

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 2, 2010
Ellis Building – Koger Center

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

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Tony Park | Jim Shepherd | Michael Frixen |
| John Kraynak | Latesa Turner | Meredith Herd |
| Wayne Tedder | Gary Phillips | George Roland |
| Harry Reed | Marek Romanowski | Mark Llewellyn |
| Jim Davis | Angela Richardson | Sid Matthew |
| Phil Maher | George Reynolds | John Gibby |
| Dave Bright | Margie Quillman | |
| Dave Snyder | Ed Ringe | |

Phil Maher called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications

II. Information Items

Item #1: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road – Design/Build Project

This item was informational only.

Harry Reed, Wayne Tedder, and Gabe Menendez questioned what would happen to any excess funding; if there was any. Phil Maher explained that right of way could not be purchased with it (in regards to acquiring the Burger King at the southeast corner of the Crawfordville intersection) and, if there were any excess funding it would be returned to FDOT per the original agreement. Jim Davis reminded the committee that to qualify for ARRA funds the project had to be construction ready.

Item #2: Capital Circle NW/SW Update US 90 to SR 20

This item was informational only.

Harry Reed questioned if there would be any modification to the project due to funds received. Jim Davis stated that it would have to be because of limitations on the federal funding. The second stage would have to be separate but would be coordinated.

Tony Park questioned if the County and Blueprint were still under negotiations or was it awaiting signature. Mr. Davis stated that there were some fine points that were being worked out.

III. Consent

Item #3: TCC Minutes December 3, 2010

There were no comments regarding the June 3, 2010 minutes.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #4: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 3 Update

Jim Davis encouraged the TCC to schedule a site visit Segment 2 to see how well it was progressing. He noted that Blueprint had experienced some fairly significant environmental issues: a depression developed in one pond and contamination issues that had exceeded Blueprint expectations. The contractor and Blueprint were working their way through them however.

Gary Phillips stated that there were to Scopes of Services for the TCC to review. Segment 3 had three main components: updating the overall concept plan, adding Van Buren pond, and considering a boxed culvert from Van Buren to the Railroad crossing west of Stearns; as well as several options for St. Augustine Branch. The brook and trail options was omitted by the IA. The final configuration would be the Trail over a boxed culvert or the Trail with stabilization to the St. Augustine Branch (from Railroad crossing to Gamble Street).

Mr. Phillips stated that, as requested by John Buss and Theresa Heiker, Kimley Horn was collecting data to update the existing stormwater models (CLOMAR for Segment 2 including the forthcoming improvements to Franklin Boulevard) and the Segment 3 Master Plan and Segment 4. Creating one continuance existing conditions model that would be used to evaluate the options as Blueprint moved forward with Segment 3.

The final item was the preparation of the 30% plans as part of phase 3; another LOA would be issued for Kimley Horn to take it to final construction plans. It would be approximately a nine-month effort that was coordinated with the FAMU Way extension.

Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint had the approval of the IA to move forward. However, staff would continue to update all committees. Mr. Tedder questioned if the alternatives would be narrowed down. Mr. Phillips reiterated that it would be either a boxed culvert or open ditch with stabilization. Mr. Davis stated that there would be boxed culverts in certain segments. The fine tuning of the particulars of the transitions was yet to be determined.

Item #3: Design & Permitting of Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint had not authorized Genesis to design Franklin yet because they had not yet completed the HUD requirements. He hoped to finalize the sub-recipient agreement with the City that week so that HUD would release the \$4.2M to begin the design. The Scope and Fee for TCC review was for Genesis design work for Franklin.

Mr. Phillips stated that the intent of Blueprint was not to replace or reconstruct the existing inlets for storm sewer on the cross streets. It was to install the boxed culvert in the median of Franklin. However, if there were opportunities, with in the existing right of way, they would look at replacing some of the man holes or drainage systems; or upsizing the connections into the boxed culvert. The scope included the option to raise the roadway section between Tennessee and Call. Blueprint would review the modeling and drainage design; it would be raised only if necessary. However, if flooding could be reduced enough by installing the boxed culvert alone, they would not raise the roadway.

The other option included was to connect underneath Tennessee Street to Leon High School parking lot. That one would be tricky, Mr. Phillips stated, because taking in more water would affect the rise down stream. It had to be one-foot or less or it would trigger revisions to the FEMA LOMAR/CLOMAR and there was not time in the project. Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint could conceivably construct a 54-inch connection and block it off until the permitting could be secured. Those issues would be explored in depth as the project moved forward. He recognized that the community would expect improvements to stormwater levels not only on Franklin, but also at LHS. There was a storage requirement of approximately 25-acre-foot in the high school parking that would not go away no matter what was done on Franklin. It would however be a significant improvement.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had historical data stating that water could get to 4.5 feet deep in the parking lot at LHS. With the improvements to Franklin, that could be reduced to less than one-foot. Without improvements to the property of Leon High School itself that could not be fixed totally. The idea of using a 54 or 72-inch culvert under East Tennessee Street and blocking it off would be sensible. Utilities would be an issue on that job. Blueprint was working with the Electric Department, encouraging them to install a duct bank simultaneously. Mr. Davis also reminded the committee that the original concept for Franklin was \$22.5M; they were discussing \$4.2M of it. It would not even be close to anyone's expectations as far as what Franklin would ultimately look like but it would address the drainage. Mr. Phillips reminded the TCC that the money had to be spent by June 1, 2012.

Harry Reed questioned if there would be any change to the contour of the road. Mr. Davis reiterated that Blueprint would review the modeling and drainage design; it would be raised only if necessary. The biggest impact to the roadway itself would be the heavy equipment traversing it. The asphalt would most likely need to be repaired in the final

stages of the project. Staff was still reviewing the MOT but had not come to a final decision. The ultimate design would be basically the same as it currently was.

Wayne Tedder questioned which end of Franklin the project would begin with. Mr. Davis stated that they would begin at the south end of Franklin because of the depth of the culvert.

In regards to the roadway design above the boxed culvert, Gabe Menendez questioned if the culvert would have “soft spots.” In other words would it be able to accommodate traffic in possible future configurations. Mr. Davis stated that he thought it would need to be reinforced at the man-holes. Ed Ringe stated that the typical concrete boxed culvert was strong enough to accept a full wheel load. Normally or frequently one sees the cranes sitting atop the culvert as it’s installed. The short answer was yes. Tony Park noted that the two west-bound lanes on Orange Avenue were over the double 10x14 boxed culvert installed there.

Tony Park questioned if Blueprint pursued the option of installing a 54-inch boxed culvert under East Tennessee but not enlarging the inlets at the cross streets, would it cause stormwater to back up into the cross street drainage system. Mr. Ringe stated that the language, as written, was to address Theresa Heiker’s concerns. When the boxed culverts were installed the water surface would be some 3-4-feet lower than what it currently was therefore it should not effect it.

Wayne Tedder questioned the accommodation of 25-acre-feet at Leon and if the School Board was addressing it. Mr. Phillips stated that Genesis had not begun to design it but in early meetings with the School Board it had been discussed. They were very supportative of the improvements. Mr. Davis stated that LCSB had acknowledged that Blueprint could not fix the problem and that it was necessary to amend the property itself.

V. Citizens to be Heard

John Gibby stated his name and that he was there to “*get some answers. I have a couple questions: For the N2 project originally what Blueprint calls N2, what are the current project limits right now?*” Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Gibby was asking that question of Blueprint. Mr. Gibby concurred. Mr. Davis stated that the original project was designed to go through Orange Avenue; from West Tennessee Street down to Orange Avenue. The project limits were subsequently reduced because of funding shortfalls, to the north side of Blountstown Highway. Mr. Gibby stated, “*Okay, because this is where I’m getting a little confused. I have a drainage report submitted to DEP in September for a segmented project. Then I’ve got one that John Kraynak and I discussed yesterday, with the project limits. A sealed set with the project limits of the full project. And I’m just confused. I mean, according to the county you’re building the whole thing. According to DEP you’re doing it segmented. And I’m just, I’m confused.*”

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint Legal Counsel has advised him not to discuss the matter because it was under litigation. Mr. Gibby stated, *“Okay, even though I’m just here as a citizen?”* Mr. Davis stated that since he (Mr. Gibby) was the plaintiff in the litigation (Mr. Davis) did not think he was there ‘as a citizen.’

Mr. Gibby stated, *“Okay, because we discussed with counsel today, that even your web page has the full project limits. So, unless they’ve yanked it since 10 AM this morning, the web page still says it’s fully funded. And I’m just confused. But we’ll move on.*

Alright, if it’s to be done in phases, when do you expect the Phase 2 documentation to be ready? Mr. Davis explained to Mr. Gibby that he was continuing to ask question that were subject to the litigation that was on going and that (Mr. Davis) was not at liberty to answer based upon advise of counsel.

Mr. Gibby stated, *“The new CSX bridge design to cover two railroad tracks has that design been completed?”* Mr. Davis stated to Mr. Gibby that his response would be the same to every question asked. Mr. Gibby, *“Okay, so, is this being recorded?”* Mr. Davis confirmed that it was. Mr. Gibby, *“Good. So, may I then, for the record, state my questions?”* Mr. Davis confirmed that he could. Mr. Gibby stated, *“Alright; with the new design of the CSX bridge, was it included in the latest drainage calculations? Next question, is the project funded? If so, at what level? I have a DOT contract for \$22M, not a contract, authorization for construction of \$22M and \$8M that the City Auditors office shows that there is \$109M in that project right now. The budget at this moment is \$109M and I’m wondering why it’s not funded? Next question: When will the final plans be ready to be submitted to FDOT to release federal money? Thank you for your time. As usual, I ask very hard questions. I try to do my paperwork. And I appreciate your time, Sir. Thank you”*

VI. Items from Members of the Committee

Tony Park noted that it was Mr. Davis’ last TCC meeting (as Executive Director) and acknowledged all of the accomplishments Blueprint had seen under his leadership. He wished Mr. Davis all the best on future endeavors. The TCC applauded Mr. Davis.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.