

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 6, 2006
Ellis Building – Koger Center
2:00 pm

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

Jim Davis	Dave Bright	Craig Diamond
Rodney Cassidy	Phil Maher	Mark Thomasson
John Buss	Bill Little	Jack Diestelhorst
Gabriel Menendez	Jim Shepherd	Bonnie Pfuntner
Wayne Tedder	Jerry Oshesky	Paul Hiers
John Kraynak	Gary Phillips	
Theresa Heiker	Ed Ringe	
Michael Wright	Angela Richardson	
Tony Park	Doug Martin	

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He also briefly listed staff changes and introduced new staff members:

- Gary Phillips an LPA employee and Blueprint’s new Project Manager for Capital Cascade Trail as well as the Project Manager for CCSE Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway.
- Paul Hiers a Jacobs’s employee and Blueprint’s new CCNW/SW and CCSW project manager. Mr. Hiers is taking over those projects from Mr. Jim Shepherd who was promoted within Jacobs and will be returning to their Tallahassee office.
- Jerry Oshesky had been promoted to a Principle with LPA Group, Inc.
- Dough Martin of OLH was Blueprint’s computer software and project management system person as well as the Project Manager for CCSE Woodville Highway to Tram Road.

I. Agenda Modifications

Phil Maher stated that agenda item number three would move from Informational to the first item discussed under Presentations and Discussions

II. Information Items

Item #1: Land Swap with United States Forest Service

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Construction Cost Escalation in Florida

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Capital Cascade Remediation Coordination

This item was informational only.

Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail Design Team

This item was informational only.

Mr. Davis asked if there were any questions on the informational items. Theresa Heiker stated that, regarding remediation coordination, the box culvert was a brand new thought to her. She asked if that suggestion came from the remediation concept or was it an issue raised for stormwater. Dave Bright stated that it was both; the plan for the hill was a geo-textile fabric with concrete near the bottom. Staff, working with John Buss, did not feel that the proposed material was capable of surviving the current flow conditions in the channel. The box culvert would provide a long-term fix as well as be more aesthetically pleasing.

Theresa Heiker stated that box culvert enclosure was not part of the original model that was reviewed by the TCC. Therefore she was unclear about the timing of the culvert if the initial sizing was based on the existing cross section under South Monroe Street. Ed Ringe stated that the information was given to LPA staff, in Columbia, SC, that was conducting the SWIM model for the project. The 16x7 was a more efficient system than the proposed double 10x5. Additionally, it would allow for some hydraulic improvement underneath South Monroe Street.

Mr. Davis thanked Mr. Buss for assisting with the box culvert. He reiterated that staff did not feel that the material proposed by WRS would meet the Blueprint vision, from the perspective of aesthetics, sustainability as well as other issues. Blueprint staff certainly, he continued, did not want WRS to install something that Blueprint would remove at a later date.

Mr. Davis further stated that his understanding, he requested Mr. Buss correct him if he misspoke, was that the original proposal of the geo-textile material might not have worked anyway. The Board, anticipating that Blueprint would want to coordinate with WRS, authorized the IMC to negotiate with the COT and their Contractor (up to \$2 million) to enhance or design certain elements of the concept so that it would not be necessary to do the same work twice. The box culvert was one such issue.

Theresa Heiker stated that the only way the box culvert would become an issue was if the evaluation of Segment 2 modification scope of work did not account for the box culvert cross section. The sub-committee had focused on South Monroe Street but the 16x7-box culvert would then become the constraint. Ms. Heiker asked if the scope of work had been modified to reflect the box culvert. Gary Phillips stated that staff would review the impacts downstream based on the box culvert. Both options were still available, he continued, and both would be brought forward; nothing had been finalized yet.

Ed Ringe stated that the existing and proposed 25-year event was at approximately 800 cubic feet per second (CFS), the box culvert was tentatively sized for 1200 CFS, which would allow staff to make adjustments both upstream and downstream. The scope would

reflect various staging in the pond to alter the amount of the water that would be stored in Segment 2 or released into Segment 3. Ms. Heiker re-stated that her issue was one of timing; once it was constructed it would become the constraint.

Ms. Heiker further stated that she was not aware of how much activity or if it had been pursued with the City, however, Leon County had received reports of activity discharging from the pit site. She stated that a citizen has phone in stating that an uncontrolled discharge of the dewatered condition into the creek. Ms. Heiker instructed the citizen to pursue it through the normal enforcement channels. She also reported the call to Curtis Watkins of the City of Tallahassee Growth Management.

III. Consent

Item #6: TCC Minutes: November 14, 2005

Theresa Heiker stated that on page 10 paragraph three Gum Road was the signalized intersection she referred to not Swamp Fox Road. Also on page 13 paragraph four, she stated that access should be maintained on the east side of Gum Swamp rather than Swamp Fox. Wayne Tedder stated that on page 11 paragraph one, the County Commission, not Planning Department approved the ...

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #3: Capital Circle NW/SW Expanded PD&E Study Update

Jim Shepherd stated that drawings which were before the committee indicated two changes which had been made to the concept following the December 15, 2005 IA meeting and the January 23, 2006 CRTPA meeting. Staff had previously shown a full six-lane section to Orange Avenue with the transition from six-lanes south of that intersection before the culvert. At the December 15, 2005 IA meeting staff was directed to transition from six-lanes to four-lanes in the vicinity of the Delta Industrial Site. He stated that it was difficult to see the transition on the graphic however, it occurs in the long straight section near Highway 20. Mr. Shepherd further stated that in January 23, 2006 at the CRTPA meeting, the CRTPA requested staff reduce the median width as much as they could. Staff reduced it from 36-feet to 22-feet in compliance with their request.

Mr. Davis stated that the changes were an attempt to minimize the disturbances in that area. The changes were proposed by City Commissioner Mustian and approved by the Board at the meeting in December.

Mr. Shepherd stated that, as a second issue, Blueprint staff had been approached by a property owner that was interested in developing in the area, who requested a frontage road on the east side of the roadway that would connect to Jackson Bluff Road. Mr. Shepherd explained that the rough graphics, which had only been drawn an hour earlier, was an attempt to show a re-developed concept. The new concept would move the full

median opening south, away from State Road 20. The Thrifty Car Rental facility, which was already significantly impacted, would be even more so with the new concept. That was all in attempt to provide storage on both sides of the main line so that cars could queue up and the intersection would work properly.

Mr. Shepherd indicated on the map the driveway, which had been cleared for Jackson Bluff Town Homes. He stated that there would be a stop at that point and traffic could either make a right into the Town Homes neighborhood or left to the frontage road. Noting that Jackson Bluff Road was a City of Tallahassee roadway, Mr. Shepherd asked Gabe Menendez if he had any comments regarding the connection of the frontage road to it. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff felt that new connection would be highly utilized to reach the signal. Additionally, staff proposed to acquire the necessary right-of-way to support a frontage road, if it were built, on the west side, to connect to Jackson Bluff Road. Mr. Menendez stated he would like to see more detail of the Jackson Bluff Road area. Mr. Shepherd stated that he would have Lochner to construct a more professional graphic for Mr. Menendez's review. Mr. Shepherd apologized again for the crude graphics and stated that staff felt it should be presented to the TCC that day, for comment, rather than wait until May for the next TCC meeting.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was cautiously optimistic in regards to the acquisition of the Delta Industrial Park, a 115-acre parcel, owned by Bartow Rainey. He stated that FDOT had been receptive to Blueprint locating a stormwater pond there, although it would only be approximately 18-inches deep, using SIS funding.

Wayne Tedder asked Mr. Shepherd to have Lochner include in the frontage road drawings the areas that were under development or had plans to be developed. Also how those parcels related to the frontage road designs. Mr. Shepherd stated that Lucy Ho and Josh Casper, he believed, owned the two parcels that would be affected. Mr. Tedder asked if Mr. Casper had a planned development. Mr. Shepherd stated that he did not believe Mr. Casper had submitted plans yet. Mr. Tedder stated that he was aware of one planned development in that area, he was trying to ascertain if Mr. Casper's was the same or if it was a separate one. Mr. Shepherd stated that he did not know the answer to the question but to his knowledge, between the power lines and Jackson Bluff Road there were only two parcels.

Mr. Davis stated that staff obviously had more homework to do on the subject. However, given that the meeting was scheduled for the same day that staff received the proposition staff attempted to show the "latest and greatest" concept. Jerry Oshesky stated that the implementation of the proposal would provide some operational improvements because currently Jackson Bluff Road was only a right-in/right-out because the median had been extended. He also stated that because of the close proximity of State Road 20 a signal could not be installed. However, staff felt the propose intersection could be signalized and would provide access southbound to Capital Circle.

Mr. Menendez asked how far off of State Road 20 the proposed intersection would be. Mr. Shepherd stated it was approximately 1000 to 1500-feet from State Road 20. Mr.

Oshesky stated that it was close but not as close as Jackson Bluff Road would be. Mr. Shepherd stated that if Blueprint pursued a frontage road on both sides of Capital Circle, City of Tallahassee Water Utility wanted to develop their site out where the mobile home park previously was. The frontage road would allow them access to a signal also.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Shepherd to clarify that statement because was that not the mitigation site. Mr. Shepherd stated that an architecture firm, he could not recall the name, had spoken to him regarding several sites they had identified for a new water facility to stage equipment. The last time Mr. Shepherd had spoken with them they stated that was their number one site. Michael Wright stated that, actually, that site could be redeveloped because it was acquired for noise mitigation not water or environmental. Mr. Shepherd stated that the architecture firm was very receptive to the frontage road concept. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Wright to confirm that Mr. Shepherd's suggestion was feasible based on the information Mr. Wright had. Mr. Wright concurred.

Theresa Heiker stated that Leon County would forward the information they had regarding flooding of that area. Tony Park asked if there would be any additional access points from Capital Circle on the east side. Mr. Shepherd stated no, however, they would probably install a deceleration lane to assist with moving traffic off the roadway. They would also, most likely retain a right-in/right-out access at Jackson Bluff Road.

Item #7: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study: Scope of Services Review by Blueprint 2000 TCC

Jim Shepherd stated that staff had distributed the draft Scope for the CCSW PD&E study for review and comment from the TCC. Mr. Davis stated that the one official charge of the TCC was to approve Scopes of Services prior to their release and staff felt that that particular one was tough. Tony Park asked if the Scope that was before them was any different from any other PD&E Blueprint undertook. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff had modified it somewhat because of the project was so unique. Mr. Park asked in what way had it been modified.

Paul Hiers stated that whole goal of it was to identify viable corridors, and to develop the engineering documents to a level that the location of the ROW could be set. If one read through the document the Blueprint vision of corridor development and how the study was supposed to be developed and the end result was to obtain the ROW documents. Jim Davis stated that the criteria for the evaluation of the corridor would return to be approved via the normal channel. That being said there was two differences that the standard Scope of Service, first and foremost was the fact that there was an emphasis on the sensitivity of the area; it would not be the "normal" PD&E. Secondly, that there was a requirement for all proposing firms to view the video recording of the IA meeting where the subject was discussed by Commissioners and the question was asked, "How are we going to ensure that the proposers know that this is not a standard PD&E?"

Tony Park asked if the PD&E would determine which side of Lake Bradford the corridor would be on. Mr. Davis stated yes. It would be two corridors and would be crafted from the standpoint, at least at that time, where they would begin with Corridor 3, the newly

identified corridor, with the option to add the existing corridor, which had not yet been approved by the Board. Ed Prescott would be at the IA meeting on February 20, 2006 and had stated to Mr. Davis that he, Mr. Prescott, would tell the Board that the existing alignment must be included in the PD&E study.

Jim Shepherd stated that other differences included the design, having it as a design option if staff was able to find the funding to allow the consultant to continue on with the design. New aerials would also be an option as well as ETDM. For Springhill Road staff would complete a typical section as well as reviewing the alternate alignment. Comments from the CAC were included also because they were very specific in how they felt the project should be developed. Determining unit costs and possible alternative alignments north and south of Orange Avenue. Also, there would only be one selection committee rather than a separate technical and selection committee.

Mr. Davis stated that one of the things staff was trying to get out of the PD&E was related to the new Corridor Preservation Order. Staff felt that in order to preserve the ROW they needed to secure the ROW maps so that the TCC would know exactly what needed to be preserved. Was this a standard PD&E, he asked? No, it was not, one would not obtain ROW maps from a standard PD&E but to capitalize on the Corridor Preservation, staff needed to know precisely where the roadway would go, stated Mr. Davis.

Mr. Park asked which segment of Springhill Road was included in the PD&E study. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was looking from the Orange Avenue intersection south to Capital Circle. Dave Bright stated that he did not recall seeing ETDM mentioned in the Scope; had it been added? He stated he had not seen it referenced in the Scope. Ms. Heiker stated that it was located at section 2.2.8; it had a one-foot DTM. Jerry Oshesky interjected that DTM was separate from the ETDM. Efficient Transportation Decision Making Model (ETDM) was the new PD&E process that FDOT had championed with other departments. It was basically a replacement to the previous PD&E process. It was completely unrelated to the Digital Train Model.

John Buss asked if he understood Mr. Shepherd correctly, in that new aerials were optional. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff did have the use of GIS for aerial photography, however, as with the graphic that were distributed earlier, the previous Orange Avenue intersection is still displayed. Mr. Buss stated that he did not see that option listed in the Scope. It stated that staff would provide aerials. Ms. Heiker confirmed that 2.2.7 stated that Blueprint staff would provide aerials. Wayne Tedder stated that Tallahassee/Leon County GIS was in the process of re-flying some areas; the CCSW might be one of those areas. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was a question of timing; if GIS flew early in the year it would be later in the year before the aerials were released. That being the case staff might wait a little longer, he stated. Mr. Shepherd stated that Mr. Davis had requested staff include that as an option in the Scope. He further stated that some of the updated aerials were available but were at such a scale that if a consultant tried to use them at 1:100 the resolution was lost.

Jim Davis stated that the bottom line was that staff wanted to ensure that if they were unable to provide current aeriels that the consultants would update the photography because of existing water levels. John Buss asked if Mr. Shepherd noted that there was still work required. Mr. Shepherd confirmed that he was keeping notes of everything that the committee stated.

Theresa Heiker asked if it was staff's intent to utilize one-foot contour in the hole. The aerial photography that was flown by GIS did not support one-foot contour without a specific targeted effort. In section 2.2.8 – one-foot contour interval was much more dense than the current GIS supported. Mr. Davis asked if he was correct in thinking that LIDAR supported two-foot contours. Ms. Heiker stated that was correct but it would support one if the coverage were intensified. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff would look into that but that they also needed input from the consultant. That was one of the requirements of their presentations, how they, the consultants, wanted to approach the project.

Ms. Heiker stated that in section 1.6, List of Meetings, there were no listings for the TCC. She asked if they were to be included or if staff would keep them abreast of the project. Mr. Shepherd stated, no, the consultants would be included in the important meetings.

Ms. Heiker stated that in section 2.12, Soil and karst topography. She stated that the Florida Geological Survey maintained a sinkhole inventory that should be referenced. Mr. Shepherd stated that geo-technical and survey were two issues that staff were not sure, at that time, how detailed they would be. That was due to the lack of money for design; the only money allocated was for the PD&E. Staff might analyze specific areas but would not perform geo-tech throughout the entire project area.

Wayne Tedder stated that the Lake Bradford Sector Plan needed to be referenced as well as the Airport Gateway Committee. He further stated that in September or November of 2005 they made some recommendations and provided those to the County Commission. The County Commission accepted the recommendations but Mr. Tedder did not think they had taken action on the items yet. Mr. Shepherd asked if Mr. Tedder agreed that staff should only review items between the Airport and downtown. Ms. Heiker stated that it specifically addressed the segment of Springhill Road. Dave Bright stated that he would also reference the Airport-Lake Bradford Citizen's Task Force report from approximately 15-years earlier; even though it was older, Mr. Bright stated it continued to surface.

John Kraynak asked, regarding section 3.1.8, Natural Features, when the NFI would be submitted? Jerry Oshesky stated that the Natural Features Inventory was during the design phase not the PD&E, typically. Mr. Kraynak stated that he supposed it could be completed afterward, however, it seemed to him that if they were identifying the features, per Leon County requirements, Blueprint might have an approved PD&E but there might be things that were incorrect. He was asking because he had seen it happen several times, where the PD&E has been completed and approved and the project moved forward to the

NFI and sometimes they would begin again from the beginning. He was cautious about...

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Kraynak what his recommendation was, to add some type of review to the PD&E. Mr. Kraynak stated that he would prefer to have the NFI taken care of up front. Depending on what happened with the Delta site it could still be completed through the City, he stated he would not speak for them, but his preference was to have the NFI approved at the time all of the identifications were being done versus months or later. Mr. Davis asked what the shelf life of the NFI was. Several people responded that it was three years.

Jerry Oshesky stated that the challenge was that the thing that would come out of the PD&E would be the selected corridor then the NFI would typically be completed. It was not typical to spend the money for an NFI on all corridor possibilities but it was up to the committee. Theresa Heiker stated that staff had stated that the Board has instructed them to be particularly sensitive to the environmental features affected by the corridors. She stated that, she felt, they would want to take the extra step of just doing the NFI. It was just an inventory, she stated.

Mr. Oshesky stated that staff would be sensitive to the environmental features. Usually the way most consultants did it was through GIS methods and other Natural Features Inventory elements at a macro level, maybe not as particular as was required for an NFI, but it was reviewed. It was part of the criteria that consultants used to evaluate the corridors in the PD&E. However, if the committee felt it was important enough to move to NFI, he wanted them to be aware that it was a fairly labor intensive corridor.

Wayne Tedder asked if a modified version of the NFI for basically the wetlands and floodplains. Those were two of the key areas and they would not tend to change. Mr. Shepherd stated that he believed that the PD&E study would determine one alternative and the NFI should be completed on that one. Mr. Tedder stated that in order for them to make their decision they would want to know what had mental impact to what environmental features; that would be key for the whole corridor.

Theresa Heiker stated that the display indicated that one corridor moved into a greater impact to habitat rather than the other corridor. Even by looking just at the gross...not the 2.7-acres of successional forest was affected versus 2.4-acres. Jerry Oshesky stated that it was gross type analysis based on, typically, GIS analysis of the specific corridor. It was fairly specific; it was not vague but was based on the information that was available to staff. It was, typically, not to the detail of the NFI on specific permitted design projects. It was a little less but enough to make a corridor level analysis, he stated. He further stated that staff would ensure that Mr. Kraynak was involved with the whole process and received copies of all of the afore mentioned documents. However, if the NFI was the only thing Mr. Kraynak felt would trigger his staff's involvement in a specific survey, well, that was a different issue. Blueprint staff would, however, keep Mr. Kraynak involved along the way.

Mr. Kraynak stated that “triggering his staff’s involvement” was part of the issue because there were many times where items were identified incorrectly. They sometimes would not find out about it until the end of the process because unless his staff had an application they were not reviewing anything. Mr. Oshesky suggested to Mr. Davis that that particular item be discussed in greater detail.

Mr. Davis stated that it might be possible to complete an NFI once the consultants identified the two most probable corridors. He reminded the committee that there were 17 alternative routes through the study area and stated that he would not want to have an NFI for each. Possibly, based upon preliminary GIS reviews, once the area was narrowed to, maybe three, routes the study could be intensified. With the results of those used to narrow the choices even farther. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Kraynak if that would be feasible. Mr. Kraynak stated, yes, he felt that his staff could work with Blueprint on that.

Mr. Davis stated that his concern was, frankly, spending an exorbitant amount of money for NFI’s on several routes, select a corridor, have it sit on a shelf for seven years, for Blueprint to then come back, in the design phase to perform another NFI anyway. He further stated that if there was a compromise... Michael Wright stated to Mr. Davis that his staff would perform enough environmental analysis to know what the major problems were. Mr. Davis agreed and stated that, conceptually, if they could narrow the alternative routes to the three most likely and then perform a streamlined NFI of the three most likely to assist with the actual recommendation and allow the TCC to review the results. If that was satisfactory then it could be an alternative. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Kraynak if that would be acceptable. Mr. Kraynak agreed.

John Buss asked if there had been some agreement that the project would be completed to County specifications or regulations. Portions of the project area were in the City as well as the County, was that not correct, he asked. Mr. Davis concurred. Mr. Buss stated that, contractually, Blueprint should speak with both agencies to determine who would regulate which or agree for one’s specifications to apply to the whole project area. Mr. Davis stated that he did not recall the final decision but thought there had been discussion of keeping CCSW split between both agencies. Mr. Oshesky stated that it was CCNW/SW that was split between both agencies. Mr. Buss stated that in section 3.1.8 there was reference to County Growth Management but no reference to City Growth Management.

Mr. Davis, addressing County personnel, asked for confirmation of the special zone near the lakes. That was confirmed.

Mr. Buss stated that there were some differences between City and County Growth Management such as definitions and regulations. Michael Wright stated that a majority of the land involved would be inside the City Limits. Furthermore, the City owned large pieces of land that Blueprint wanted to go through. Mr. Buss stated that many of the natural impacts, wetlands, floodplains, water quality – reference chapter 20 of the PD&E manual, as Mr. Tedder stated, there would be environmental and stormwater issues with the project. He did not know if what was summarized in the PD&E manual would delve

to the level that the Commissioner's would want to choose an alignment. Mr. Davis stated that he knew that they would not be to the level the Board would want and asked Mr. Buss which paragraphs Mr. Buss was referencing. Mr. Buss stated that it was section 3.18.

Gabriel Menendez stated that in section 2.2.8 there needed to be coordination with TATMAS.

Theresa Heiker stated that in regards to water quality, the City and County both have lake-monitoring programs that have historical data on Lake Cascade, Lake Bradford, and Lake Hiawatha. They would provide background information on the current conditions of each of those lakes.

Item #8: Scopes of Work for Capital Cascade Trail

Gary Phillips offered a brief explanation of the distributed material and reiterated what the agenda item stated, that staff would like to have the TCC approve both Scopes of Work for Capital Cascades Trail. He stated that there had been four meetings to review the two draft Scopes, two for the Master Plan Expansion Activities and two for the Segment 2 Design and Permitting.

Mr. Phillips stated that the expansion of the Master Plan was a continuation of the previous two years of effort of picking up some things that were undetermined early on or an expansion of some things that staff was already aware of. Task one was an evaluation of reducing the peak stage in Segment 2 lower pond. Staff had identified specific reductions and was studying the effects downstream in Segment 3. He stated that staff would account for either a box culvert or the open channel in the review.

Mr. Phillips stated that as Segments 2 and 3 were picking up the karst features and the additional cultural resource assessments, as directed by others on Segments 3 and 4, task number four was to obtain a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR). He stated that it was a critical element and staff would begin as soon as it was secured.

Task five, Mr. Phillips stated, would be to analyze interim improvements for Segment 1; which was necessary because of it being last in the sequencing. Staff would investigate removing the medians at Call Street and College Avenue as well as other items. There was a construction limit of \$5 million for interim improvements, he stated. If staff discovered interim improvements that were workable they would tie the design with Segment 2. Thereby, completing construction of the interim improvement in Segment 1 and the construction of Segment 2 simultaneously.

Michael Wright requested Mr. Phillips to refresh his memory of the boundaries of Segment 2 and Segment 3. Mr. Phillips stated that Segment 2 was from Lafayette Street to South Monroe Street and Segment 3 was from South Monroe Street to Gamble Street. Jim Davis stated that the issue with the interim improvements for Segment 1 involved the Leon County School Board. If they installed the proposed stormwater pond at Leon High School, Blueprint needed to complete the improvements in Segment 1 for the stormwater

pond to work, as it should. Mr. Wright stated that he was actually more interested in Segment 3 at that time because the City would be building a road there prior to Segment 3 construction.

Theresa Heiker stated that on page five of section 1.3 FAMU Way extension, she stated that he needed to accommodate the volume from the reduction of peak stage. She knew that Mark Llewellyn wanted to be very specific about what his charge was but she thought that the goal of modeling the downstream condition was to reduce the tail water at South Monroe Street. The Scope of Work pre-supposed that one determined how much volume would be lost; that was what would be accommodated downstream. Mr. Phillips stated that in section 1.1 staff identified the change in elevations to 93.5 and then 90 so they would have an actual idea of the volumes.

Wayne Tedder asked if either of the Scopes before the TCC addressed the actual design, as far as, the aesthetic quality or was it simply an engineering solution at that point. Mr. Phillips stated no. Mr. Tedder asked at what point they would be able to review the actual designs. John Buss stated, to follow up on Mr. Tedder's request, that when the TCC discussed the completion of the original study there were still outstanding issues on three. The committee agreed that they would go forward with Segment 2, have it completed and detailed before three would be reviewed for aesthetics. However, he did not see it included in the Scope, he stated. Jerry Oshesky stated that he had always assumed that it would be completed during the design of Segment 3.

Mr. Buss stated that it was work that would complete the conceptual...he trailed off but continued with; the Commission might or might not want to do that any longer. However, he wanted to state for the record that Segment 3, in the original concept, contained quite a bit more urban renewal than it actually would be receiving. Furthermore, there was not nearly as much as in Segment 2, however, those seemed to have flipped-flopped with multiple Citizen Committees and public meetings as a result of it. Furthermore, he thought, that the TCC would review; for example, Blueprint's initial studies indicated that another \$10 million would add a fair amount of additional ponds and amenities to Segment 3. So that, the current study could take a look at what might be possible and quantify it.

Mr. Phillips stated that the ponds were included in the conveyance but the amenities had not specifically been discussed. Mr. Buss clarified that by amenities he was not referring to restrooms, etc but to turning its appearance from an industrial area to more of a riparian corridor through there. So, the IA could make an informed decision or choice. However, the question had not actually gotten to them in that context.

Ed Ringe stated that, if he understood Mr. Buss correctly, the study would identify potential additional storage requirements between Wahnish Way and South Monroe Street. With the understanding that below Wahnish Way, staff would fit one of the original footprints, which was seen in the narrower concepts. He further stated that staff had not studied which one...it was the only one that gave Blueprint what was needed. Furthermore, he stated, that he felt everyone recognized that as the \$10 million one. He

stated that they would either be able to do something from Wahnish Way to South Monroe Street or fall back to the narrower footprint; but he agreed that it was not specific in the Scope. Mr. Phillips stated that he would work with Mr. Buss to draft more specific language for it.

Mr. Buss stated that his office had begun to work with FAMU once again regarding their Master Plan. Due to their financial issues their growth plans had been significantly restrained. They, FAMU, now say that they are much more flexible on the northern boundary, in terms of working with Blueprint 2000 to improve things. For instance, he stated, the original concept plan indicated a park/pond in FAMU's northeast corner of their campus, near the ditch and the single-family housing they had been acquiring. They were interested in meeting to discuss possibilities.

Theresa Heiker questioned the phrasing in section 1.3. It stated that "provide a summary of stormwater evaluation" would be completed by the City of Tallahassee. She asked if it was intended to say that Blueprint would provide an accounting of available volume per use by the City. Mr. Phillips stated that it was the capacity that would be used by other users of the Blueprint system. Ms. Heiker stated that if it was a matter of what needs would be applied to that then the City, not Blueprint, would determine it. It was more of a summarization of capacity per use, she asked.

John Buss stated that it was most likely coordination. He stated that the City had funded a separate study of the City's needs for Gaines Street, and he felt it was intended to be the interaction between the City and Blueprint. Ed Ringe stated that the language came from where Genesis was doing some of the evaluations for the City on Gaines Street. It was basically to bring the information from Genesis and included it in the technical data to create a more complete image. John Buss stated that Blueprint staff was attempting to integrate the information that the City had paid for separately into the data. Mr. Ringe concurred. Jim Davis suggested the language be modified to the effect of, "in coordination with the City" and provide the summary. Jerry Oshesky asked for the name of the existing study so that it could be referenced as such in the Scope. The Gaines Basin Feasibility Study, stated Gabe Menendez.

Theresa Heiker stated that in 2.2, it stated 60-grain size tests on Segment 1 and Segment 3; should that be 6-grain size based on a ten-foot boring. Gabe Menendez stated that he did not see any coordination listed in the Scope with the Remediation Project. Mr. Phillips stated that the coordination was included in the design of Segment 2, the next Scope.

Mr. Phillips stated that tasks 1-4 would be a technical addendum to the Master Plan and will be included in Technical Report 3.

Theresa Heiker requested to have Mr. Phillips specify the size of the box culvert in task 1.1 so that it was clear from the beginning.

Michael Wright asked if staff had identified which areas would be acquired for additional ponds in Segment 3 and if that data was available. Mr. Davis stated that the data was in the concept; however, the Board had not approved it. Mr. Wright stated that the City was acquiring land in that same general area and he wanted to ensure that they did not impact Blueprint. Gabe Menendez asked if it would change depending on the outcome of the jurisdictional severance. Jerry Oshesky asked if ROW requirements would change with severance. Ed Ringe stated that yes, it probably would. To more or less, asked Mr. Oshesky. Mr. Phillips stated that it was only if they created new impervious... Mr. Oshesky asked if it was correct that it would be significantly more if they did not receive severance.

Mr. Ringe stated that they would lose the ability to treat in-basin/in-line and would need to separate the treatment areas from the main channel. Currently the treatment was centered over the top of the channel. Severance would have a definite impact, he stated.

Mr. Menendez asked, then, what was "driving the train in terms of design. Mr. Ringe stated, "Severance." Mr. Menendez asked how that would impact the timeframe of the project. Mr. Phillips stated that staff was working that issue and had met, the previous week, regarding it. Mr. Ringe stated that there were meetings scheduled over the next four to six weeks and that staff hoped to have a resolution by then. Mr. Phillips stated that staff could proceed with the design of Segment 2 and severance concurrently.

Jim Davis stated that as he understood it, yes, jurisdictional severance would affect the ponds. However, it was not related to existing water but new water. John Buss stated that he was correct and incorrect in the context that if, in the future, they wanted to enhance the treatment i.e. to include alum it would not be possible. Furthermore, he stated, it was a maintenance issue for the City. If they were not severed then all of the lakes would become jurisdictional wetlands and would require dredge and fill permits for any maintenance that was needed. It would not be a very good way to leave the project, he stated. Mr. Davis agreed.

Mr Buss stated that from his discussions with lower level permitting people, they were fairly conciliatory that the features they were interested in protecting were remote. If staff could make the case that the channel or lakes would not affect those... Mr. Davis clarified that the permitting folks were generally interested in the area south of Orange Avenue, correct? Mr. Buss concurred and stated that it was generally not an issue for them but it was not their call, either.

Theresa Heiker stated that task four did not actually state if it was a LOMR for current conditions. Mr. Phillips confirmed that she was correct. Ms. Heiker stated that she was not clear about why the Scope reiterated the design requirements; were changes being considered? (Section 4.2.1) John Buss stated that it was the same model but with additional FEMA documents and regulations. Ms. Heiker asked if the idea was to use the elevation that was determined by the existing model (Singhofen). Mr. Buss stated that he had not had much input on that issue of late, however, where it was, conceptually, in his mind was that there was a downstream flood revision and they needed to flow seamlessly

at the transition. Furthermore, he believed, there were some revisions that utilized the modeling that was previously completed however, there would be a fair amount of “re-packaging” that was necessary to deliver it in the form that FEMA would want.

Theresa Heiker stated that the Meyers Park study was no longer listed in the Master Plan. Mr. Ringe stated that he had begun the draft Scope for Blueprint staff to complete the conceptual feasibility effort. It would move into a design concept at a later date.

John Buss asked Mr. Phillips if David Henry had reviewed the Scope. Mr. Phillips confirmed that he had. Mr. Buss stated that he was surprised that they were doing something that large with a LOMR. Mr. Phillips stated that Mr. Henry had suggested the process.

Mr. Phillips stated that the second Scope was for the Segment 2 design permitting. He stated that the design survey would be completed during that phase. The final hydraulic design would be completed and staff would review a by-pass culvert as part of that effort. It would also coincide with the review of stream velocities. Theresa Heiker interrupted to question the usage of a by-pass culvert. Mr. Ringe stated that it was included as an option or a supplemental. One of the concepts, he stated, was to install a box culvert and flood it in reverse, in the event of a major rain event, to minimize park damage from high velocity conditions. However, that option was a last resort, he concluded.

Ms. Heiker asked if they would, essentially, be bypassing the upper segment. Mr. Ringe stated that they would, essentially, go from the outlet at Lafayette Street down to the lower pool where it would back up. John Buss clarified that it would be a “high flow” bypass but during low-flows would keep the same... Mr. Ringe stated that he was correct. The problem was that they anticipated 400-500 CFS trying to travel the main channel. Mr. Buss stated that he understood exactly what Mr. Ringe was explaining; they were dealing with two completely different storms.

Mr. Phillips stated that task five was park programming and that that was the nationally/internationally recognized firm that would assist with the theme of the park, amenities, landscape, hardscape, etc. Mr. Oshesky asked Mr. Tedder if that answered his earlier question. Mr. Tedder stated that he saw where there were two groups that would be formed as well as coordination with a multitude of other people. However, what concerned him was in Section 5.4 the Executive Committee. He stated that he was not clear on the purpose of the committee, was it design orientation or simply for program amenities and how they would function in the park because many of the people listed did not have any design background. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Oshesky responded jointly that it was more of a program level. Mr. Tedder confirmed that the design concept would return to the TCC for review. Misters Phillips, Oshesky, and Davis all confirmed that was correct.

John Buss asked if staff felt they needed a technical person on the oversight committee. He was concerned that if the committee consisted of folks that wanted everything to look nice but did not understand City budgeting or what the City could really accomplish.

Having a technical person involved with the committee could eliminate the “head-butting” later on. Mr. Davis stated that his thoughts were to have a fairly senior-level group of citizens that would be able to speak to the Board, at the final meeting to say, we who have been active in the process all along, agree with the recommendation made by staff. Mr. Davis stated that staff would not propose something to the committee or the Board that could not be accomplished. Mr. Buss stated that the committee would basically be cheerleaders. Mr. Davis stated that while he would not use that term it was a pretty good analogy.

Michael Wright inquired to the timeframe. Mr. Davis replied, 18 months. Mr. Oshesky stated that 18 months was for the whole process through final design. Mr. Wright suggested that Mr. Davis leave an opening for a City representative, possibly someone like Tom Coe or his replacement. Mr. Davis stated that would be fine but reiterated that the intent was to have a very senior person participate. Mr. Wright stated that was his goal.

Mr. Phillips stated that constructions documents were a large part of the Scope. Ms. Heiker interjected that regarding the lake augmentation wells; she was not clear why there was a separate well for irrigation. It served the same purpose basically surface discharge. She stated that it seemed redundant. Furthermore, in the discussion regarding base flow analysis for normal, semi-draught, severe-draught, and wet conditions, she thought there was a normal pool established as a part of the original evaluation, therefore she was not clear as to why it spoke of establishing a normal pool.

John Buss stated that the Scope was not referring to the level but how much water would need to be pumped to maintain the level. Mr. Davis stated that the intent was to keep water in the stilling pool. In the dry season there may not be enough flow to maintain that stilling pool. Ms. Heiker stated that the Scope referenced the lower pond. Mr. Buss inquired which section she was looking at. Ms. Heiker stated that was why she was unclear why there were two lake augmentation wells because 4.1.6 spoke about maintaining a wet pool for the lower pond. She thought they were discussing the lower pond; Mr. Davis agreed. Ms. Heiker further stated that they had not previously discussed lake augmentation wells and she was trying to determine where those wells would be discharging. Was it the top pond or the bottom pond, she asked.

Mr. Ringe stated that it was the entire Segment 2 system. The idea was to maintain stages at the upper pond as well as at the cascade recreation and the lower pond. Essentially, they would need to establish a water budget, output, and consequentially input, under various conditions, to determine pumping demand and cost would be under a full range of conditions. Ms. Heiker stated that whatever level the system was maintained at would obviously affect the floodplain analysis. She did not know if...when they were previously scoping it out she was not aware of the floodplain impact. Mr. Ringe stated that staff remained somewhat flexible on the pool elevation so they could not list specifics at that point. They would be a range of approximately six-feet in just the lower pool. Ms. Heiker stated that she would encourage staff to ensure there was a specific connection between the level established for lake augmentation and the letter of

map revision for flooding that was completed for the design condition. The initial models that were analyzed assumed no water under a normal condition, she concluded.

Mr. Davis requested she clarify where they assumed there would be “no water.” Ms. Heiker stated that when they ran the pre-post conditions the flooding analysis did not assume a set condition in the lake for those studies. Therefore, if it was to be maintained at a specific elevation it was not accurately reflected in that assessment.

Mr. Phillips briefly outlined the remaining tasks and stated that even though there had been a couple of meetings previously regarding the Scope, if the Committee had any further comments they could email him over the next week. He stated that staff was looking to finalize both Scopes and to proceed with Letters of Authorization with Genesis. Dave Bright thanked the TCC members that participated in the sub-committee and reiterated that they should submit any additional comments within the next week.

Michael Wright asked for an explanation of how staff was proceeding with the jurisdictional severance. Mr. Phillips stated that staff had met twice with the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACOE) and FL Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). They had completed an extensive wetland survey in the two basins to show what the impact of severance would be because both entities would lose jurisdiction over the wetlands. Additionally, staff met with USACOE and FDEP following the survey and they requested Blueprint gather further information for them. The USACOE had stated that they did not want to be intimately involved in the field aspect however they did want to remain “in the loop” because even though they would sever the wetlands USACOE would retain permitting authority.

Mr. Phillips stated that over the next four weeks staff would present another information package for both USACOE and FDEP. Mr. Wright asked when Mr. Phillips thought they might reach a resolution. Mr. Phillips stated that within the next two to three months they should have it resolved. He further stated that they had suggested severing at Gaines Street because they did not see the justification for south of Gaines Street. However, staff informed them that Gaines Street was not reasonable; hence the reason for staff preparing the additional information. Mr. Phillips stated that the intent was that severance was feasible but where to actually sever was the question. The areas needed to be jurisdictionally severed not physically severed, there could not be a physical separation. The central drainage ditch was an example of that.

John Buss stated that the wetlands study identified all of the wetlands in the surrounding area and showed that the only quality wetlands are remote. They are connected but the construction will not affect them. Staff could make a strong case that the project would not affect them and that they would continue to be protected under local regulations; which were more stringent than stated regulations. The downside was that they could say that it was possible for the ordinances to be changed. Therefore staff might have to make some agreements to specifics.

Mr. Davis stated that what USACOE and FDEP had stated, as he recalled, was that conceptually it was a good idea, it was feasible and (somewhat) agree however T1 they could not commit based upon a concept but needed specifics. Mr. Wright asked if staff was optimistic that they could accomplish the severance. Mr. Davis stated that yes staff was optimistic.

John Buss pointed out that firstly staff was responsible for convincing USACOE and FDEP that they wanted to sever and secondly was to determine how to sever. Typically, plans and specifications must be complete for USACOE and FDEP to even take it into consideration. However because the project was long term staff would need to develop a Master Plan Letter of Intent, and they might "drag their feet" on it but eventually that was what would be necessary. Staff would have the Master Plan Letter of Intent approved, receive actual plans and specs on Segment 2, and finally a permit will be issued or they will sever. The most that staff would have to rely on would be the Master Plan Letter of Intent, he concluded. He stated that a Master Plan Letter of Intent was used in an Airport project in Orlando, he believed.

Item #9: Reallocation and Appropriation of Supplemental Funds in the Master Plan

Phil Maher stated that in the past several months Blueprint had been awarded over \$60 million in grants. They were supplemental funds that had not been included in the Master Plan and Item no. 9 indicated staff's recommended allocations of these funds. He reviewed the information listed in the agenda item.

Mr. Maher stated that in September 2005 staff presented the IA with priorities for additional funding, if received. The first priority was leveraging of dollars. Staff recommended a \$4.3 million match for TRIP, \$1 million match for the OGT Grant for Atkinson, and a \$980,000 FCT match for Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4.

Mr. Wright asked if Blueprint received \$8.6 for ROW. Mr. Maher responded yes and reiterated that Blueprint received a TRIP grant of \$4.3 million and was utilizing \$4.3 million of the dollars that were freed up to match the TRIP funds.

Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint already had the program for the FCT grant to match, and did not need to re-program any of the dollars. Mr. Maher stated what was listed on the spreadsheet was merely Blueprint's match.

Mr. Wright asked if staff felt confident that \$8.6 million was sufficient to secure the ROW for Woodville Highway to Tram Road. Mr. Maher stated that it did not take into consideration anything coming from St. Joe. Mr. Oshesky stated that approximately 75-percent of the ROW in that area belonged to St. Joe. Mr. Davis stated yes. Mr. Oshesky stated that staff had revisited it recently and that Ray Youmans remained confident. Mr. Bright asked if St. Joe donated the majority of that ROW during the Capital Office Center DRI to begin with. Did it take into account that Blueprint should own most of that already? Mr. Oshesky stated that 75-foot of it was previously reserved however they needed more.

Theresa Heiker asked if the colored sheet (Master Plan) reflected how money had been allocated or the current condition and that was how staff wanted to apply it. Mr. Maher stated that it included the re-allocations.

Mr. Maher stated that the second priority was the PD&E for Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. However, the Board felt it was a priority to extend it the study area to Crawfordville Highway. The third priority was to accelerate full funding for the stormwater and greenways for Capital Circle Northwest. Staff matched the \$1 million for the Atkinson property, however, it was not received then the \$1 million would be moved down and used to acquire the Atkinson property. Which was currently \$6 million, therefore, staff would use the \$1 million that would have been used for match and there was also \$2.5 million budgeted for the next two years.

Mr. Maher stated that the final priority was to enhance the Landbank funds to allow for early opportunity land purchases, and also in 2008-2010 as a cushion in case other costs escalate. If money needed to be moved from Landbank it would not adversely affect any other project.

Mr. Maher stated, regarding cost escalation, staff had re-evaluated all projects to ensure that each was solvent. In doing so, staff felt that increases were necessary for the Capital Circle Woodville Highway to Tram Road and Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway as well as Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 and Segment 4. John Buss asked if the numbers reflected in the spreadsheet were the increases. Mr. Davis confirmed that they were.

Theresa Heiker stated that regarding Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1, there had been discussion of advance funding \$5 million but it was not identified in the spreadsheet. Mr. Maher stated that it was not shown... Mr. Davis interjected that Mr. Maher had, only moments ago, indicated to him that it was not. Mr. Maher stated that staff did not realize Mr. Phillips had included earlier use of the \$5 million. Therefore, if staff chose to use the \$5 million for Segment 1 sooner than they had originally anticipated then they would need to make adjustments. Mr. Davis stated that staff would review how, exactly to fund it.

Wayne Tedder asked about the Senate Bill 360 and if there were more dollars that could become available for transportation. Mr. Davis stated that SB 360 basically provided \$4.5 billion, with \$3.1 allocated under the SIS portion. Theoretically there was another \$1.4 billion out there; however, he did not feel that Blueprint would receive any more. Mr. Tedder asked what was necessary to tap into it other than being politically connected. Jerry Oshesky stated that the project needed to be production ready. That was what staff intended to do for Woodville Highway to Tram Road and Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway. Mr. Davis stated that one would also need to be consistent with the CRTPA priorities.

Mr. Tedder stated that SB 360 basically stated that a city cannot grow unless it has "these" roads under construction in three –years. However they would be in a stop-work

scenario if they did not get some of the roads completed. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was doing the best they could. Mr. Wright stated that Tallahassee was in better shape than many places. Mr. Davis stated that staff felt sufficiently knowledgeable of the mechanism to obtain the money and felt that the \$62 million that Blueprint received the previous year was “proof in the pudding.” Mr. Wright stated that staff had done well to be in this position. Mr. Davis stated that staff was continuing to position themselves to obtain as much for the community as they could and if they could get money for Mahan Drive they would do that too!

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

Tony Park stated that he had included Mr. Davis and Mr. Bright in some emails regarding CCNW, the phase that was under construction, regarding the stormwater pond on the Gibby property. The emails were in reference to easement modifications that were located in the City limits and the box culvert that traversed the easements. He needed some assurances to the capacity of the stormwater pond with the development (Swank Development) that the City had approved in that southwest quadrant. The pond has taken to account that development not constructing any stormwater facilities or attenuation. They, the development, had requested a modification to the agreement that Mr. Park needed to present to the Board (County Commission?) on February 14, 2006. He had drafted an agenda item to modify those easements but he did not know if there was any “sigh-off” by FDOT or Blueprint that the pond was accepting that stormwater. The approval of the development was entirely in the City limits. He wanted to be sure that the developments that were occurring that would impact Blueprint projects were not getting permitted without, at least, some question to Blueprint.

Mr. Davis stated that he would like Mr. Bill Little to address that because Blueprint did have some concerns regarding the cost sharing of the \$800,000 grant from NFWFMD. Mr. Little stated that immediately prior to that meeting he and Ms. Heiker exchanged some emails and that there was language in the grant agreement with NFWFMD, which stated that Blueprint would not accept waters that would otherwise require onsite treatment mitigation for development or re-development for the entire retrofit portion. The portion that was not retrofit was exclusively reserved for government projects, the parent project as well as additional work on Highway 90, that FDOT had earmarked, and the extension of CCNW to the south.

Mr. Little stated that the issue was that if the regional pond were not being constructed would the Swank re-development site have needed to have onsite ponds. It seemed to him that, if it did, than it needed them. If it did not and the water was taken to the regional pond then he, and Ms. Heiker, thought that it was in contradiction to the

agreement with the NFWFMD. Mr. Wright asked if Mr. Little thought the City had approved something that allowed that. Mr. Park stated that was his understanding. Ms. Heiker stated that it had been approved. Mr. Tedder stated that the site was quite impervious...

Mr. Davis stated that the issues, as he understood it, came down to definitions. The stormwater pond could carry retrofit water; currently the area was almost all impervious. Therefore the water that was entering the pond was in fact retrofit water. If that same site were re-developed, even though one might not create any more impervious, by definition, if it is re-development that water is no longer retrofit water. Normally, from the quantity of water that was entering the pond it would not be an issue. John Buss stated that it turned on the City's ordinance that was changed with the re-development of the former K-Mart site at the corner of North Monroe Street and Tharpe Street. That site was completely redeveloped but there was no stormwater pond installed. He stated that he knew, with roadways, there were thresholds but he thought, in the private sector at least, if it was not made any larger nothing at all "had" to be done. Mr. Buss stated that the water might be going to the pond because the pond was on the conveyance but, under ordinance, Swank might not be required to do anything.

Ms. Heiker stated that the question fell back to FDEP delegation to the City of Tallahassee. The developers had not submitted any documentation to Leon County they had obtained permits from FDEP but were relying on City permits. If the City permit had an exemption for re-development, she had not found it in the State rules and the ENP specifically clarified that it only applied to local permitting.

Ms. Heiker stated that the County had run into that with their re-development ordinance. They included in that ordinance a specific requirement for onsite compliance with State. The NFWFMD staff opposed the County stating that they would never be allowed to use a Florida Forever funded facility even if they allowed re-development with onsite State compliance. Which, if the NFWFMD took a hard line with the County she would expect that they would also take a hard line with Blueprint.

John Buss stated that the State rule was if one created a new discharge, meaning if one moved the discharge or increased the load. Either would be considered a new discharge and it would require a FDEP permit and trigger treatment requirements. Mr. Wright stated that he would follow up on the issue at his staff meeting the next day. He recapitulated what staff had suggested for clarification, the developers would not be allowed to include their water into the system. Mr. Park stated that staff had concerns about it. Ms. Heiker stated that the concern was the impact on the grant. The NFWFMD was not making any type of concession to the County. Mr. Wright stated that if Swank proceeded with re-development of the site they would need to build their own treatment facility. Ms. Heiker stated that to meet State standards, yes.

Mr. Buss stated, to carry the reasoning forward, that if the pond were build and the grant received then everyone upstream from there would be required to retrofit regardless of the local ordinances stated. Ms. Heiker stated that was the position the NFWFMD staff

had taken. Furthermore, the City ordinances were also very specific that if one were to use a regional facility that they would need an agreement from the receiving system. John Buss stated that, under his scenario, there was no need for a facility. Additionally, he was not sure, if that was how the ordinance was worded, that government would have any recourse. Jerry Oshesky asked if that were true even if the regional pond were not there. Ms. Heiker stated that it was only applicable in the City; the County still required treatment.

Mr. Buss asked if the pond was in the County. Multiple persons responded that the pond was in the County but the development was in the City. Mr. Buss stated that the development would fall under City ordinances. He did not think that, even after the fact that the City could say "This ordinance may cause problems so we are not going to abide by it." Tony Park stated that an even bigger policy issue was that the City needed to maintain the easement and the pipe.

Mr. Little requested to send the grant agreement to Mr. Buss, with the specific language highlighted, for his review. Mr. Buss stated that would be fine but that it should also be sent to Bob Herndon.

Jerry Oshesky asked what the regional pond actually retrofit. Theresa Heiker stated that they originally were looking at a volume control because of the downstream flow conditions. It was an apparent wetland interaction, by the construction of the ditch, FDOT emphasized the retrofit capabilities of the existing impervious. It acknowledged that the volume was there for 311-acres but they never made any assertions that they would do anything other than treat the road system. Furthermore, they specifically received an exemption for the road problems under the grant; that was why they were stuck.

Simultaneously, Mr. Davis asked what constituted re-development because that was the real issue. The amount of water that was going in that pond, in his opinion, was retrofit water. If they called that water, water from re-development according to the rules it did not count. John Buss stated that the City had "done away with" retrofit other than government projects above a certain magnitude. He felt certain that road management did not "forget" to require a stormwater pond of the developer.

Mr. Wright stated that he was not so concerned about that one site as he was how many hundreds of acres were they referencing upstream that would flow to the facility. The definition of retrofit and re-development were vitally important. Were they in the grant? Ms. Heiker stated that the grant referred to the 6225, which was why they felt they were on safe ground with their re-development ordinance requiring on site compliance. However, the NFWMD stated that was not the case if they accepted a Florida Forever grant. Which would affect Boone Boulevard or anything that reoccurred. Mr. Buss asked how they would build the roadway. Ms. Heiker stated that there was a specific exemption under the grant. They specifically calculated the volume for the road projects but because the NFWMD raised that issue, the County was adamant that they were

doing a road project for that site. So the NFWFMD stated that they would give that as an exemption. Mr. Wright stated that it would be an adventure!

John Buss asked Mr. Park if he was correct in recalling emails between him and Streets and Drainage regarding them not wanting the easement. Mr. Park stated that he and Mr. Menendez were working on it.

Tony Park stated that there should be more coordination between City and County Growth Management because each was approving site (re) development but they needed to be checking other issues such as ponds and requiring some sign-off by the pond owner. Mr. Buss stated that Swank was not discharging to a County pond but simply to a conveyance. He stated that, if push came to shove, they could not say that everyone upstream of some area that government had chosen to build a... Ms. Heiker interrupted Mr. Buss and stated that they (government/NFWFMD) were saying if Blueprint chose to accept the grant you will agree to do it. Mr. Buss stated that no one was given authority for anyone to do anything; the water flowed to them by nature, by gravity. It was not as if anyone allowed the developer to discharge to the pond, he would be discharging to the conveyance. Theresa Heiker stated that County Growth Management worked on all of those sites and would be able to say, "You cannot do that because we have a grant that precludes it." They just had not had the opportunity to do so yet.

Mr. Wright stated that the majority of the "City's" water flowed to the County, sooner or later. Ms. Heiker stated that not all of them had ponds that were grant funded. Mr. Oshesky stated that it sounded like an argument for consolidation. Mr. Davis confirmed that Mr. Wright would follow up on the issue and report back to staff. He stated that he hoped they could see it resolved because he would not like to give the money back.

VI. Adjournment

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