

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

SunTrust Bank Building
2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200
Thursday, October 20, 2011

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

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Wayne Tedder | Dave Bright | Junious Brown |
| Tony Park | Dave Snyder | Shelonda Meeks |
| John Kraynak | Jim Shepherd | Margie Quillman |
| Rodney Cassidy | Gary Phillips | Jeff Diemer |
| Theresa Heiker | Angela Ivy | Mark Llewellyn |
| Harry Reed | Marek Romanowski | Ryan Wetherell |
| <i>Steve Shaffer</i> | Joey Gordon | John Gibby |

Wayne Tedder called the meeting to order at pm.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications

II. Information Items

There were no Informational Items.

III. Consent

There were no Consent Items.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #1: Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief

Wayne Tedder gave a brief background on the nature and funding source (\$4.2M from the CDBG) of the project. There was an extremely tight deadline of July 2012 for spending the funds that if it was not complied with the money would be lost. The purpose of the special TCC meeting was for everyone present to make decisions that would allow the project to move forward.

Mark Llewellyn with Genesis gave a lengthy and detailed present; a copy of which is on file at Blueprint. The following are questions or discussion points from the committee.

With the 54" pipe would create minor flooding conditions at the FDOT parking lot and the intersection of Suwannee Street, Meyers Park Drive, and Cascades Park Lane. Mr. Tedder questioned the depth of the flood conditions. Mr. Llewellyn stated probably six-inches in the parking lot, maybe coming over the curb; at the intersection it was potentially slightly more than six-inches. There would be multiple outlets for either location.

Tony Park questioned what would happen at S421, Lafayette Street. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the inlet for S421 was off the street and in the grass. Theresa Heiker questioned if the water would flow across Lafayette to enter the inlet. Mr. Llewellyn indicated on the PowerPoint graphic the location of a high elevation point and the flow direction into an 18" pipe. Mr. Park questioned if it would impact the work the County was planning for the Lafayette Street intersection. Mr. Llewellyn confirmed there would be no impact. Ms. Heiker asked about S221, Pensacola Street. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it would be affected by the no-bypass pipe as well. Genesis was looking at tying that inlet directly to the boxed culvert to address the staging up at that inlet.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that Genesis was using Hydroflow for the stormwater modeling. They took the peak hydraulic grade line for the 25-year event and backed it up into the basins to see what would flood. Hydraulically they were assuming that the timing was simultaneous. Ms. Heiker stated that she had not reviewed Hydroflow however the SWMM models indicated surcharges on Lafayette. Her comment on the submittal was based on the SWMM results. Mr. Llewellyn stated Genesis had tweaked it significantly since then. Leslie Hope confirmed that they used Hydroflow for all side street drainage.

Mr. Tedder stated that with the changes proposed by Genesis, there would be flooding in the parking lot at Leon High School (LHS) for two years. However, once all projects were completed (after two years) there would be no flooding during a 25-year event and very little in a 100-year event. He requested concurrence from the School Board (LCSB) that the approach was acceptable. Franklin Boulevard would not flood but LHS would for two more years. He stated that he thought the elected officials were under the impression that everything would be resolved with one project. He requested that LCSB share their concerns so they could be addressed.

Danny Allbritton stated that their biggest concern was the proposed change at the LHS inlet; taking it back to the original restricted 7.5 square feet. If that were implemented, would the inlet north of LHS be restricted again as well, he questioned.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that the restrictions that currently existed along Franklin Boulevard, at each of the crossroads, would be removed in the process of the project. That would allow the water to flow under Franklin easier and more quickly relieving the pressure in the system. Also, the bottom elevation would be lowered which would allow more water to enter the system. Mr. Allbritton confirmed that the culvert under East Mahan would be unrestricted. Mr. Llewellyn concurred that it would replicate and improve it. Secondly, regarding the inlet north of LHS, he understood but was not optimistic that

would happen. Mr. Allbritton spoke about the complaints and public records requests LCSB were receiving regarding flooding at and near LHS. He stated that he understood that FDOT not wanting to deal with flooding in their parking lots however with the elevations they were discussing it was shoes getting wet versus vehicles flooding at the school.

Ms. Heiker stated that with the supplemental pipe, the sites she understood to be of concern were Meyers Park Lane, FDOT, and Franklin at Pensacola. Mr. Llewellyn confirmed that. Ms. Heiker stated that was a concern of Leon County. Mr. Allbritton stated that it was his experience that LHS flooded not because water could not get off site but because Franklin Boulevard backed up. Also, that speed with which the water came onto LHS property was an issue.

Mr. Tedder noted two decision points: (1) he did not see any 'bang for the buck' to install the 54" pipe. If everyone could agree to that they would move on from it. (2) He suggested that if Genesis could demonstrate to LCSB that if the inlet at LHS was temporarily restricted and it had no net increase impact to LHS, for Blueprint to proceed with the projects opening all current restrictions at crossroads and lowering the elevation of the boxed culvert. If LCSB felt comfortable that it would have little to no impact it would significantly help them move forward.

Mr. Allbritton stated that the position he was in was that if it was restricted and he did not have something showing no impact and vehicles were destroyed...his re-election issue might be that he was not running. To a chorus of laughter Mr. Llewellyn confirmed that everyone in the room understood that quite intimately.

Ed Ringe stated that because of the changes to the LOMAR/CLOMAR the timing would not allow Blueprint to keep the restriction at LHS open without getting the FEMA. If LCSB did not agree to the temporary restriction the boxed culvert could not be constructed. Mr. Allbritton understood the position. He questioned if LCSB could add a steel plate to the opening, underneath the trash grate, so that it would be accessible should other issues arise. Mr. Llewellyn concurred. Mr. Allbritton stated that LCSB was considering installing a boxed culvert across LHS to the north side. The justification for that was that the large the pipe, on the north end, was storing more water. If they could increase the storage it would reduce flooding.

Mr. Tedder asked for input from Stormwater stating that it was a 'speak now or forever hold your peace' moment. Ms. Heiker stated that she had not seen the model; she was taking Genesis at their word. Jodie Cahoon stated that they had not reviewed the model but had reviewed the results provided by Blueprint; based on that however, the City was fine with the FEMA issues. The other aspect was timing; based on the sequence of construction to ensure the peak elevations were no exceeded.

Craig Barkve stated that his concern was the volume at LHS and Franklin Boulevard. It seemed that the storage they currently had at those locations would be taken away. He

was not clear on where that volume of water was going. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the majority of it would go to the park and there was available capacity downstream that would be taken advantage of. Ms. Heiker questioned how they were increasing the volume if they were also increasing the discharge. Mr. Llewellyn clarified that even with the increased size there was less water going out than was coming in. Ultimately it would be staged higher in the park.

John Kraynak questioned the flooding in the park with the raising of elevations there. Mr. Llewellyn reminded him that the park was designed to flood. Mr. Kraynak questioned how much worse the increased elevations would be. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the controlling factor in the park was the Electric Building which was at 98-feet. The current design was at 97-feet; they could add another foot of flooding over a significant portion of the park.

Ms. Heiker reminded Mr. Llewellyn that she had not seen the model and asked him to confirm that the inlets in Segment 2 for Franklin and Lafayette would not be adversely affected by the proposed change in stage. Mr. Llewellyn confirmed that it would not.

Mr. Tedder questioned City and County Stormwater folks on what they needed to review and how much time they estimated needing. Mr. Cahoon did not advocate the review of the model. The engineer of record produced satisfactory results that City Stormwater had reviewed for FEMA requirements. Ultimately the second CLOMAR submittal would be reviewed by FEMA who would review the whole project. Any questions they found would have to be addressed by the engineer of record. It was recommended that Growth Management give their input as they would be the ones that would actually review the model.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that they had 90% plans submittal and comments on the 60% plans from all relevant departments in both governments. All of those comments were being addressed and would have the opportunity to review again with the 90% plans. Ms. Heiker stressed that the flood level was based on SWMM modeling and did not account for any surface flow issues. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it assumed all the water would be in the system. They hoped to install additional inlets where they could too and would help offset the difference. Ms. Heiker stated that she wanted everyone to understand that the surface flow created hazardous conditions. That should be addressed in the side street planning; a subject that had been discussed long before the flood relief project.

Mr. Tedder asked if anyone had any concerns or if anything specifically jumped out before they moved on. Tony Park stated that he did not see anything specifically but questioned how much destruction there would be to the southbound lanes by Electric with the replacement of the power poles. He was not sure if milling and resurfacing would be adequate. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the plans called for them to saw cut the pavement and drill holes to set the poles. The holes would certainly be repaired before they milled and resurfaced the roadway.

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint was asked by the City management to look at opportunities to begin transitions from flood relief to the preferred concept with pedestrian facilities on both sides and bike lanes; if it could be accomplished in the same general time frame and for a reasonable dollar amount. Three options were developed:

Option A: The northbound lanes would need to be reconstructed as part of the FEMA/HUD project, therefore Option A was to shift the northbound lanes over the box, reduce the size of the median, and a multi-use path on the west side. There would also be a eight-foot sidewalk on the east side for a total cost of approximately \$930K over the \$4.2M. The bulk of the cost was absorbed by the work done for the HUD project. The schedule could not be changed however under a change order Genesis could develop the design while also moving forward with the flood relief project.

Option B: Obtaining 10-foot easements on the west side of the roadway. Some residents had previously stated at public meetings that they would be willing to donate the easements for a trail or sidewalk. They would be going outside of existing ROW. There would also be an eight-foot trail; in some places it would be necessary for retaining walls or fencing. The estimate with donated ROW was approximately \$480K over the \$4.2M for the flood relief project.

Ms. Heiker pointed out a stormwater pond on one corner of Franklin and Call that might present a problem. Mr. Tedder stated that the east side might be a better option as it appeared to be flat; the only terrain that might be problematic was near the FL Bar Association. Mr. Phillips stated that ROW was available but would require a retaining wall. Staff felt however that staying on the west side would be more ideal than having people cross Franklin. Mr. Tedder stated that the ultimate conditions would include sidewalks on both sides. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the configuration of the design of the Lafayette / Franklin intersection accommodated the 10' trail being on the west side.

Dave Bright questioned if the approved concept included bike lanes on the roadways. Mr. Llewellyn stated no, the preferred concept did not include them. Mr. Bright thought it did and was to double check it. Mr. Llewellyn stated that one concept did but it narrowed the sidewalk widths.

Option C: Included the shifting and reconstruction of the southbound lanes in addition to the flood relief project milling and resurfacing. This would reduce the median width but still allow for a trail on the west side. The cost for option C would be approximately \$2.3M over the \$4.2M for the flood relief project.

Mr. Phillips stated that Options A and B could be combined; the easement donations could be pursued at any time. Mr. Tedder asked what the median width was in the ultimate design. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it was approximately 8-10-feet. It was currently approximately 22-feet. Theoretically the northbound lanes could be moved 10-feet if all were to be pulled up; leaving 19-feet of flat area within in the ROW to do sidewalks or a mixed use trail. Ms. Heiker stated that the Master Plan intended for there

to be turn lanes at some of the major intersections. The median space would need to accommodate those lanes.

Mr. Tedder questioned if there was a better way to tie in at the park and still minimize throw-away on Franklin. Mr. Llewellyn stated that Apalachee Parkway was the challenge; they did not have the ability to get the trail under the Parkway on the east side. They could cross pedestrians at the signal at Pensacola except for the off ramp or at Park Avenue. The ideas were surfaced that they could construct a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side with landscaping and pursue the west side easements. Cherie Horne stated that land owners might be more willing to give the easement on the west before a sidewalk was constructed on the east.

Dave Snyder reiterated that the plan was to move forward with the current plans and issues a change order when the trail/sidewalk details were sorted out. Mr. Tedder stated that in his opinion the northbound lanes should be moved in to the minimum medium widths and call it a day on the flood relief project. If the funding became available for the sidewalks great but he did not want to debate and loose the HUD money. It might affect some of Blueprint's abilities however, chasing easements... Ms. Horne stated that she felt they should definitely pursue sidewalks her point was to the coordination of timing.

Harry Reed questioned how to cross pedestrians underneath the Parkway. Mr. Tedder stated that the property owners on the southwest side of the project were willing to donate a 10' ROW, so pedestrians could be crossed at Pensacola. Mr. Park noted that the off-ramp from the Parkway onto Pensacola presented a problem. Mr. Phillips stated that staff would review that and determine what would be the safest possible crossing.

Mr. Park noted that the TCC did not have voting power. He questioned what decision Mr. Tedder was seeking. Mr. Tedder stated that the priority was to minimize throw-away in getting to the ultimate build-out. They were considering different options that could piggyback onto the flood relief project that everyone was agreed to. It made sense however, certainly if the northbound lanes were coming up anyway, to shift them in to the median width that was in the preferred concept, leaving room for turn lanes. Whether they had the money to construct sidewalks, at the very least dedicate the space for a five-foot sidewalk on the east side, per the Master Plan. Blueprint could independently pursue easements on the west side for a 10-foot trail. If funding became available and the IA approved him shifting it, move forward with construction of them.

Mr. Llewellyn noted that the preferred concept included the underground utilities for \$1.2M. Mr. Tedder stated that was a prime reason to slow progress on the west side until Blueprint and Utilities could sort the funding out.

Mr. Tedder stated that without any objections Blueprint would try to shift the northbound laned in to the median. Mr. Snyder stated that it would be done after the contract was bid. It would be additional work, design and construction, to be done under a change

order due to the timing of the HUD money on the flood relief project. Genesis would move forward with the plans without anything under East Mahan Street with the road put back where it was. Once the contractor was on board Blueprint would have Genesis revise the plans to move the roadway to the west with a sidewalk on the east side.

Mr. Park asked if Blueprint had spoken with DCA regarding the potential change order because they were approving a set of plans as is. The change order would change their contract that they approved. Ms. Heiker stated that if Blueprint changed the construction DCA must approve it. Mr. Snyder stated he would follow up on that.

V. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

VI. Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:48 am.