

## Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 23, 2007  
Ellis Building – Koger Center  
1:00 pm

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

<b>Rodney Cassidy</b>	Jim Davis	Ed Ringe
<b>Wayne Tedder</b>	Phil Maher	Margie Quillman
<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	Dave Bright	Angela Richardson
<b>John Buss</b>	Steve Nichols	Debra Schiro
<b>Tony Park</b>	Doug Martin	Harry Reed
<b>Vince Long</b>	Marek Romanowski	Raymond Ashe
<b>John Kraynak</b>	Randy Matheny	
<b>Michael Wright</b>	Gary Phillips	

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm.

### I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

### II. Information Items

#### **Item #1: Capital Circle NW/SW: Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Right of Way Acquisition and Resolution**

Randy Matheny stated that additional parcels for mitigation sites had been identified as well as two other parcels that needed the Board's approval for acquisition. Mr. Matheny identified the parcels on a map for the committee.

#### **Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Marketing Plan Update**

Jim Davis reminded the TCC that Blueprint had brokered a deal with the Knight Foundation to fund a marketing plan with Ziffer-Stansberry Public Relations firm. He further stated that on Wednesday, August 22, 2007 staff met with Janet Hinkle who had agreed to a Co-Chair position, with Loranne Ausley, and would be the "leg person" out raising money for the unfunded amenities of Cascade Park.

### **III. Consent**

#### **Item #3: May 17, 2007 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes**

Theresa Heiker noted that the titles were incorrect on two agenda items.

### **IV. Presentations/Discussions**

#### **Item #4: 2008 CAC, TCC, and IA Meeting Dates**

There were no comments regarding the scheduled meeting dates.

#### **Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail: Sequence of Construction and Design Services Authorization for the Next Segment**

Jim Davis stated the based upon recent activity and continued flooding on South Monroe Street, which was unrelated to the Capital Cascade Trail project, staff thought it prudent to resurface it to the IA to see if they would like to reconsider the sequence of construction. As it stood currently, the construction schedule was for Segment 2, 4, 3 and 1. He stated that staff did not have strong leanings either way; it was simply a proactive approach. Furthermore, Mr. Davis stated, that several advantages (related to the FAMU Way extension) were discovered during staff review that could warrant re-designating the construction sequence.

Gary Phillips stated that the advantages to moving ahead with Segment 3 next would be the opportunities to reduce flooding on South Monroe, to protect the business on South Monroe and it would tie in with the FAMU Way extension PD&E that was currently underway. Also, FDOT had a design /resurfacing project that had a drainage component that would not only offer improvements but Blueprint would have a better opportunity to coordinate if they were reviewing Segment 3 at the same time. Furthermore, each segment had been designed as “stand alone” segments therefore changing the construction sequence would not increase the flooding in Segment 4.

Mr. Phillips stated that Segment 4 began at the regional stormwater facility and continued to Munson Slough. It was originally touted as the ‘water quality’ segment however each segment of the project had a water quality improvements element; including Segment 3. Furthermore, staff would recommend to the Board that the Master Plan and the Financial Plan be adjusted so that staff could proceed with Segment 3. The costs between the two were very similar, Mr. Phillips stated.

Ed Ringe stated that the key point to focus on with the box culvert in place was that the surface water essentially moved across level. In the proposed 25 and existing 100 year

floods were at the same stage as the current design. Which, staff felt, would be the biggest thing to address if they moved the study sequence up.

Also, regarding FDOT, Mr. Ringe stated that in the 1990's, following the last round of significant flooding of South Monroe, they committed to a study in conjunction with the resurfacing project. They had assigned that to EC Driver and Blueprint/LPA had provided the existing conditions hydraulics model to them and would also furnish them with the recalibrated model when it became available. Michael Wright asked about the timing of the FDOT drainage study. Mr. Ringe stated that it was underway; it was currently in the research and evaluation mode.

John Buss asked if there was any reason FDOT could not complete the study and make their improvements (if they were funded) before Blueprint completed Segment 3; would not it only be a couple years difference? Mr. Ringe stated that yes it would only be a couple years however the elevations and profiles were such that until Segment 3 was designed / improved they would not be able to solve any problems on South Monroe Street. Mr. Ringe stated that it was the coordination between the study and design efforts that would have the most benefit.

Jim Davis stated that the bottom line was, in fact, time. It would be a trade off, he stated, though that could reduce the flooding on South Monroe a couple years earlier. Whereas, if Segment 4 was completed first, South Monroe would continue to flood until Segment 3 was completed. Mr. Buss stated that FDOT could complete their study and improvements but they would not be effective. Mr. Ringe pointed out that currently FDOT improvements were not funded. Mr. Buss stated that even the 2-year gain was questionable because of that. Mr. Davis concurred.

Mr. Buss stated that his reasoning for that line of questioning was based on his seeing repeatedly that water quality would be handled in Segment 4 and he did not see any quantification. The advantage was potentially a two-year acceleration of South Monroe Street flooding relief however the disadvantage was that water quality would be delayed. He questioned if everything would work if Blueprint had not yet built the water quality. Mr. Ringe stated that his concern was that they were designing and building the upstream and downstream portions however they were unsure what would occur in the middle segment. It would lock them into the scenario and open them up to the potential of Monroe Street dumping more water into the system than they could have anticipated.

Mr. Buss acknowledged that Mr. Ringe's concerns were valid but that it was standard to build stormwater facilities from the bottom (Segment 4) to the top (Segment 1). This project was a bit unusual because they were not following that format. However, he still was not clear on how the water quality would work if Blueprint built Segment 3 first.

Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Buss was correct in that they would forego the water quality benefits that they had touted throughout the process. There was however some limited benefits from the ponds that would be built in Segment 3. Mr. Buss stated that he was

not speaking to the general benefits or drawbacks of water quality but more specifically, would Blueprint create a handicap in permitting because they would need Segment 4. He felt that the Master Plan envisioned Segment 4; if the improvements they had relied on in Segment 4 would still be there.

Michael Wright stated that it was his understanding that the flooding issues on South Monroe were largely due to the storm sewer plumbing not having the necessary capacity; not simply a flooding of the ditch or backing up. Mr. Buss stated no, however it would depend on the rain event. Mr. Davis stated that was part of the reasoning behind the FDOT study.

Mr. Wright stated that his only concern was the coordination on the PD&E for FAMU Way. Dave Bright stated that Blueprint staff was involved with the meetings and were also concerned with coordination. The committee concurred that coordination was critical, particularly regarding right-of-way.

Tony Park stated that the County had water quality issues at Lake Munson. One of the advantages of constructing Segment 4 next was the water quality of that lake and the neighborhoods in that area. He was not sure that the timing was great enough to justify the changes. He was concerned that with tying Segment 3 and Segment 4 into the FAMU Way and Gaines Street Revitalization that they could be significantly delayed. Mr. Wright stated that the City had "money in the bank" and despite Mr. Park's concerns, Mr. Wright felt confident that would not be the issue. Mr. Park stated that he saw it as potential for negative ("building roads over water quality") publicity.

Gary Phillips stated that the timing of the project would be essentially the same except Segment 3 would be completed prior to Segment 4, if the changes were made to the sequencing. Phil Maher stated that funding for Segment 4 would come available in October 2007 at the beginning of fiscal year 2008; if they were switched funding for Segment 3 would be available in October. Tony Park questioned why they could not be done concurrently.

Mr. Wright stated that he was not as concern about construction of Segment 3 as he was about the design and coordination. Unless there was some aspect of it in which there were joint decisions to be made or ponds that needed to be constructed as part of the road project. He offered to advance fund those as well. He wanted to ensure however, that the roadway and whatever Blueprint built would work together.

John Buss questioned if there was a problem with approaching it incrementally. If both were under design at the same time there would be opportunities for collaboration. Mr. Davis questioned if funding could be shifted to design both Segment 3 and 4 concurrently and forego construction of either until they were caught up again. Mr. Maher stated that there was approximately \$3 million that would come available in October 2007. However, if they moved money from the Landbank ...

Mr. Davis emphasize to the committee that by going the route of concurrent design of Segment 3 and 4 that construction of both segments would be delayed. The committee agreed that it would give all parties involved more flexibility and help them all “feel” better. Mr. Davis stated that staff would look more closely at what funding was available; however if it was financially feasible, Blueprint would design both segments and forego the construction of either pending the results of the design. He could see either scenario however the final staff recommendation to the IA would be driven by money. Mr. Davis stated that there were details that would need to be discussed once staff had reviewed the finances in greater detail.

The committee discussed the pros and cons of using one or two consultants to design all of the projects, FAMU Way, Segment 3, and Segment 4. Mr. Davis stated that the collective was subject to Blueprint working out the financial details, designing Segment 3, Segment 4, and FAMU Way extension concurrently was the preferred concept. The committee agreed.

Mr. Davis stated that it was Blueprint’s intention not to continue with an option on the Genesis contract. Blueprint was satisfied with the performance by Genesis; however they intend to advertise competitively for Segments 3 and 4.

**Item #6: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study: Weighting of Evaluation Criteria**

Raymond Ashe, Project Manager with Kimley Horn, stated that the intent was to review the relevant importance of the criteria in relation to each other. At that point in the process, he stated, they were not as concerned with the effect; that portion of the evaluation would come later. The criterion was determined based on input from citizens and stakeholders at district forums and charrettes with professional evaluation by Blueprint and Kimley Horn staff. Jim Davis stated, from a procedural standpoint that not every criterion could be a 3; it was necessary to maintain a balance and if one was increased it almost implied that another needed to be decreased. Currently, he stated, there were four criterion weighted at 1, five weighted at 2, and four weighted at 3.

John Kraynak stated that his concern with the minimal rating for Floodplains was that they could not be easily replaced. There were many functional benefits in a naturally vegetated floodplain that he did not want to see destroyed. Furthermore, he stated that the Comp Plan protected naturally vegetated floodplains and that they could not be disturbed unless they were altered. He felt it needed a higher weight.

John Buss stated that undisturbed floodplains were a preservation feature and it did not matter how they were altered. They could not be disturbed without a linear infrastructure variance. From a hydraulic standpoint one could provide an equivalence but not from an ecological position. Wayne Tedder recommended increasing the weight of Floodplains and decreasing Vegetation and Wildlife. His justification for that was that while important, preserving a 30-inch oak tree was not as high a priority as preserving the floodplain that related to the top priorities of wetlands and stormwater management.

Rodney Cassidy suggested decreasing Recreation/Open space/Greenways because all of that would automatically come with the floodplains themselves.

Mr. Ashe stated that regarding floodplains, Kimley Horn was looking at them for their hydraulic value and ability for storage. The fact that they were naturally vegetated or quality floodplain areas would be picked up in the Wetlands criterion; which had the highest weight available. However, the hydraulic capacity of that floodplain was the purpose of the Floodplain criterion.

Mr. Buss stated that he felt they would be better served if it were placed where the regulatory structure of Tallahassee had it because not all floodplains were wetlands. Furthermore, they might want to specify "altered floodplains" and "undisturbed floodplains" to more accurately weigh them.

Theresa Heiker stated that by following Mr. Tedder's suggestion the emphasis would be placed on the features of the floodplain that the committee was concerned with. She felt it would more aptly address the issues of concern than Mr. Cassidy's suggestion because the social issues needed to be taken into account during the PD&E. Mr. Ashe stated that it seemed the committee was venturing into the Effect evaluation rather than the Weight with their discussion. Mr. Buss disagreed because the effect was a measure of the disruption or the magnitude of the intrusion. The weight was the importance of the feature that was being disturbed.

Tony Park requested clarification on the scoring of the weights and effects. Which was better, a higher or lower number? Mr. Ashe stated that the negative numbers represented the impacts and the positive numbers represented the enhancements. Therefore the lower number would be the least desirable. They would be looking for higher numbers. Mr. Park asked, if the alignment enhanced the floodplain it would be given a positive number? Mr. Ashe confirmed that. Mr. Buss offered that if weirs were installed in a badly disturbed floodplain and it was restored to a more natural state would be an example of that. However, he felt that the more expected application of it would be 'would the alignment tear through a vegetated, forested floodplain or one that was a concrete plant or shopping mall.

Mr. Buss reiterated his position on the distinction between altered and undisturbed floodplain. Separating the two, he felt, would provide a more accurate evaluation of each. Ms. Heiker stated that emphasized what Mr. Ashe stated earlier; that the Floodplain criterion was a hydraulic number and that Vegetation and Wildlife was where the habitat came into play. That was why Wetlands was weighted at a 3, Vegetation and Wildlife at a 2, and Floodplains at a 1. Mr. Buss stated that he saw her point but to do it that way, however, was inconsistent with the regulatory scheme and the Comp Plan. Ms. Heiker stated that as it was it recognized specifically that the Vegetation and Wildlife component of the floodplain had a greater concern than the hydraulic capacity.

Ms. Heiker stated that she felt that it had been finessed as well as it could be. Jim Davis stated that he would like Mr. Ashe to clarify in the description listed on the matrix what they were actually evaluating. The committee agreed that with the expanded notes clarifying each category the weighting on the Floodplain criterion should remain a 1 and that Vegetation and Wildlife should remain a 2.

Mr. Davis moved through the list to identify the areas of concern and eliminate from discussion the ones that the committee agreed upon. Access and Mobility and Recreation / Open Space / Greenways were the criterion pulled for discussion.

Regarding Access and Mobility, Wayne Tedder stated that mobility was the major objective of building the roadway and he felt should be the top priority. Mr. Ashe stated that the interpretation of that criterion was that access and mobility of the roadway were secondary benefits. Mobility was for the ability to accommodate some of the mass transit systems, bicycle or pedestrian traffic, etc. Access was for enhanced access to areas that were underdevelopment or for future development. Mr. Tedder questioned if the roadway was also and SIS connector; Mr. Davis stated, no it was not. However, he continued, depending on the alignment, a portion of it could be. Mr. Park stated that as he understood it, the criterion was to evaluate how the new alignment accommodated access and mobility. Mr. Davis confirmed his statement.

Mr. Davis questioned if that category was one in which they would truly evaluate in the "effect" rather than weighting. If they were to evaluate an alignment along the existing alignment, that touched the entrance to the airport (ala SIS) would that not be an effect? Mr. Ashe stated that the number of parcels that the roadway provided access to, the number of greenways or trails would be on the effect side. Mr. Davis stated that at the same time, by incorporating the Airport into the Access and Mobility category then any evaluation of an alignment that would touch or provide access to the Airport would be weighted higher than an alignment that did not. However, how important was that function? Hence the reason it was at a 2 in the weighting; the other issues would be considered with the effects.

John Buss suggested that Mr. Ashe draft a paragraph for each category that more fully explained the definitions of each. Mr. Davis concurred. There being no further discussion, the point was acquiesced at a 2.

Regarding Recreational / Open Space / Greenways Rodney Cassidy stated that his concern or question was, did they leave the areas that the community recognized as most valuable under the Comp Plan in the Land Development Code or build through them and replace them with artificial open space. In his opinion it should be weighted lower because they could be located anywhere, whether it flooded or not, and maintain the more valued areas because of the vegetation and wildlife benefits to the floodplains. John Buss stated that, again, he felt it should be more clearly defined i.e. "natural areas" because some people considered a golf course to be of the same quality as natural open areas.

Mr. Ashe stated that he agreed with both comments however he had to factor in the information obtained via the district forums that were held for area residents. They requested the inclusion of recreational greenspace be included because there was not a constructed park (i.e. Tom Brown) on the southwest side of town. Mr. Cassidy stated that he was by no means suggesting that it could not be placed there. However, the configuration could be manipulated through the flexibility of linear infrastructure variance and still protect the natural areas and allow them to benefit the environment as well.

Mr. Davis questioned if Mr. Cassidy's primary concern was that Vegetation and Wildlife was weighted as a 2 as compared to a 3. Or was it that he did not think that Recreational / Open Space / Greenway should be a 2? Mr. Davis offered a suggestion before the answers were given. He suggested that they clarify the definitions, make Vegetation and Wildlife a 3 and Recreational / Open Space / Greenways a 1. That configuration would still give the one-third, one-third, almost one-third breakdown they were looking for.

Mr. Buss questioned how the desire of the residents of that area wanting the City to build a park was relevant to the construction of the road. Mr. Ashe stated that in the grand scheme the properties that were available, where stormwater management facilities might be needed or desired it could be that in association with the roadway alignment and the acquisition of right-of-way could include development of those acquisitions or facilities into something more recreational. Mr. Davis likened it to the Regional Stormwater Pond 1 on the Capital Circle Northwest project. Furthermore, at the public meetings that category rivaled Lake Protection with the community.

Based upon the discussion, the committee agreed that they were content with the weighting breakdown being four 1's, four 2's, and five 3's.

## **V. Items from Members of the Committee**

Dave Bright suggested forming a subcommittee to work on the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and Segment 4 Scope of Services. The following members agreed to serve: Theresa Heiker, John Buss, Wayne Tedder, and Gabe Menendez. Dave Bright would be the chair of the committee.

John Buss stated, in regards to the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Dog Park, that they needed to come to some resolution because Genesis continued to design it. He felt it was problematic because of the TMDL on the ditch that required an 85% reduction of coliform and he did not feel it was the most feasible location for it due to the storm sewer properties. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was trying to form a committee that would include David Chapman of TPRD because a portion of the decision would be based on the methodologies that would be used to police the park itself. Regarding policing, Mr. Buss stated that the limit was 400 counts per 100 milliliters and there were 23 to 40



million bacteria per gram of dog feces. He did not think that policing alone would be sufficient.

Jim Davis updated the committee of the staff changes at Blueprint. He also noted the groundbreaking ceremony for the E2 project on August 22 at 10 am and the ribbon cutting ceremony for the N1 project on September 26, noting that it was opening ahead of schedule and under budget.

## **VI. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:24 pm.