

**Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes**  
 Thursday, October 29, 2009  
 Ellis Building – Koger Center

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

<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	<b>Rodney Cassidy</b>	Dave Snyder
<b>Gabe Menendez</b>	<b>Jim Davis</b>	Angela Richardson
<b>Tony Park</b>	<b>Harry Reed</b>	Jim Shepherd
<b>John Buss</b>	Phil Maher	Gary Phillips
<b>Wayne Tedder</b>	Dave Bright	Margie Quillman
<b>John Kraynak</b>	Latesa Turner	Claire Forbes

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

### **I. Agenda Modifications**

There were no Agenda Modifications

### **II. Information Items**

#### **Item #1: Capital Cascade Trail Update**

Gary Phillips stated that the schedule enclosed in the agenda packet had been delayed by approximately two weeks. The IFB would be November 12, 2009; the pre-bid conference November 24, 2009; with the official posting January 18, 2010.

Regarding Segment 3 and Segment 4, Mr. Phillips spoke briefly about the ditch lining options. Blueprint had approximately 30% design completed on the boxed culvert option, as it provided the most “bang for the buck.” Additionally it tied in well hydraulically with Segment 2 improvements that would reduce flooding on South Monroe that was caused by the backflow conditions at the culverts at Monroe and Adams streets. Jim Davis clarified that the concept of a “babbling brook” was misconceived because the flow was only a trickle of 4 cfs.

Harry Reed suggested caution regarding placement of the trail regarding the sanitary sewer; so that it was not in danger of being ‘dug up’ with any repairs, etc to the collection system. Also he cautioned about the street crossings i.e. Adams Street.

#### **Item #2: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study – IA Actions**

Latesa Turner stated that at the September 21, 2009 IA meeting, the Board approved the Widening alternative with several caveats: (1) aggressive commitments would be written into the PD&E study for erosion control and protection of the chain-of-lakes during construction; (2) Blueprint would pursue water quality improvements to the West Ditch, Grassy Lake, and Black Swamp, including investigating the possible segregation of drainage flows from the West Ditch to Grassy Lake; and (4) that commitments would be included in the PD&E document which would hold harmless the environmental and

erosion control measures if construction funding were to become tight. The project would be cancelled before Blueprint would forego the environmental protections.

Theresa Heiker stated that both she and Tony Park were a little concerned with the statements, in the agenda item, regarding the TCC. Neither she nor Mr. Park recalled discussions by the TCC endorsing, supporting or taking any position on either of the alternatives. Furthermore, it was not reflected in the minutes. Jim Davis agreed that some literary license taken; however the statement was based on the larger delta in the scoring of the matrix following the discussion with the TCC. He suggested changing the language to read: "The adjusted score, as developed the TCC, supported the widening of the existing alignment." Ms. Heiker confirmed that she would be more comfortable with that change.

John Buss expressed concern over developing previously undesignated stormwater projects when the ones promised to the voters had not yet been completed. Mr. Davis stated that staff would use the remaining funds from the PD&E Study (approximately \$200,000) to develop a concept of what could be done on the West Ditch. Blueprint would not take millions from other projects to accomplish this task.

Mr. Buss stated that in his opinion, that \$200K would be better spent on a study of the erosion problems between Gamble Street and Springhill Road. There were "severe problems" there and Mr. Buss expressed his opinion that Blueprint should address the items promised to the voters first before embarking on a new stormwater project. Mr. Davis stated that he understood and would be happy to discuss it further with Mr. Buss off line.

Ms. Heiker stated that having read the CAC minutes, the position that seemed to be presented was that there was a balance within this PD&E. It seemed that the understanding of the CAC was that the realignment option was specifically to include the redirection of the West Drainage ditch from Grassy Lake/Lake Bradford. So it was proposed by the CAC to be done in conjunction with the existing alignment.

**Item #3: Approved 2010 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules**

This item was informational only.

**III. Consent**

**Item #4: TCC Minutes August 27, 2009**

To item four, there was a correction to the grammar and clarification that Blueprint was seeking an additional \$8.3M for a total of \$13M in stimulus funds for the E3 project. .

**IV. Presentations/Discussions**

**Item #5: Capital Circle SE Update (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)**

Jim Davis stated that Blueprint was still hoping/waiting for the additional \$8.3M in stimulus funding. However, they were under pressure by FDOT to spend the \$4.7M. Also from the USFS to construct the storm water pond due to a pending land swap with the Nature Conservancy. A meeting was scheduled for Mr. Davis, the Mayor, Commissioner Mustian, and Harry Reed with the Secretary of FDOT for further discussions.

**Item #6: West Ditch/Black Swamp Project Development**

Jim Davis stated that Blueprint's goal was to form a working group and would surface the issues as necessary with the committee.

**V. Citizens to be Heard**

There were none.

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

John Buss stated that the last couple Capital Cascade Trail meetings had been cancelled. He did not feel that was wise... Mr. Davis stated that the last couple had been line-by-line reviews. Jim Shepherd confirmed those.

Mr. Buss noted the use of "development" versus "re-development" in Agenda Item 1, regarding the use of the pond at Coal Chute Park. He stated that he was curious if the ponds had taken a new turn; were they "re-development" ponds as opposed to dealing with the existing problem. He questioned if staff was far enough along to have an accounting of the capacity. Alicia Wetherall stated that the ponds would, by design standards, treat anything that would come to them. Kimley Horn had been given a list of priorities and was only adding things that the design standards would accommodate. Mr. Buss stated that the concept for the facilities was to support existing problems not to support development. With development and re-development creeping in, he was okay with it to the extent that he could "get a handle on it." Gabe Menendez stated that he had requested the analysis of that pond to establish the capacity to determine what could be supported on the south-side of the Gaines Street re-development. The CRA was participating and in support of the development capacity. Mr. Buss stated that he was concerned that the project was getting of course. If that was what the Commission wanted that was fine; if they knew both sides of the story. Ed Ringe stated that most of the areas, when they were switching concepts from in-line to off-line treatment ponds and the areas Mr. Buss were referring to will be designed as off-line systems. Those were the areas being re-developed. They were accomplishing two goals simultaneously.

Wayne Tedder stated that the CRA was participating to ensure that was enough volume capacity for the re-development of Gaines Street. Mr. Menendez stated that the concept

was that Coal Chute Park pond was off-line and the existing capacity would accommodate Railroad Square, as well as the southern half of the Gaines Street project (from Railroad Avenue to Lake Bradford Road). The CRA agreed to participate in the study in support of that concept. Jim Davis stated that the CRA had contributed \$650K toward the acquisition of the ROW and design costs. The accounting did not yet exist because Blueprint did not yet have the total capacity. However, Mr. Davis did not think that Blueprint had “missed the mark.” For instance, Railroad Square had previously stated that they would donate land to increase the size of the pond. Naturally, they want to treat their water there as well. Blueprint had also told Michael Parker that the excess capacity, above and beyond what Blueprint or COT Public Works et al needed (still to be negotiated), would be something that the CRA could use. The pond would be designed but might not be built for awhile.

Gary Phillips stated that the pond was between 2.5 and 3-acres; the re-development was 20 plus acres. Blueprint was cognizant of the Master Plan improvements and incorporating the new development that was adjacent to the facility, looking to treat their stormwater. Mr. Buss stated that was not the original intent of the project. He reiterated that the original intent was not to support development or re-development but to deal with existing problems. There were 80-90-acres, he estimated, that drained to that area. It sounded as though close to 100 percent of the pond would be used to treat re-development.

Mr. Davis reminded Mr. Buss that the water he was referencing, the un-treated water... The concept was for the vast majority of water quality improvements would be constructed in Segment 4. It was never the intent of the Master Plan to provide significant treatment in Segment 2 or Segment 3.

Mr. Buss stated that was not his issue. His issue was that Blueprint turned the ponds into support of re-development which would have built additional ponds and capacity for the general environment. Mr. Menendez stated that if indeed Blueprint was to treat the water in Segment 4 there should not have been an issue with using the ditch as conveyance. There was the question of severance ... what was Segment 4 going to treat, he questioned. Theresa Heiker stated that she recalled that the idea of having the facility along the entire run of the stream system was to provide treatment but also to provide attenuation. To prevent the construction of massive culverts to the bottom of the hill; it would attenuate and treat the flow as it went. Now, Blueprint would have to construct multiple facilities in the industrial areas so that could occur. Segment 2 appeared to be providing treatment facilities for the extension and re-development. Conveyance was in boxed culverts that released at Gamble Street; without providing any attenuation.

Jim Davis stated that it was a cash flow issue. When the Board consolidated Segment 3 and Segment 4, Blueprint identified the projects within the combined segments that would give the most “bang for the buck.” The channel project had been discussed earlier and there was the pond on the south end was under design for which the County owned the ROW. Dave Bright interjected that the guidance from the Board was to work the

ditch conveyance, Coal Chute Park, and Pond 5. Gary Phillips stated that he did not know how they proposed that Blueprint put blinders on and not accommodate development and re-development that was occurring adjacent to the stormwater facility that was under capacity. Ms. Heiker stated that the idea was that the Blueprint funding was intended to address storage and long standing impacts. Development and re-development would address their own impacts independently. That was specifically discussed in the EECC report. Mr. Phillips stated both Ms. Heiker and Mr. Buss were familiar with the Gaines Street issues... Mr. Bright questioned if Coal Chute Pond would be taking stormwater from FAMU Way. Mr. Phillips denied that stating, that it was coming from Gaines Street and would happen within the next six months as the Gaines Street project would be under construction.

Mr. Davis questioned if the revitalization of Gaines Street would produce additional water. Several people responded that it would not change the volume. Mr. Menendez stated there were issues at Railroad Avenue and Gaines; there might be some flow that needed to be brought around. Mr. Buss stated that if they were not able to use Blueprint ponds they would have to invest more in stormwater. Blueprint's project did not begin to provide ponds for the re-development of Gaines Street.

Mr. Davis asked, if the majority of the water in the Coal Chute Park Pond was coming from Gaines Street, and it was not new water, was not that accomplishing what Mr. Buss was questioning? That pond would be treating water that was coming off of Gaines Street, which was currently not being treated, was that not consistent with what Mr. Buss was requesting? Mr. Buss concurred but stated that it did not mean that one could build a hotel on Gaines Street and not include a stormwater pond. That was the link Blueprint was creating because they had allocated capacity to the pond. Mr. Davis disagreed because Blueprint did not know yet what the capacity of the Coal Chute pond would be. Mr. Menendez supported Mr. Davis' and stated that honestly, it was a gamble.

Mr. Phillips stated that the pond design was at less than 30%. Mr. Davis stated that what he heard Mr. Buss saying was: There should be no new capacity allocated within the Coal Chute Park Pond. Assuming that there was no way that one pond could handle all of the existing water. It should all be used for existing water. Mr. Buss clarified, not necessarily all but the majority, yes. Mr. Davis stated that was clearly Blueprint's intention. Mr. Buss acknowledged that Blueprint was caught between the City requesting action and then complaining about it. He was asking Blueprint to be the "gate keeper" of the projects. Mr. Davis stated that if the Coal Chute Pond came to fruition under the worst case scenario Mr. Buss was envisioning, there would not be much "Blueprint" money invested in it at all. The ROW had been purchased by the CRA, if the grant for \$2M was awarded to Blueprint...the more than \$90M was available today would still be available to do all the things Blueprint envisioned.

## **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:18 pm.