system as enhancement to adjacent projects” was her point of objection. Mr. Buss agreed and asked if it could be phrased more clearly. However, he did not want it to obligate Blueprint to create another pond for treatment of the water from Franklin Boulevard when they were already providing additional capacity to retrofit the community. Dialog to that extent needed to occur with Florida Department of Environmental Protection staff as it was in no way intended to provide additional capacity for FAMU or adjacent street projects. Gabe Menendez interjected it was not to preclude that possibility in the future if FAMU contributed funding.

Mr. Davis stated it was to our advantage, if it made sound business sense, to expand existing projects for future development on someone else’s nickel. Mr. Menendez stated that with FAMU Way adjacent to Segment 3, portions of FAMU would be accommodated by the very nature of the design. If some of the areas or ponds needed to be expanded so be it. Ms. Heiker felt that was how it should be stated in the correspondence from Genesis. Mr. Davis, speaking directly to Ms. Heiker, stated that Blueprint would not pay for FAMU Way extension stormwater requirements. Blueprint would be receptive to modification of existing plans if the City or FAMU provided funding, similar to the agreement regarding utilities on Capital Circle Southeast. Ms. Heiker agreed and further stated if it was intended to address the impacts of Franklin Boulevard it should have been noted within Segment 1. As she understood it, Franklin Boulevard was to be attenuated in Segment 2, however, the Genesis correspondence states attenuation would be in Segment 3. Mr. Llewellyn stated he would change the language of the letter from “adjacent projects” to “Franklin Boulevard” and move it up to Segment 1. Ms. Heiker continued: during the original scoping decisions, discussions of improving Franklin Boulevard would result in a need for treatment capacity at Cascade Park. If Cascade Segment 2 was not the point that would provide offsetting mitigation then it would move it to Segment 3. Mr. Davis stated again the issue could be resolved in

a sidebar. Ms. Heiker agreed yet continued that utilization of capacity would be based on expansion at the expense of the requesting entity. Mr. Davis stated that was clear all along.

Wayne Tedder wanted to ensure there was a live emphasis on the final design of Segment 3 between FAMU Way and Gaines Street, with the quality of that roadway being integrated as a greenway not merely a drainage facility. Mr. Davis clarified that he was referring to the FAMU Way extension. Mr. Tedder stated the City had presented concepts to the FAMU Board of Directors carrying forward the Blueprint vision that it would be an attractive waterway with high quality design. Mr. Llewellyn further clarified for Mr. Davis that Mr. Tedder was referring to the greenway adjacent to FAMU Way.

Mr. Davis reminded the Committee that FAMU Way was a City project not funded by Blueprint and it was reflected on the concept maps only to acknowledge it was being proposed. There were also efficiencies to Blueprint designing and constructing the conveyance concurrent with the City project. Mr. Bright stated if all entities worked together closely the opportunities for jointly obtaining the needed ROW would greatly improve. If Blueprint went about it singularly the priority would be for a stormwater conveyance system. However with everyone working closely together the possibility of acquiring enough ROW to include the sidewalk, trail and greenspace would exist. Mr. Menendez stated he felt Mr. Tedder's point was as Blueprint moved forward not to do anything that would preclude the achievement of the vision of including the FAMU Way extension. Mr. Davis fully agreed.

Mr. Tedder further stated he was not opposed to the joint bicycle/pedestrian facilities along Franklin Boulevard, and in fact at the January TCC meeting he provided comp plan language that focused on those facilities. He wanted to ensure the recommendations were integrated into the downtown connectivity plan. Mr. Bright discussed changes Mr. Llewellyn made to the cross-section for Segment 1 which included the joint facilities in addition to other recommendation from the January TCC meeting. Mr. Buss stated that the focus of the CCT project was never to improve bicycle traffic along Franklin Boulevard but to create a scenic roadway and trail system. Motorists must learn to slow down through the five blocks of the joint-use facility or take a different route. He did not support elimination of greenspace to include two bike lanes. Mr. Davis stated he would consider another alternative and as everyone present knew, the bicycle/pedestrian community was a vocal group, however the Board would make the final decision and in his opinion felt they would agree with Mr. Buss. Mr. Buss agreed.

Ms. Heiker asked for a clarification regarding open versus closed conveyance near FAMU Way east on M.L. King, and on the description of reinforced side banks. Mr. Llewellyn stated it was merely an alternative that was up for review. Mr. Tedder expressed concern that "reinforced" (concrete with guard rails) side banks were contrary to the vision of a greenway. Mr. Buss stated there were many possibilities for architectural side banks therefore it should not be ruled out. Mr. Buss also reminded the committee that some community organizations and residents felt Segment 3 was too

utilitarian. Mr. Llewellyn stated there was little ROW available along FAMU Way and Genesis staff was trying to identify what that cross section could look like. Mr. Tedder suggested working with FAMU for additional land. Mr. Bright interjected that Blueprint staff had spoken to FAMU officials repeatedly and they were not interested. There were multiple discussions regarding benefits to both sides but it was not progressing. Mr. Davis stated the Blueprint staff would continue dialog with FAMU.

Item #5 - Addition of the Construction of the Segment 4 of Cascades Trail into Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program

As noted in the agenda, the IA voted to move the construction of Segment 4 into Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. Segment 4 was initially approved for right-of-way acquisition only in Tier 1. As a result, staff was developing a scope for additional archeological/historical resources services and additional geotechnical services to obtain the information to evaluate pond locations, karst potential and historic/cultural impacts, etc within Segment 4, as well as some additional information on Segment 3. Public hearings on the Segment 4 revision will be held at upcoming City and County Commission meetings as well as a public hearing before the Board takes up the issue for a super-majority vote at the May 16, 2005 IA meeting. As part of the requirements of the Interlocal Agreement the TCC must submit comments regarding the issue.

Ms. Heiker asked where the funding was coming from. Mr. Davis stated the funding was reallocated from Segment 1, the reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard, to fund the stormwater ponds in Segment 4. Mr. Tedder stated he concurred. Ms. Heiker asked if Segment 1 was moving to Tier 2. Phil Maher stated no; when additional dollars became available Segment 1 would be funded. Gabe Menendez stated he understood it to mean that construction of Segment 1 was the lowest priority of the four segments. Mr. Davis confirmed he was correct. He further stated Segment 1 was a budgetary issue within tier 1, however, Segment 4 construction was in actuality the movement of a project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 which required a super-majority vote provisions be implemented. Which, as Mr. Bright stated, required recommendations from the TCC, CAC, two public hearings and the super-majority vote of the Board itself. Having said that, his question of the TCC was were there any objections to the movement of Segment 4 construction to from Tier 2 to Tier 1. Ms. Heiker asked what fiscal impacts it would have. Mr. Maher stated that the IA identified priorities and offered direction to staff for the completion of those priorities, mainly Capital Cascade and Capital Circle improvements from I-10 to Orange Avenue. Mr. Maher continued, they additionally wanted to keep the Sensitive Lands and Water Quality issues of the City and County intact. Mr. Davis stated the fiscal impacts would have to be reviewed further, but that was a Master Plan issue. Returning to the issue at hand, he asked again if any committee member objected to the moving of Segment 4 construction to Tier 1. Barring any objections he stated he would assume the committee had consensus.

Mr. Buss stated he wanted the opportunity to speak in support of the move and express for the record which members supported it too. He further stated the transportation issues would eventually be corrected but he fully supported the move based on the relative stormwater problems to residents in the county down stream. Another committee

member agreed with Mr. Buss and expressed similar reasoning for support. Mr. Davis asked if they could say they enthusiastically supported it. Ms. Heiker stated no because when the tiers were originally established there was not a relative benefit associated with the project but a realization of funding constraints and the impacts. She felt the committees and board were not considering what they were giving up to move Segment 4 construction to Tier 1. She was also apprehensive regarding the IA's elimination of stormwater enhancements that were originally intended to be provided with the widening of Capital Circle. She felt that while there were excellent benefits to moving Segment 4 construction up, if they were to lose additional enhancements associated with the transportation projects currently under contract then nothing would be gained. She could not categorically support that decision.

Mr. Buss stated he understood it was funding for Segment 1 that it being given up not what would enhance stormwater out on Capital Circle. Mr. Maher stated the IA directed staff to use Segment 1 funding for Segment 4 construction, and speaking simultaneously, the Board did move funding for enhanced stormwater in the two Capital Circle NW projects to the improvements of Capital Circle, I-10 to Orange Avenue. Ms. Heiker stated her concern lay in the shifting of funds so it appeared as a gain but was actually a loss for another project and that the project which lost funding would fall through the cracks. Mr. Menendez asked if staff were still working within the original budget of Capital Cascades; Blueprint staff confirmed that. Therefore, he continued no money was reallocated from Capital Cascade to Capital Circle projects. Ms. Heiker stated that staff was removing the stormwater retrofit related to Capital Circle. Mr. Maher stated that was a separate issue from the agenda item being discussed. Ms. Heiker further stated she could not categorically support the 2, 4, 3, 1 ordering without seeing what impacts would be to the other projects; other systems that were affected by existing stormwater discharges that would not be addressed because of the shuffling of funds.

Mr. Davis clarified that the IA considered the projects independently. Within the Capital Cascade Trail project the Board directed the sales tax revenue funding, which had been allocated for Segment 1, be moved to the construction of Segment 4. Furthermore, the budget for Capital Circle Northwest improvements was not reduced, the Board simply reallocated the funding within that project by moving the stormwater retrofit dollars to the construction of the previously un-funded segment from Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue. The amount of money available did not change, no projects were eliminated, no portion of any project was eliminated...one new project was added to construction. The money stayed the same with some reallocation. That was the net result the construction of Segment 1 was subject to additional funding coming available. Stormwater retrofit for CCNW was not eliminated as a Tier 1 project but was also subject to additional funding coming available.

Ms. Heiker asked if the revised fiscal considerations would be available at the time of adoption of the recommendation. Mr. Maher stated the Master Plan would use the existing funding at that particular time and staff would work through the priorities the Board established. The IA would be presented with Blueprint's operating and capital

budgets and the Master Plan at the May 16, 2005 meeting. Mr. Davis stated the TCC would have the opportunity to review those documents prior to that meeting.

Mr. Buss asked Ms. Heiker if it was safe to say she did not oppose construction of Segment 4 over Segment 1 in the Capital Cascade project but did not support the IA's decision to eliminate the enhanced stormwater funding in support of building more roadways in the Capital Circle NW project. Would it cure her objection if funding was moved from Capital Cascade to Capital Circle NW stormwater retrofit? Ms. Heiker stated her concern was of the original scheduling of the improvements were contrary to best practices and now she felt staff was "hop/skipping." For the project to proceed in a methodical, reasonable manner it should be 4,3,2,1 otherwise there would be no long-term benefits. Mr. Menendez reminded her that the phasing was 2,4,3,1 due to the remediation project at Cascade Park. It was fiscally responsible, he continued, to begin with Segment 2 then proceed to 4, 3, and 1 as best practice. Ms. Heiker stated her sole concern was in moving Segment 4 construction to Tier 1 without reviewing the impact of projects already in Tier 1, begged the question of, "were we still holding to the Capital Cascade budget as it was originally laid out?" Mr. Maher stated the original budget for Capital Cascade Trail was approximately \$70 million; currently it was approximately \$150 million. Ms. Heiker stated as long as the Intergovernmental Agency has taken the position that the project in its entirety should be constructed not just "get what we can get" with the money that has been allocated she was comfortable. Mr. Davis stated that was never the case. When staff brought the revised budget of approximately \$150 million the Board accepted it. They never said you only have X dollars, do the best you can. In fact, in reviewing the Master Plan the project was fully funded with the exception of Segment 4 at the expense of segments of Capital Circle which had no funding whatsoever. Ms. Heiker stated she felt better.

Mr. Davis stated again the assumption of support of the committee, specifically strong support by John Buss and informed consent with minor dissention opinion from Theresa Hiker regarding fiscal ramifications. This was taken as a true statement with no objections form the committee.

Mr. Bright asked the committee to review page 9 of the communication from Genesis group regarding the storm-event modeling. As it stood the storm event modeling scope called for 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100-year frequencies, and resulted in 84 model runs/sets of data. As a layman in the issue, it seemed an extraordinary amount of data to review. Knowing the accuracy of the transportation model, he questioned what benefit would the 84 model runs serve, especially given the direction by the IA to a preferred concept for each of the four segments. Mr. Bright further stated he would like to reduce the model runs to a number all members felt to be an acceptable, necessary amount of data for permitting, FEMA and FDOT issues. Some of the run combinations are of concepts staff did not anticipate returning to the table. Could the 5 and 10 year storm events be eliminated? Add a 50 year event as needed for DOT, maybe?

Ms. Heiker asked what was in the original scope, stating she thought it was the critical duration, 25 and 100. Mr. Llewellyn stated was 5, 25, 50 and 100 years for three

alternatives. Mr. Buss stated that with six storms and three alternatives it was only 18 models over four segments but Mark Llewellyn clarified that it was the sequencing that was driving the number up. Mr. Llewellyn agreed. Mr. Buss suggested reviewing "what would probably happen." Mr. Davis agreed it was a better idea. Mr. Buss clarified he was not suggesting which to eliminate but it should be a sidebar for a technical meeting and should be deferred to the sub-committee. Mr. Davis asked if the subject could be deferred to them? Mr. Llewellyn and Mr. Bright stated it was fine but asked for it to occur following the TCC meeting or the extreme near future as the information was needed soon to meet the report production date. Mr. Buss wanted to review it with his staff first. Mr. Llewellyn stated he needed an answer by the middle of the week of March 14, 2005. Ms. Heiker stated she felt that 2, 25, 100 would be a preferred sequence based on the residents suffering through flood events every couple of years. Mr. Davis stated if the data for the 25 year events was recorded, obviously the two year events would be less severe but more frequent, other than the fact that it would be nice to have the data at two year intervals, what benefit would it serve. Ms. Heiker stated that the two-year event is what the residents see more frequently. Mr. Buss gave the analogy of the water may be up to their shoulders occasionally but it was at their knees everyday. Ms. Heiker stated it was still substantial. Mr. Bright asked if the five-year sequence could be eliminated if the two-year remained. Mr. Buss and Ms. Heiker stated that could only be determined when a final decision of sequencing was agreed upon by the IA. Mr. Davis firmly stated the IA and staff were committed to the Segment sequencing of 2, 4, 3, 1 and asked to have the sequencing resolved by the week of March 14. Blueprint staff would take care of everything else. Mr. Buss stated fine Blueprint would be "the ones left holding the bag." Mr. Bright stated the IA was supportive of moving forward not backward. Mr. Davis stated the Board had provided clear direction to Blueprint staff to move forward, and if that changed it would have to be addressed at that time.

Mr. Bright addressed the last issue regarding Capital Cascade Trail which was additional analyses in Segment 4 based on the fact that it will probably be moved up in construction. There were two borings remaining in the initial scope but the level of detail necessary for design requires additional geophysical and geotechnical work in addition to more archeological and historical analyses. Mr. Bright asked the committee to address what level of additional geo-tech work was necessary in Segment 4 and Segment 3 to determine ponds, at that time. Also what could be deferred to the very beginning of the actual design for those segments? Many City and County projects, as well as other area construction, have been plagued by sinkholes in the past and the likelihood of this project not hitting one was slim. Was that an issue that needed to be addressed currently or could staff factor in 10% in construction to handle it if/when it happened?

Ms. Heiker asked Myron Hayden if the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) was a potential screening tool in the locations of the potential ponds rather than just borings which may or may not drill into potential cavities. Mr. Hayden responded that the cost estimate given to Mr. Bright included geophysical exploration in conjunction with soil borings. That was the most time and cost efficient method of exploration for that project because it allowed for the interpretation of the stratigraphy. Mr. Davis stated he felt the number of borings could be significantly less. Mr. Hayden agreed stating the proposal included

boring every couple of acres and/or boring before and after the geophysical. In case an anomaly was discovered it would assist in identification of the anomaly.

Mr. Davis stated the bottom line was did it need to be done immediately or could it wait until the design phase. Mr. Buss asked approximately how much money was being discussed. Mr. Llewellyn responded with \$100,000. Mr. Buss also asked Mr. Hayden as to what level of reliability would the geophysical provide. Mr. Hayden stated it was a degree of comfort that would be based on the knowledge of anomalies that could cause long-term problems with the pond. Of course the degree of comfort or knowledge would be a function of how extensive the investigation was. Mr. Buss asked if the level of investigation to be provided would assure the appropriate level of comfort. Mr. Hayden replied that yes, he felt it would be sufficient realizing that a sinkhole could be created during the construction process itself, however, the likelihood would be low, not zero percent chance, but low. Mr. Buss asked if only the sites on the most probable concept were being explored. Mr. Hayden explained he was exploring the sites provided to him by Genesis. Mr. Llewellyn confirmed they were sites of the preferred concepts. He further stated the results of the geotechnical work would not be available prior to the May 16, 2005 IA meeting. If the decision was to proceed with the geotechnical, would the committee recommend proceeding with the alternatives analyses of Segment 4?

Mr. Menendez explained that in his experience at Welaunee, voids were discovered and had to be filled; City Public Works typically ends efforts at five truck loads. Mr. Hayden agreed and stated if the borings and geophysical exploration encountered anomalies in the pond areas, additional investigation or work would be necessary to ascertain the extent of them. This phase was to determine the likelihood of the existence of a cavity not necessarily to determine its extent that would be up to the Board. Mr. Menendez stated the Public Works office knew there would be issues at Welaunee but continued with the project. Blueprint may or may not hit one. Mr. Davis stated that until construction was underway staff would not know what exactly would be unearthed. The question was what level of due diligence should staff exercise to prevent catastrophic failure that could have been avoided; if it were obvious. Mr. Davis returned to the original question should that due diligence need to occur now, during the preliminary concept design or could it occur during the actual design phase itself. It will be completed but when was the question.

Mr. Menendez stated he felt it was an expensive effort to perform at a concept level and should be focused on when the design alternatives were narrowed down. Ms. Heiker asked Mr. Hayden to clarify why the technology he utilized was better and if it could have detected the void at the Henrietta site. Mr. Hayden explained that the equipment provided a deeper image than standard GPR. As for Henrietta, it possibly could have helped, but he could not say for sure. Ms. Heiker stated in hindsight Henrietta would have been designed differently if they had known about the cavity; as it turned out the County spent approximately \$250,000 on remediation. Mr. Buss asked what the political downside would be because in his opinion \$100,000 was a small amount to spend in relation to the entire project. Mr. Davis stated he was not concerned about that, however, if the borings were completed during the concept design it would help appease the more

vocal groups. Mr. Buss agreed and suggested it be competed then unless there were political ramifications to asking for the money. Mr. Menendez clarified that the data would be utilized no matter which alternative was finalized. Mr. Davis confirmed stating the pond locations in Segment 4 did not fluctuate. Mr. Menendez stated if the concepts would not fluctuate he would recommend moving ahead. Mr. Davis lightheartedly replied it would depend on the results of the geotechnical survey. Mr. Davis asked if the committee felt they reached consensus. Members strongly supported the idea in a unanimous non-vote.

With the agenda items being concluded Mr. Davis mentioned that Blueprint had awarded the contract for Capital Circle Southeast and in conjunction with that staff was actively working with the Water Utility for a supplemental contract to include significant water and sewer activities at their expense. The same level of service would also be included with the next segment, Tram to Woodville. If any departments had any activities that would be impacted in those corridors please contact Blueprint as early as possible. A more competitive price could be received if bid out up front Blueprint had no objection to that type of joint project. After the fact however, it makes it difficult on the community and the pricing may not be as good.

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business Jim Davis adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:17 am.