

**Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes**  
Thursday, August 27, 2009  
Ellis Building – Koger Center

Attendees: (TCC Members in Bold) (TCC Member Substitutes In Bold Italics)

<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	<b>John Kraynak</b>	Latesa Turner
<b>Gabe Menendez</b>	Phil Maher	David Bright
<b>Tony Park</b>	Dave Snyder	Meredith
<b>John Buss</b>	Angela Richardson	Steve Godfrey
<b>Wayne Tedder</b>	Jim Shepherd	Ryan Wetherall
<b>Harry Reed</b>	Gary Phillips	George Reynolds
<b>Jim Davis</b>	Margie Quillman	Claire Forbes

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm.

**I. Agenda Modifications**

There were no Agenda Modifications

**II. Information Items**

**Item #1: FAMU Way Extension – from west of Lake Bradford Road to east of South Monroe Street and Coordination with Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 (UPDATE)**

This item was informational only.

John Buss asked for clarification on cost; was stormwater included? Dave Snyder confirmed that it was; to include Coal Shute Park and Hyman Meyers Industrial Park.

**III. Consent**

**Item #3: TCC Minutes May 21, 2009**

There were no comments regarding the May minutes.

**IV. Presentations/Discussions**

**Item #2: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update**

Jim Davis gave a brief history of the project and introduced Steve Godfrey of Kimley Horn. Mr. Godfrey offered a detailed presentation on the PD&E study and the preferred alternative; a copy of which is in the file. Jim Davis stated that the intent of the presentation was to give the CAC a “sneak preview” of the presentation the Board would receive at the September meeting. Below are specific comments or questions from Committee members.

Theresa Heiker stated that with a -.5 for realignment with direct discharge eliminated on location; would the road that currently crossed Bradford Brook be removed? Mr. Godfrey stated that it would not. As part of the realignment they were investigating including linear ponds to reduce or eliminate the direct discharge.

John Kraynak stated that the floodplain was not only a volume issue but that there was an entire ecosystem tied with it. He questioned where in the matrix it was included. Mr. Godfrey stated that associated wildlife was included with the wetlands. Mr. Kraynak questioned if the wetland acreage was increased. Mr. Godfrey stated no; the only thing that happened was the effects on the wetland acreage were represented in the idea of a new encroachment in the floodplains; which was in the floodplain section. The acreage was always identified as 5.1 acres but it was not fully reflecting the impact of those 5.1 acres because some of it was listed in floodplains. They moved it to wetlands and it subsequently changed the weighting.

John Buss noted that some areas of floodplain mitigation were upstream of the project. He questioned if they were planning compensating treatment rather than actual treatment. Mr. Godfrey stated that with the elevation changes and design cutting through a higher elevation area, the drainage would be fine. Mr. Buss stated that they would have a difficult time with compensating volume in an area that already flooded. It was too detailed and difficult to get into at that meeting, he stated, however, he was concerned by not. John Kraynak stated that if thought maybe because in some areas there would be dry retention. Mr. Buss stated if using the term "retention" doubling the numbers might be true but they had to be careful of the language used. Mr. Buss questioned if they were using zero discharge ponds. Mr. Godfrey stated they were not. Mr. Buss corrected the language to "detaining" water.

John Kraynak stated that he understood the goal was to approach the state standard and that they were discussing pre, equal, and post in terms of pollutants. If they used wet detention ponds they would not be able to achieve their goal; they might only reach half of it. Depending on the treatment train and comparing the two roadways, the current and the proposed, they could not be equal. Mr. Godfrey stated that they addressed the increased pollutant loads in surface water; it included water quality as well. Mr. Kraynak disagreed with the weighted number given their parameters however he did not have a suggestion, off hand, as to what it should be. Theresa Heiker stated that the independent treatment would ultimately, in a heavy storm event, collections system bypasses and stormwater would discharge directly into those bodies of water. A new six-laned road with sidewalks and bike lanes disturbing a new discharge at the confluence of the west ditch, Bradford Brook, and Black Swamp that would go directly into them. That was the nature of a heavy storm. Mr. Godfrey stated that on the realignment they were balancing five locations of direct discharge all the time. In a major storm event impacts were occurring as the road was being washed. Those five locations would be eliminated in conjunction with the impacts of the new area.

Theresa Heiker stated that with the elimination of the discharge Mr. Godfrey was talking about treating the water. It could be listed under Stormwater Management as treatment versus the continued discharge under Surface Water and the impact to the stream system accommodating that flow. She felt that adding six-lanes of roadway created a greater impact at the confluence point because it was at the bottom of the hill. It would be extremely difficult to manage the stormwater other than discharge. In double checking the original discussion of the EECC they focused on improving and protecting the water quality and stormwater associated with the Bradford Brook and Lake Bradford. Increasing the discharge at that point increased the impact with Lack Bradford.

Mr. Godfrey stated that the ponds were sized to accommodate a 125-year storm event; they would mitigate the discharge from the roadway. Ms. Heiker stated that the idea the EECC had with the realignment was to enhance Lake Bradford. She did not see or hear anything that enhanced. The information presented maintained the existing with a new road.

Mr. Kraynak disagreed stating that he did not see that Kimley Horn / Blueprint could achieve pre v/s post with the pollutant load in the additional impervious. If a TMDL on both analyses on both ends, there would be a definite pollutant load increase; unless they were committing to a reasonably significant treatment train. Mr. Godfrey stated that in the Water Management Report, CDM committed that there would not be an increase in the pollutant load. Ms. Heiker stated that there was not an increase but that was not the point. The point of realigning the road was to improve the conditions.

Given their concerns, Mr. Godfrey questioned what Ms. Heiker and Mr. Kraynak felt the rating should be. Mr. Kraynak stated that it would require thought; it was difficult to quantify. Mr. Buss suggested that the discussion be continued off line as it was more detailed than what was necessary at the TCC. Jim Davis stated that he understood the discomfort and requested they give a relative starting point that they could be comfortable. There were no issues unless their number was so large that Kimley Horn could not agree with it. For the sake of discussion what was the order of magnitude they foresaw. Ms. Heiker stated -3; Mr. Kraynak was not that high, he stated. That was due to some of the treatment that was being provided. The two wet ponds concerned him because of the pollutant load they discharged directly to the lake system. He hazarded a guess at -1.5 or -2. Mr. Davis suggested adding the -1.5 as a placeholder and following up with an off-line meeting for further discussion.

Harry Reed stated that from the perspective of the CRTPA discussions or rankings of (future) Transportation with the existing alignment, they would need to acquire additional ROW. Mr. Godfrey stated that he did not know what the origin of the rail might be yet he identified land that was not government owned that could accommodate an adjacent corridor for light rail.

John Buss stated that he was not certain of the relative weightings however he disagreed with the numbers for Noise Impacts, certainly in reference to existing homeowners.

Comparing it to newer development along Thomasville Road was ... people moved to the “problem” rather than the other way and that was a fundamental difference. Wayne Tedder stated that he felt the quality of that roadway versus others in the community would be significantly different. Amenities would be provided along the roadway that would encourage people to move closer to it to utilize those amenities. He stated that he understood the difference Mr. Buss mentioned however he felt that the opportunity created would equal the impact.

Theresa Heiker stated that ultimately a permit had to account for compensation to impacts to floodplains; she felt that had adequately been addressed in Floodplain. She stated that if they could identify additional floodplain construction, emphasizing enhanced storage in of-site facilities attached to the location, she believed they could begin to receive credit. If however, the project itself was required to internally balance... Mr. Godfrey stated that there was no deficiency or credit; there was a zero net affect as related to volume only.

Ms. Heiker stated that she believed the intent of the EECC was to create additional storage to further buffer the lake system. They were planning for additional facilities to provide additional off-site floodplain storage. Internally balancing the project to get a permit should not be reflected as a net zero. Mr. Godfrey stated there was not a net impact, which would have been reflected as a negative in the matrix, nor a net benefit, reflected as a positive. He explained that he was trying to keep everything internally consistent with the way the evaluation matrix was being utilized. However, he understood that she would rather see it reflected as zero than showing mitigation. Mr. Godfrey stated that Kimley Horn would take that under advisement.

**Item #4: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road Design/Build Project**

Dave Snyder briefly updated the Committee of the status of Stimulus Funding. Stating that Blueprint was had been award \$4.7M from FDOT and was awaiting information on the additional \$13M (overage from other projects that came in under budget) that was thought to be forthcoming. Mr. Davis stated that Capital Circle Southeast was the number one priority for District 3. Without confirmation from Central Office however, there would be no formal commitment of funds.

**Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 - Update**

Gary Phillips stated that six firms had responded to the RFQ. The evaluation committee would meet on September 17, 2009 to score the proposals. Three firms would be shortlisted at that meeting. He also gave an extremely brief update of Segment 3 and Segment 4 from the agenda item.

**V. Citizens to be Heard**

There were none.

## **VI. Items from Members of the Committee**

There were no items from Members of the Committee.

## **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:17 pm.