

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 14, 2005

Ellis Building – Koger Center

2:00 pm

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm.

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

Jim Davis	Dave Bright	Jim Lee
<i>June O'Meara</i>	Phil Maher	Mark Thomasson
John Buss	Bill Little	Jack Diestelhorst
Gabriel Menendez	Jim Shepherd	Shuli Leonard
Wayne Tedder	Jerry Oshesky	
John Kraynak	Gary Phillips	
Theresa Heiker	Ed Ringe	
Jack Kostrzewa	Angela Richardson	
Tony Park		

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

Item #1: September 7, 2005 TCC Meeting Minutes

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Capital Circle Southwest Corridor Study/PD&E Alternative (State Road 20 to Springhill Road)

Jim Davis stated that, in his opinion, the study area would include Corridor 1, the existing alignment, as well as the new corridor north of Orange Avenue. In September, the CAC recommended eliminating the existing alignment, and the Board concurred. Staff communicated to the Board that eliminating the existing alignment from the PD&E could jeopardize federal funding and the Board stated that they wanted to see that in writing from FDOT. A copy of the letter from FDOT was attached to the agenda item where it stated that Blueprint did not have to consider the existing alignment but not doing so would jeopardize federal funding. Mr. Davis further stated that he hoped that it would be a fairly straightforward issue where Corridor 1 was added back into the study.

Mr. Davis stated that as staff reviewed Corridor 3 and the existing alignment, what they would propose to the Board was to extend the PD&E to Crawfordville Road rather than terminating it at Springhill Road. The reason for that was that no one knew where Corridor 3 would connect back to Capital Circle but it was possible, if not probable, that it would be east of the existing Springhill Road/Capital Circle intersection. Going all the

way to Crawfordville Road would also complete the PD&E studies for the entire Capital Circle.

Tony Park requested clarification on the priorities set forth by the Board. Mr. Davis stated that at the September 19, 2005 IA meeting staff requested the Board provide them with guidance for how to allocate any “new” money. Priority number one was to use the additional funding for leveraging, number two was to complete the PD&E Studies around Capital Circle.

Mr. Davis segued into a recap of staff’s leveraging activity. He stated that Blueprint had had a banner two months, to the tune of approximately \$60 million; \$16.1 million for CCNW/SW from Orange Avenue to I-10 from the Federal Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU); \$42.6 million for right-of-way (ROW) for CCNW/SW from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue from Strategic Intermodal system (SIS) funds; and \$4.3 million in Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funding for CCSE from Woodville Highway to Tram Road. He continued that all of the “awards” were reimbursable dollars and staff was working out significant cash flow issues. For example, the \$42.6M in SIS funding was based on FDOT’s ROW estimate; however, Blueprint’s ROW estimate was substantially less than that. Could staff spend the difference on construction, and could we acquire the entire 230-foot ROW, were examples of issues Blueprint was working on.

III. Presentations/Discussions

Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design

Dave Bright stated that the agenda item was quite similar to the one presented to the TCC at their September 7, 2005 meeting. At the September 19, 2005 IA meeting the Board had a motion and second on the floor to move forward with staff recommendation for Segment 2 design with Genesis, as well as looking at the unresolved Master Plan issues through a separate contract. However, when Commissioner Proctor raised the issue of MBE participation, the motion was tabled. The board did not vote, but requested more information from staff on MBE and the proposed Segment 2 design team.

Mr. Bright further stated that staff would like to have a TCC sub-committee work through any technical issues related to the two Scopes of Services. He suggested the same TCC sub-committee members as they previously had review the stormwater modeling issues, with the addition of staff from Public Works due to the roadway issues. Staff proposed to finalize the draft Scopes, and based on direction received from the Board at the December 15, 2005 meeting, it would either go out to bid or they would extend the Genesis contract. John Buss asked if staff intended to have the scope finalized by the IA meeting. Mr. Bright stated that the draft was available and he hoped to have one or two sub-committee meetings by then. If at that time, the sub-committee was comfortable with the Scope, then that would be communicated to the IA. If not, they would tell the IA that final approval of the Scope was subject to the approval by the sub-

committee and possibly the full TCC in February. Mr. Bright clarified that the IA did not approve Scopes they simply authorized staff to forward in the project; the TCC would approve the Scope.

Mr. Bright stated that the IA vote went awry when the MBE issue was raised. He further stated that staff pointed out to the Board that Blueprint used the City of Tallahassee and Leon County's approved MBE's from the four-county metro-area. Mr. Davis stated he had since met with Commissioner Proctor and everything had been clarified.

Mr. Bright stated that, regarding the sub-committee; John Buss and Theresa Heiker would be appropriate members. Tony Park stated that he was not sure if Ms. Heiker or Joe Brown would participate as of yet. Mr. Bright asked Mr. Park to let him know by the end of that week who, from the County, would participate. He further stated that they wanted to be sure that the Scope addressed not only stormwater, hydraulics, and morphology, but also provided input and coordination on road issues.

John Buss stated that regarding the draft scope, as related to the Expanded Master Plan activities, was the work listed additional work or was it the "table of contents" from the first contract. Mr. Bright stated that they were additional things that were not fully resolved earlier, for example, the South Monroe additional capacity, what affect does storage at Leon High School have on anything they had modeled to that point, how much storage could they anticipate, etc. Mr. Buss stated that, for example, if it was repeated survey work he wanted to point out that there was a rather extensive survey completed earlier in the project. Mr. Bright stated that there was a significant amount of survey work completed in Phase 1 to determine the channel cross-sections, but he did not feel that the entire ground survey that was necessary for design and construction plans was completed. Gary Phillips stated the Cascade Remediation Project was surveying in Segment 2 currently; Blueprint could most likely use theirs. Mr. Bright stated that they would continue to review the previous scope and tweak the Scope to be consistent and not repeat what was already required.

Theresa Heiker asked if staff was approaching the work as two separate work orders or as separate firms. Mr. Bright stated that it would be two separate Letters of Authorization. Ms. Heiker stated that it would probably be one firm however. Mr. Bright stated, yes, unless the Board decided to go to RFP on the Segment 2 design then staff might try to have Genesis finish the remaining tasks. So it could possibly be an LOA for Genesis to extend their contract for the Expanded Master Plan components, and a RFP for the main Segment 2 design. Mr. Davis stated the contract was set up as a package but staff only executed the work by LOA. Ms. Heiker stated that she understood the agenda item to say that staff would complete the Myers Park pond analysis in house concurrent with but not as part of the Master Plan. Ed Ringe stated that the thought was to have Myers Park as a separate task. He also stated that the contract was designed for pieces to be neatly broken away. Ms. Heiker stated she wanted to ensure pieces were not lost.

Wayne Tedder asked for clarification of the "Executive Committee" that was mentioned in the agenda item. Was it an established committee? Mr. Davis stated that no, it was a

new committee. He further stated that staff's thoughts were to have a group of senior people that were intimately involved who could oversee the project, from the larger perspective, to keep everyone on track. Mr. Davis stated that no one had actually been selected as of yet. Mr. Tedder volunteered a member of the Planning Department to participate.

Gabriel Menendez asked what Blueprint's game plan would be. Dave Bright stated that staff would receive input from the sub-committee on the two draft Scopes, then at the December 15, 2005 IA meeting request approval to move into Segment 2 design either via the existing Genesis contract or by RFP. Jim Davis added the caveat of "... subject to approval of the Scope of Service by the TCC", i.e. sub-committee. Mr. Bright stated that the status of the Scopes would be included with the IA agenda.

Mr. Menendez asked what the anticipated design fee for Segment 2 was. Mr. Bright stated that in the current adopted Master Plan there was \$1.6 million for Segment 2 design, however, staff anticipated the need for another \$400,000 approximately for the Expanded Master Plan's unresolved issues. Therefore, approximately, \$2 million for the remaining design fee. Mr. Menendez asked how staff would address the statue on consultant services. John Buss and Theresa Heiker stated simultaneously that the Design Phase was included as an option in the original contract solicitation. Mr. Bright stated that points were awarded based on their proposed design teams and services. Mr. Davis stated that the ability to do the design was a sub-category in the selection criteria. Mr. Bright further stated that the Scope of Services indicated that the Phase 2 Scope would be prepared and could be used to extend the contract of the Phase 1 consultant or be used in the RFP. Mr. Menendez questioned that if the IA moved away from Genesis then would Blueprint open up the RFQ/RFP process. Mr. Bright stated that was correct. Mr. Davis stated that if the Board's guidance was to do an RFP then staff's recommendation would be to finish the additional Expanded Master Plan tasks with Genesis. Once that was complete then bring the new firm on board.

John Buss asked if Blueprint staff had discussed this with the commissioners. Mr. Davis stated that staff had discussed this issue with Commissioner Lightsey; her concern was that she did not feel comfortable with an engineering firm designing what the City, Blueprint, etc. hoped to be a "world class park." Staff assured the Board that if they exercised the Genesis option, the team would include a world-class park design firm. They had subsequently identified two such firms Hargreaves and Associates and Carr, Lynch, and Sandell Inc. both of Cambridge, Massachusetts. The River City Company out of Chattanooga, Tennessee, recommended these firms. Genesis would still complete the vast majority of the engineering work with the park design firms as Key sub-contractors.

Mr. Menendez asked if the Board or Blueprint was telling Genesis that they must hire one of those firms. Mr. Davis stated, no that Genesis was proposing to include both firms. Mr. Menendez stated that it would fundamentally change the composition of the team that was considered at the time of the RFQ/RFP. Theresa Heiker stated that she did not see it as a substantial change because the park was a portion of the project but not the defining portion. Dave Bright stated that during that point in the process staff was most concerned

with the management team, the stormwater design firm, and those firms have not changed. Ms. Heiker stated that staff evaluated the RFP's on the entire range of planning, design through construction. Mr. Davis stated that he felt it was fine because the prime contractor was still the prime and the vast majority of the sub-contractors were still subs. John Buss asked what role Greenways, Inc played in the process. Mr. Davis stated that they had some play in Segment 2 park programming, being lead by Hargreaves Associates; therefore their involvement should be minimal. However, Greenways Inc. did have institutional memory based upon meetings, and their relationship with the Trust for Public Land, etc. Mr. Davis stated that he felt that the team was "sell-able" and that the Board would support it.

Tony Park asked for clarification regarding the Myers Park feasibility study, did staff intend to complete it prior to RFP? Ed Ringe stated that staff would ensure that it was a feasible project before taking it out to a design contract. Mr. Park asked what impact the pond would have on Segment 2. Mr. Ringe stated that it did not do enough; there were wetlands and volume issues as well as cost of land. Mr. Bright stated that one of the issues was that it would mainly pull off Lafayette Street stormwater. Jim Davis asked if he understood Mr. Parks to mean that Leon County would probably consider favorably if Blueprint would do that. Mr. Parks replied that yes, even if it were marginal. Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Ringe would keep Mr. Park abreast of the process. Mr. Ringe agreed and stated that there were a few property appraisal issues they could discuss.

Gabriel Menendez asked who would champion the abandonments (of Gadsden Street ROW). Gary Phillips stated that it was in the Scope that the consultant would provide it. Wayne Tedder inquired to the ownership of either side of the ROW because City policy stated that property owners on either side could have ROW and if it was intended to serve as part of that area then it needed to be addressed. Dave Bright stated that the City of Tallahassee owned both sides of Gadsden.

Mr. Menendez asked who owned the Bloxham annex. Mr. Bright stated it was the State owned, however, part of that block was proposed to be abandoned and sold. Mr. Tedder stated that it needed to be coordinated with the State. Phil Maher stated that Blueprint had already met with the State concerning the easement for Segment 2 itself, because they still owned a portion of the Cascade property (west of FDOT). Mr. Bright asked if there was an exception that abandoned property went to the owners on both sides. Mr. Tedder stated that the State could deed that property to Blueprint. Mr. Menendez asked who would own the park. Mr. Davis stated that the City of Tallahassee would own the park.

There being no further discussion on the agenda item Mr. Davis stated that the Scope was still subject to the sub-committee's approval, and staff would proceed to the IA regarding the consultant issues.

Item #4: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E: Typical Section, Recommended Alignment, and Extended Design Limits

Jim Shepherd stated that he would quickly move through the Power Point presentation he had prepared because much of the information had been provided previously to the TCC

and at several public meetings. The purpose of the agenda item was to request final approval of the typical sections, recommended alignment, and to extend the design from Blountstown Highway (State Road 20) to Orange Avenue (State Road 371).

Mr. Shepherd stated that the staff recommendation was to proceed with combination alignment #2. He further stated that there were five outstanding issues related to the alignment and he would point them out for discussion as he moved through the recommended alignment. Beginning at Orange Avenue, he noted that one of the Commissioners had inquired as to how staff proposed to handle stormwater in the vicinity of the intersection. Staff proposed, whether it was the right or left alignment, the area west of the intersection would be used for a stormwater pond. South of Orange Avenue and east of Capital Circle there was a possible 4F property (publicly owned land used for recreation or wildlife refuge) that was owned by the Apalachicola National Forest and used as a recreational area, via a memorandum of understanding with the Tallahassee Museum.

Staff recommendation was to proceed with a right (east) alignment because it was farther away from Lake Cascade. It also provided a better opportunity for a future Orange Avenue or Tyson Road alternative. However, staff would ask for guidance from the IA regarding a right or left alignment at that intersection. Mr. Shepherd added that there were several people, however, that would prefer the alignment to be to the left because Blueprint would have to purchase the rental car agency. Mr. Davis interjected that staff speculated that to be the motivation of those people.

Mr. Shepherd stated that one of the issues with either the left or right alignment was to avoid the sinkhole that was just off the intersection. Mr. Shepherd continued that staff had removed the frontage road from the east side of Capital Circle at the Delta Industrial site, after discussions with Bartow Rainey. John Buss asked why Mr. Rainey made that decision. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff proposed the frontage road thinking it was the best option for that site; which would also have access off of the road where the Jackson Bluff Town Homes would be located, a driveway could be located there.

Gabriel Menendez asked if staff was providing Mr. Rainey direct access to the main road. He continued that it was his understanding that they were building limited access roads. Mr. Buss concurred. Mr. Shepherd stated that Mr. Rainey's site plan only showed one driveway; therefore the frontage road would only serve as an on/off ramp to the one site. On the west side of Capital Circle, the frontage road would provide access to multiple businesses. Tony Parks asked if it would be a "right in, right out" only. Mr. Davis stated that it would. Mr. Shepherd added that a "directional" southbound median opening could be added if necessary.

Mr. Davis stated that if Blueprint insisted upon using the ROW in that area for a frontage road at Mr. Rainey's site, it could eliminate Mr. Rainey's ability, based upon where he backs up to the wetland area, to develop the front. He further stated that they could end up with a frontage road with no space to build anything along it; everything would need to be located behind it anyway. Mr. Buss asked if by not including the frontage road

were they protecting the community, in terms of traffic flow. Mr. Menendez asked if there would be a full median opening at that driveway. Mr. Shepherd stated that there probably would not be, but there was the possibility of having a directional opening. Therefore, they could connect the Jackson Bluff Town Homes and the other developments, including the Delta site if necessary, at the full median opening used to serve the Jackson Bluff Town Homes and the frontage road on the west side of Capital Circle.

Theresa Heiker asked if Thrifty would be bought out. Mr. Shepherd stated, yes. Mr. Menendez asked Mr. Shepherd to clarify his statement, would Thrifty be bought out regardless of whether there was a frontage road or not? Mr. Shepherd indicated an area of the map and stated that the frontage road in that area would be gone. Mr. Menendez asked if they were removing it because of the "front part." Mr. Shepherd confirmed that. Mr. Menendez stated that with the frontage road scenario there was one point of conflict but without it there would be two. Mr. Shepherd concurred.

Mr. Menendez continued, that one had an impact, there was the additional point of conflict, it could impact the traffic flow through the area. If they allowed directional openings it would create more of a problem than a "right in/right out" only. He asked if with a "right in/out" scenario would acceleration and deceleration lanes be included. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff had not planned to include them. Mr. Menendez reminded the committee and staff that it was an industrial park and their traffic did not consist of fast moving vehicles. It would take time and effort for them to get up or down to the appropriate speed; if they were out in the main through lanes it would be a significant point of friction.

Mr. Menendez further stated that he understood Mr. Rainey's reasoning for not wanting a frontage road; however, without it, he was not sure there was a significant benefit with that alignment. Jim Davis stated that if staff did not allow the driveway in the middle of the site and forced all of his traffic to the full median opening to the north and possibly signalized this intersection (at least investigate that possibility), then there would only be one point of conflict and they would be okay. Mr. Shepherd stated that Mr. Rainey thought it would be a waste of money to connect to the front of his property; he would prefer the connection to be to the rear of his property with a right in/out at that point.

Wayne Tedder asked what opportunities were further down the road. Mr. Shepherd stated that there were other opportunities, for example the Jackson Bluff Town Homes development had purchased another parcel in that area; therefore, they could essentially use it for the new development. Mr. Tedder cautioned the committee and staff against creating the opportunity for truck traffic to travel through a residential area.

Tony Park asked about the width of the frontage road on the west side. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was a two-lane road that would allow traffic to merge into the main flow of southbound traffic. Mr. Park asked if there was a median opening proposed. Mr. Shepherd replied, no it was a slip ramp. Mr. Park asked about the status of the property on the southeast side of Mr. Rainey. Mr. Davis replied that it was vacant property that

possibly belonged to the City of Tallahassee. Mr. Park asked if those vacant parcels could potentially be developed. Mr. Menendez stated that they could.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Shepherd for clarification on the width of the right of way. Mr. Shepherd stated it was 230 feet and that two frontage roads would fit within the ROW. Mr. Menendez asked how they would narrow the ROW if they did not have two frontage roads. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint would not narrow the ROW; Blueprint would purchase 230 feet. Mr. Menendez stated that, in his opinion, it would be in the public's best interest to include both frontage roads. Mr. Davis proposed, hypothetically, that Blueprint acquire the whole Delta Industrial Park and used the backside for stormwater treatment. Mr. Menendez stated they would not need it for Delta but could possibly need it for the other property on the east side of Capital Circle.

Jim Davis asked the committee if their recommendation was to include two frontage roads. John Buss stated that he did not know enough about transportation to say one way or another and he felt certain that Mr. Rainey did not either. Furthermore, Mr. Rainey did not have the community's best interest as his primary motivation. Mr. Davis stated that he initially asked the same question of Lochner but, unfortunately, at that time he could not recall what their response was. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Shepherd if he could recall Lochner's response. Before Mr. Shepherd could respond, Mr. Menendez asked if green dashed line symbolized the wetlands. Mr. Davis stated yes. Mr. Shepherd stated that the US Army Corp of Engineers had not verified the line yet but that was what Lochner had communicated to Blueprint.

Mr. Shepherd stated that, regarding Bartow Rainey, the bottom line was that staff did not know what he intended to do; whether it be light industrial or residential or when. The question became did they want to spend the money now, since it was within the 230 feet of ROW that Blueprint was to purchase anyway; it could always be built at a later date. Dave Bright asked Mr. Tedder if he had been involved in any discussion regarding what Mr. Rainey had been approved for, or might have been vested for, versus what he might change to. Mr. Tedder stated that it would have to be reviewed on an annual basis because once the land use changes, and what it is vested for, it would be required to fully comply with environmental...it would, basically, have to start over. Mr. Bright confirmed that it included concurrency and everything. Mr. Tedder agreed.

Mr. Davis stated that it was staff's understanding that Mr. Rainey intended to change the land use to residential. Mr. Tedder stated that he had not seen anything to support that. Mr. Menendez asked, if he changed the land use to residential would he lose his vesting. Mr. Tedder confirmed that he would. Mr. Davis stated that as he understood it, vesting was negotiable, based on information from Linda Hurst. Simply because they were originally vested through a letter of negotiation, if he changed the land use areas he had some latitude to renegotiate it. Mr. Tedder stated that Mr. Rainey or Ms. Hurst would need to respond to the Commission so that they fully understood what could and could not occur.

Mr. Davis asked if he understood the committee's position to state that Blueprint should pursue the frontage road on the east side. Mr. Menendez stated that, while he would not speak for anyone else, he felt it should be pursued.

Jim Shepherd continued his presentation by discussing the property at the northwest corner of the State Road 20 intersection, that Leon County School Board intended to use for bus maintenance, driver training, and a stormwater pond. Mr. Shepherd further stated that Blueprint was working with Uncle Bob's Storage and LCSB to ensure joint usage of a full median opening. Jim Davis stated that LCSB had approached Blueprint to discuss the possibility of joint venture on stormwater issues. Mr. Shepherd added that the only potential problem with that scenario was that the LCSB property was located at the highest point in the road.

Mr. Menendez asked about the property to the east of the intersection. Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint would purchase, essentially, to the centerline of Norman Road. Mr. Menendez asked for clarification of how Norman would be tied into Capital Circle. Mr. Shepherd stated that he felt they could use driveway connections. Mr. Menendez asked then what would happen to the remaining portion of Norman. Mr. Shepherd stated that he hoped the ROW on Capital Circle would shift to the east ROW line of Norman Road and Norman Road could be abandoned. They could build driveways connecting the properties directly to Capital Circle. Mr. Tedder stated that those properties did not currently have direct access to Capital Circle and he would discourage it in the future. Mr. Shepherd stated that a frontage road could be built in that location but his concern was how to move traffic on or off because of its close proximity to the State Road 20 intersection.

The committee continued to discuss possibilities for a frontage road at that location with multiple references to the map. Mr. Davis thought they each made valid points and Mr. Shepherd stated that staff would further investigate a frontage road for those nine properties. Mr. Shepherd asked Mr. Tedder if the access to Norman Road could be changed to come off old Blountstown Highway. Mr. Tedder stated that they could do whatever was necessary. John Buss stated that in his opinion the access road was the best solution and the property owners could re-develop. Mr. Menendez stated that the frontage road would add value to the property.

Mr. Shepherd continued with a brief discussion of Gum Swamp; based on coordination with John Kraynak, they had tentatively agreed to a short bridge and mitigation that Blueprint would pursue in conjunction with that. Theresa Heiker reminded Mr. Shepherd that County employees needed access to the control structure at Gum Swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was necessary for Lochner to review the profile, but Blueprint might be able to provide a driveway. It somewhat depended on, he continued, if Blueprint could purchase all of the parcels down Swamp Fox Road and provide a directional opening there. If that was not possible, it could be like many of the other businesses in that area, the County staff would need to find another route.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Heiker to clarify what type of access she was referring to. Ms. Heiker stated that, unfortunately, there was no other access. She elaborated on the County's activities at the beaver dam, the necessity of having heavy equipment (dump trucks) have access to the site, and stated that their primary vehicle for maintenance was a retrofit school bus. Mr. Shepherd asked if the vehicles could back into the site. Ms. Heiker stated that was not an option. Mr. Maher and Mr. Davis asked if Blueprint could purchase a new vehicle for the County, as it might be less expensive.

Mr. Menendez asked if it was possible to give right-hand access (northbound) under the bridge. Mr. Shepherd stated that there was not enough clearance underneath the bridge. Ms. Heiker suggested raising the elevation of the bridge as an alternative. Mr. Shepherd stated that if they exited the highway to the east and looped under the bridge that could possibly resolve the issue. Mr. Shepherd asked if it was ever necessary for County staff to enter it during a high flow or emergency situation. Ms. Heiker stated that was not necessary; besides the entire area would flood in a high flow situation.

Mr. Shepherd moved the committee along by stating that staff's first option was to acquire all of the parcels out Swamp Fox Road. If they were able to do that, Swamp Fox Road would be eliminated as well as the restrictions it imposed. If Blueprint was not able to acquire those parcels, the second option was to purchase the property behind the Advantage North American van line, back to the west, as well as other parcels. He stated that staff would review it all in greater detail. Ms. Heiker offered an additional option for accessing Swamp Fox Road, which was a signalized intersection. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff had not offered that as an option because they did not want to cause any damage to the wetlands. Ms. Heiker agreed and stated that the bank on the east side of Gum Creek was fully developed and they could turn there.

Jim Davis stated that, as he understood the issue for Ms. Heiker and Tony Park, was access to the control feature from either the northbound or southbound direction. He asked if it was possible for them to survive with access from only one direction. Ms. Heiker stated that they could survive with one but from the northbound direction there was an existing vertical drop of approximately five feet. If staff raised the road to bridge the swamp, the vertical drop would increase as well, and there was not much distance to make the recovery. Mr. Tedder asked, when the debris was removed, which direction was it taken in, north or south. Ms. Heiker stated that it currently did not matter, however normally they would go north. Mr. Tedder suggested making it a northbound access.

Mr. Davis further stated that because of the developed property farther west on Swamp Fox Road there was the possibility of eliminating the access and cut over to Gum Road where there is a signalized intersection. Ms. Heiker confirmed that. Mr. Shepherd stated that Swamp Fox Road presented many variables. Ms. Heiker asked if staff intended to change the elevation of the road for the bridge. Mr. Shepherd stated that he did not think the elevation would change significantly.

Moving north, Mr. Shepherd stated, regarding the transfer station, the ROW line crossed over the circulation road, therefore Lochner would need to review. This was because of

the only available aerials were outdated and did not show it. Ms. Heiker stated that the 2004 information was available from the GIS website. Mr. Shepherd stated that he would check on the newer aerials. He continued, regarding the transfer station, it would most likely be, he felt, similar to the power line easement that was obtained from COT Electric on CCSE. There were multiple discussions, amongst the committee members, regarding the feasibility of Mr. Shepherd's suggestion. Mr. Davis stated that it was a conundrum.

Wayne Tedder stated that approximately two years previous, the Planning Department had approved a multi-family, planned unit development and the projected ROW required setbacks. Ms. Heiker stated that it was where the Wayne Frier Home Center was currently located. Furthermore, she continued, one of the pond sites was very close to their (?) regional facility. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was proposing to make Gum Road a four-legged intersection to address those issues. He further stated that the alignment could be shifted if necessary, however, staff was trying to avoid the east side, as it was owned by Leon County and there was a conservation easement for it. Lochner's sub-consultant had surveyed that area; staff would determine exactly where the road was on the transfer station site from that survey.

John Kraynak asked Mr. Shepherd to explain why there was a 10-foot sidewalk through Gum Swamp. He thought the intent was to minimize the footprint through that area yet the typical section called for two bike paths and the 10-foot sidewalk. Ms. Heiker stated that at one bridge it was narrower but it did widen out again. Mr. Shepherd stated that Mr. Kraynak was correct; staff did keep a 10-foot sidewalk through the swamp. Mr. Davis stated that he thought that staff was reducing the median width through the swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated that at the time staff made their decision that they were unsure if the entire swamp would need to be bridged. However, the FDOT standards specifically state that the "footprint" needs to be at least as wide, if not wider. Mr. Kraynak asked if that included the sidewalk as well. Mr. Shepherd replied, yes.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any reason the sidewalk could not be brought to six-feet rather than ten-feet. Jerry Oshesky stated that 10-feet was the minimum width for a two-way multi-use trail. It was suggested to have the bike-path relocated to the edge of the highway. Mr. Oshesky stated that they served two separate purposes. The multi-use sidewalk was for more than cyclists; in-line skaters, joggers, etc would also use it whereas bike-lanes were for more skilled cyclists. Mr. Davis stated that the median width had been reduced by 14-feet, from 36-feet to 22-feet.

Ms. Heiker asked Mr. Shepherd to explain the following bridge widths: the bridge through Gum Swamp had an 11-foot median for 137-feet at the outside. The bridge over Gum Creek was 125-feet at the outside, and the bridge over the CSX railroad was 139-feet. Mr. Shepherd stated that the 36-feet was from edge of travel lane to edge of travel lane. The 42-feet would be a curb-to-curb measurement. Through Gum Swamp, he continued, it was 22-feet. Ms. Heiker asked if that was to allow for the transition. Mr. Shepherd confirmed that it was.

Mr. Davis asked if the dimensions of the bridge through Gum Swamp would match the roadway. Mr. Shepherd confirmed that the roadway dimensions were consistent with the bridge dimensions. Mr. Menendez stated that while staff had narrowed the median they had also added a 2.5-foot shoulder. Mr. Shepherd stated that was correct. Ms. Heiker stated that there was 36-feet at CSX and 22-feet crossing Gum Creek and Gum Swamp. Mr. Davis stated that was deliberate, based on guidance from the Board to reduce the footprint across Gum Swamp. Mr. Shepherd explained that the transition to narrow the median would occur in the curve of the road before reaching the bridge.

Mr. Menendez asked if there was a cost savings for narrowing the bridge. Mr. Shepherd stated, for example, the bridge across Gum Swamp was tentatively planned to be 100-feet long. If a 10-foot trail were reduced to a five-foot sidewalk the savings would be five-feet over 100-feet; not including fill, etc.

Mr. Shepherd, continuing his presentation, stated that staff was still considering access to R&L Carriers, Wayne Frier, and Capital Hydraulics. Mr. Menendez interjected a suggestion. He stated that if staff could swing the alignment out more within the ROW, so that it became more of a traditional two-phase intersection, it was possible to install a signal light due to the full median opening. It would be controlled better and give full access to the freight/trucking company and multi-family planned development. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was evaluating that whole area and trying to gain access to the properties and would hopefully have a better solution 2-3 weeks from then.

Wayne Tedder stated that if a site plan had not been submitted on the Wayne Frier site he felt it would be an opportunity to provide access to that parcel. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was proposing a directional opening into the freight/trucking company, as well as another full and possibly directional opening to the south. That, of course, was all subject to change. Mr. Menendez stated that staff should utilize signalized intersections and eliminate the directional openings.

Mr. Shepherd stated that at Blountstown Highway, even though that particular project transitioned from six-lanes to two, staff was attempting to acquire the ROW that FDOT would need in the future. Lochner had analyzed the cost and impacts of the left, right, and center alignments and they felt that the center alignment would be the most feasible. It was not the least expensive but with the center alignment the businesses would not be relocated, therefore Blueprint would not need to acquire them.

Mr. Shepherd concluded his presentation by stating that staff had presented two options in the agenda item. The only real difference between the two, he continued, was the request for the IA to choose a right/east or left/west alignment in the vicinity of Orange Avenue. Staff was also evaluating additional scenarios in the vicinity of Orange Avenue and it was possible that staff could present them as well at the December 15, 2005 IA meeting.

John Buss asked if the typical sections showed optional median treatment. Mr. Shepherd confirmed that it did. Mr. Buss asked how the optional median treatment related to the

typical section that staff was asking the IA to approve. As an extension to that question, Mr. Menendez stated, the frontage road discussion would affect the typical sections also. Mr. Shepherd stated that yes, Mr. Menendez was correct, and staff would have to amend the typical to show both frontage roads. In response to Mr. Buss, Mr. Davis stated that wherever staff could feasibly use the median to capture and treat stormwater that would be the preferred solution with the exception to those areas where the grade would not facilitate that. Tony Park stated that if that was the case then the depressed median should be included in the typical section and the raised median should be the optional.

John Buss asked how the stormwater would be removed from the depressed median. Jerry Oshesky stated that they would have to construct inlets in the median to remove the stormwater. John Buss stated that many of the roads had 15% added to their cost for enhanced stormwater. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Buss if by 15% he was referring to the additional \$22 million for stormwater retrofit. Mr. Buss stated, no, the EECC would typically add 15% to each road project for stormwater and the retrofit was a separate category. His point was, he continued, that he did not want to see large amounts of money spent on “window dressing” et cetera. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint agreed with Mr. Buss and, in fact, that was included in the multi-modal guidelines as a guiding parameter.

Gabe Menendez asked how much higher than the swamp was the roadway. Mr. Shepherd stated it was approximately five-feet. Mr. Menendez asked if the elevation from the bottom of the ditch to the swamp would provide the cover needed over the pipe. Mr. Shepherd stated that was the driving force for obtaining the profile. Mr. Menendez asked if the pipe was below the water elevation in the swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated that the design was not to that point yet, but that they did agree to raise the roadway 1.5-feet. The main reason for the additional culverts, however, was an eco-passage for wildlife to pass beneath the road.

Mr. Davis stated as an aside, in regards to ROW maintenance, Blueprint received \$42 million in SIS funds for ROW. Staff was trying to resolve with FDOT if those funds could be spent on acquiring the full 230-feet. If that was the case would FDOT own the full 230-feet and would they accept maintenance responsibility for the full 230-feet.

Mr. Davis recapitulated the discussion to ensure all points were noted by staff: (1) leave the frontage road at Delta Park, (2) if staff purchased the whole 117-acre parcel to use for stormwater it would eliminate the necessity for the frontage road, (3) construct a frontage road at Norman Road and tie it in at Capital Circle at a signalized intersection not State Road 20, (4) maintain some sort of access at Swamp Fox Road for County’s retrofit school bus, (5) turning radius at the transfer station and impact to the buffer, (6) signalized intersections are better than directional median openings, and (7) reverse the typical section for the median to show the depressed median as primary and mounded as the option.

Tony Parks asked where they were on stormwater pond locations. Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint staff had a report that indicated the locations. At the time the report was

written it was unclear whether or not the County would maintain them. Theresa Heiker stated that, initially, the IA voted to remove all of the additional funding, therefore the pond sighting report was not reviewed from the perspective that the County would take it for maintenance. They had just learned, the week before the meeting, that it was a possibility that the retrofit money might be added back, therefore County staff would need to review it from the perspective of a potential joint use.

Mr. Davis stated that the \$22 million of additional stormwater and greenways that was removed, for construction from Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue at the direction of the Board, was back in the program in the out years. Staff had that listed and the Board approved it as number three or four on the priority list. Mr. Maher clarified that the Regional Pond No.1 project was funded out of that amount; therefore it was less than \$22 million. Ms. Heiker asked if Blueprint had a plan for stormwater solely from the roadway section. Mr. Shepherd stated that they would most likely be the same as the regional sites, but the ponds would be smaller.

Ms. Heiker also asked if the mitigation areas were intended to address full construction of Capital Circle. Additionally, she asked if the four regional facility sites; would there be a co-location with LCSB. Mr. Shepherd stated that the LCSB was not addressed in the report; it would be reviewed and addressed. However, based on some of Ms. Heiker's comments, the Regional Stormwater Pond No. 1 could be partially used for treatment but not attenuation, therefore staff was looking into other sites. Ms. Heiker asked if Lochner would be producing another report in 2005. Mr. Shepherd stated that his preference was to have her comment on the existing report.

Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail, Segment 2 coordination with the Cascades Remediation Project

Dave Bright stated that, as many were already aware, the remediation groundbreaking was held the week prior to the TCC meeting. He stated that staff had met with the City of Tallahassee and the remediation consultant WRS to discuss how their contract with COT related to the stormwater pond, what condition it would be left in when the remediation was complete, and to ensure that the channel (from the outflow of the pond, under the CSX railroad and around the bend to Monroe), would be as compatible as possible with what Blueprint would need for the ultimate park and channel design. Mr. Bright also briefly discussed the concept and grading plan graphic, which was included in the agenda item, for the pond.

Mr. Bright stated that when staff met with Jeanette Curtis, Project Manager Cascades Park Remediation, City of Tallahassee, and WRS they wanted to ensure that Blueprint was involved early on so that the grading plan WRS would use at the end of their project was coordinated, as much as possible, with the grading plan which was required for the future stormwater pond. Also that the design of and lining that would be used in the channel would be compatible with the flow and velocity as well as the aesthetics of what Blueprint would need for the channel. It was determined that Blueprint would work with WRS, early on, to complete the design.

Mr. Bright further stated that at that meeting, John Buss, pointed out that the geo-textile material that the City was proposing for the channel liner, initially did not seem to be aesthetically compatible nor would it withstand the flow or velocity. Furthermore, the remediation project would be complete prior to Blueprint having any storage facilities constructed in Capital Cascade Park. Meaning that the current flow would be a factor during the construction of the channel.

Mr. Bright stated that they had also discussed the possibility of using rock gabions along the channel. They were more durable and aesthetically pleasing than geo-textile but this would need to be discussed in greater detail with the City. Additionally, they discussed the possibility of augmenting the current Genesis contract to ensure that they could work with WRS so that the constructed pond design met with the design needed by Blueprint. Moreover, the joint efforts of all entities were needed to determine what was necessary for the channel lining, as well as a cost sharing plan. One potential for cost sharing was, through negotiation of the JPA, for the City to advance fund the design coordination of the pond and the increased cost for the improved channel lining. Blueprint would reimburse the City in fiscal year 2008 when the funding for construction of Segment 2 became available.

Mr. Bright stated that staff would be asking the IA for authorization to work with COT and WRS to determine what, ultimately, needs to be constructed, compare that with what they were currently proposing and create a cost sharing plan for the project. This was, Mr. Bright continued, the logical approach from several perspectives (1) cost savings, (2) to avoid opening the "landfill" area a second time, and (3) to eliminate WRS from filling the void created by the remediation for Blueprint to only remove it, approximately, one year later. Jim Davis summarized that it would give Blueprint the flexibility to make comments and decisions. As well as to have the authority to collaborate and cooperate with COT and WRS for a total project.

John Buss stated that he had not been contacted by Ms. Curtis. However, he did have one concern and had spoken with the attorney, who agreed, as did the Utility Business Customer Service Department (UBCS). The concern was, he did not feel that WRS had put much effort into planning or design based on their proposal of using "plastic" (geo-textile) in the channel for the water to destroy. Additionally, he felt it was wise to be prudent of the financial and political aspects as well. Phil Maher asked if EPA would allow Blueprint to open that area once it had be capped. Some members of the committee stated that there would be no contamination there any longer; therefore it should not be an issue. Gabe Menendez explained that they would excavate to a certain depth, install a liner, back fill and cap the area. Theresa Heiker stated that the only part that would be visible would be the portion that could be seen from South Monroe Street, if they stabilized that portion of the channel that would address the issue of the public's perception that they were "re-working" it.

John Buss stated that, while he realized the portion of the agenda item that referred to the utilization of historic flows was not in the scope of work, he felt it would be judicious to

use the project's stormwater model. Several people had been surprised to learn that at times the water had been over the handrail on Monroe Street, he stated. Secondly, he stated, that Stormwater had offered to provide interim funding for that phase, to get to the IA however, it seemed that the schedule was moving quicker than anticipated, therefore he did not know if that was necessary any longer. Also, he continued, Jim English, attorney for COT, had committed funding from COT, although he was not sure of its exact source. Based on that he requested staff strike Stormwater's name from the budget portion of the agenda item.

Gabe Menendez asked if WRS had coordinated with anyone at Blueprint. Dave Bright stated that staff had contacted Ms. Curtis nearly two months earlier regarding rumors of the cost for the remediation project decreasing and amenities being eliminated (going back to the time when the city was negotiating with URS); nothing came of it however. Mr. Menendez asked if WRS had met with Blueprint at all. Mr. Bright stated that there had been two meetings. Gary Phillips stated that they had also spoken at the groundbreaking. John Buss interjected that, in his opinion, WRS' positions was that they worked for Ms. Curtis therefore were, most likely, "staying out of it."

Phil Maher stated that there was a consent order between EPA, the State of Florida, and the City of Tallahassee for the remediation. If Blueprint modified the design after the fact; what would that do to the consent agreement? There could, possibly be legal ramifications. (Several members of the committee commented simultaneously on Mr. Maher's statement, unfortunately, it was unintelligible on the recording.)

Mr. Menendez suggested that staff "get this done as they separate them out." Mr. Davis stated that, clearly, that was what staff was trying to do. Mr. Menendez asked if staff was requesting permission, from the IA, to negotiate with WRS. John Buss explained that WRS would complete the remediation project by June 2006; Blueprint intended to request authorization, from the IA, for interim coordination issues. Mr. Menendez stated he understood that, but felt it was not necessary because the consulting firms that bid on the remediation were required to coordinate their efforts with Blueprint. Mr. Menendez stated that, as a member of the selection committee, was one of the requirements the firm's rankings were based on. Mr. Davis stated that that had not happened. Mr. Menendez stated that it was premature, then to go to the IA because it would send a message that there was no pool of money the contractor could go after to make the changes.

Dave Bright clarified that, part of what the firms bid on, for the remediation project, was to coordinate efforts with Genesis (Blueprint). Mr. Menendez stated that was part of the qualifications. John Buss stated that would become relevant if they (WRS) wanted money to complete...but what they were discussing included the actual construction. Mr. Menendez stated that he felt Blueprint would be in a better negotiating position if that coordination were in place first. Which, should be included in their contract already, he emphasized. Mr. Bright asked Mr. Menendez if he could provide Blueprint with the scope of the contract. Mr. Menendez stated that he would contact both Ms. Curtis and Koren Taylor for that information.

Mr. Davis stated that it all boiled down to Blueprint exercising sound management decision and the agenda item gave Blueprint the latitude to do just that. As it stood, he did not have the authority or money to negotiate with COT or WRS. He understood what Mr. Menendez was saying, and he paraphrased, "in their (WRS) bid should have been enough man hours and money to coordinate with us (Blueprint) because it was a requirement."

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

Jim Davis stated that he want to confirm, in regards to the Genesis contract that was discussed with the design of Segment 2 of Capital Cascade Trail, that he understood the TCC to be in support of the staff recommendation that stated to exercise the option in the Genesis contract for the requested scope and additional work, and that an emphasis be placed on the Myers Park pond and Lafayette Street. The committee concurred.

Phil Maher stated that the tentative meeting schedule for 2006 had been distributed. He requested the members review and comment on it. He also stated that the IA schedule was included as well. John Buss commented that the March 20, 2006 meeting fell during the LCSB spring break. Theresa Heiker stated that she was under the impression that the TCC was only going to meet before the IA meetings. Mr. Maher stated that staff scheduled six but it was probable that they would only actually have three. Mr. Davis stated that he was of the philosophy that it was easier to cancel a meeting than schedule one at the last minutes with so many people involved. As for the March meeting, staff would need to see how it fit with the IA agenda. Mr. Maher stated that it could possibly be moved up one week.

Jim Shepherd stated that staff might pull together the scope for the Capital Circle SW PD&E before February and if so it would need to be reviewed by the committee.

Gabe Menendez asked about the schedule for CCSE from Tram to Woodville. Mr. Davis stated that the schedule was being re-evaluated based on money. When they put the package together there were several "drop-dead" dates that were all predicated on receiving \$14 million in TRIP or other funds. Blueprint only received \$4 million in the first iteration of TRIP but that was only the first year, he stated. If they could get a commitment from the District they might "still be in the hunt." The other issue was that they received \$42 million for CCNW/SW; significantly more than staff expected. It was possible that the excess from CCNW/SW could be applied to CCSE. He stated that the cash flow would determine if Blueprint moved forward with a standard design/bid/build or design/build. The RFQ, however, was on the street. Staff designed it so that they

would be able to end it at any time without penalty to Blueprint, short of issuing the RFP to the three firms. If it progressed to the point of the firms preparing their proposals before Blueprint terminated the process the Blueprint would be obligated to pay a stipend of \$25,000 to each.

John Buss asked about permitting for CCSE; was it to be standard? Mr. Davis stated that he certainly hoped not based on the process thus far. He further stated that Blueprint had learned several lessons therefore it should be a “cleaner” process. Furthermore, Blueprint would control the construction of the ponds and maintain the schedule. Jerry Oshesky stated that Blueprint would also include minimum schedule durations and mandate that they were adhered to, which was something they did not stick to on the first project.

Mr. Menendez asked if Blueprint would condemn property in that project. Mr. Davis and Mr. Oshesky answered simultaneously, yes. Mr. Oshesky stated that Southwood owned the majority of the property however. Mr. Menendez asked if that would be factored into the schedule. Mr. Oshesky stated that it would. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had been very successful with the property acquisition in that area.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business Jim Davis adjourned the meeting at 4:11 pm.