

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 27, 2009

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

Tom O’Steen, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. Acknowledgments were made of the service of the four outgoing members: Kathy Archibald, Jerry Conger, Gregg Patterson, and Jess Van Dyke.

Committee Members present:

Lamar Taylor	Scott Balog
Jess Van Dyke	Nancy Miller
Kevin McGorty	Burt Davy
Kathy Archibald (telephonically)	Jerry Conger
Tom O’Steen	Windell Page
Gregg Patterson	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Gary Phillips
Dave Bright	Margie Quillman
Phil Maher	Latesa Turner
Dave Snyder	Angela Richardson
Jim Shepherd	Ray Youmans

Agenda Modifications

Dave Bright introduced the newest Blueprint Intern, Claire Forbes.

Information Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

This item was informational only.

Windell Page, being the newest member, questioned the process for sharing such information with Commissioners. Jim Davis stated that all City and County Commissioners are updated via email with each of Blueprint’s successes; specifically regarding funding. Margie Quillman also noted that press releases are also issued.

Jim Davis stated that FDOT had imposed additional guidelines and rules on Federal Stimulus dollars and briefly discussed the delays in spending state wide. Furthermore, the delta from FDOT projects whose bids had come in lower than the original estimates would be reallocated by FDOT Central Office in the near future.

Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail Update

This item was informational only.

Burt Davy questioned if any of Coal Shute Park was currently funded or when Blueprint anticipated funding. Dave Bright stated that Blueprint did not have enough funding in the budget for construction. The City CRA had provided funding for acquisition of the property. He anticipated the City to submit the TIGER (Transportation Infrastructure Generating Economic Recovery) grant within a month. If Coal Shute Park was not the winning project and the \$2M was not awarded to the City, Blueprint would not have funding to build the project. The bottom line was in the ballpark of \$4M. Mr. Davy questioned if Blueprint would move forward with construction plans and permits for Coal Shute Park even if they did not have the funding. Mr. Bright stated that the project had been authorized to go to 100% and would proceed in case "money fell into [their] lap," like what happened with Capital Circle Woodville to Crawfordville.

Item #3: FY 2008 Performance Evaluation

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Update of the Operating and Capital Outlay Budget

This item was informational only.

Consent Items

Item #5: CAC Minutes: May 21, 2009

This item was informational only.

Item #6: Proposed 2010 IA, TCC, and CAC Meetings Schedules

This item was informational only.

Nancy Miller moved the Consent Agenda; Scott Balog seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #7: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

Dave Bright stated that there was a slight modification to the agenda item. Blueprint was in receipt of an email from Stephen Hogge, CONA President, stating that he was the appointee for the CAC. His nomination would take effect immediately upon IA approval.

Jerry Conger noted a correction to the Agenda item; Steve Amnott, the Disabled Community Representative, was not "removed" from the CAC, he was simply not reappointed.

Jerry Conger moved approval of the item as amended; Gregg Patterson seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Burt Davy expressed his concern with lack of attendance, vacancies, and lack of nominations for said vacancies.

Item #10: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study – Preferred Alternative

Steve Godfrey offered a detailed presentation on the PD&E study and the preferred alternative; a copy of which is in the file. Jim Davis stated that the intent of the presentation was to give the CAC a “sneak preview” of the presentation the Board would receive at the September meeting. Below are specific comments or questions from Committee members.

Kathy Archibald stated that widening the existing alignment would have no effect on Lake Hiawatha, Lake Minnehaha, or Lake Bradford. Mr. Godfrey stated that the dry ponds which would be created along the existing alignment would not be holding water. Consequently they would not discharge pollutants. The area along the existing alignment was sandier than the area north of Orange Avenue which had more clay.

Jess Van Dyke stated that the key point was whether the west ditch discharged to Lake Bradford or Black Swamp. Mr. Godfrey stated that the flow would travel down the west ditch, through the culvert at Lake Bradford Road, and into Black Swamp. In significant rain events or when the flow was heavy enough it would overtop the ditch and flow into Grassy Lake. Additionally there would be a second ditch so that when the flow was impeded at Lake Bradford Road, there would be an opportunity for it to backflow into Grassy Lake. Besides stormwater retention in a pond site (to be constructed west of Paul Dirac Drive), that second ditch would serve as stormwater and floodplain mitigation. If it became a dry pond some of those concerns would be eliminated.

Kevin McGorty questioned if there was a difference between analyzing the quality of water in the four lake system versus the impact it currently had on Black Swamp and Grassy Lake. Mr. Godfrey stated that they recognized that water quality was higher in Lake Bradford, however, the permanent impact on it would be non-existent in the Widening option because of the sandy soil and water management system. Mr. McGorty stated that the Realignment Alternative was the result of considerable committee meetings. He fully respected the process and the direction, however, had no level of comfort with the impact to the chain of lakes. His concerns were long term in the degradation of the lake system. Mr. Godfrey stated that with the Realignment Alternative, there would be major construction through wetlands and floodplains. There were potential impacts on the environment, no matter the course of action, if erosion was not managed correctly during construction. Strict design, contracting, and monitoring methods would be incorporated into the project, no matter which alternative was selected, and would become commitments of the PD&E.

Kathy Archibald stated that she would like a consideration of the discharge of the roadway and what it was discharging into. Discharge into the Bradford chain of lakes would have a greater and more direct impact on the aquifer (via sinkholes in the lakes) than if it discharged into Black Swamp, which was more capable of handling and filtering the stormwater runoff. Mr. Van Dyke stated that the west ditch was a great threat to Lake Bradford during high flow. If, during the project, the flow was somewhat obstructed so that it would discharge into Black Swamp, it would improve the water quality of Lake Bradford over the long term. The swamp was tougher; nutrient pollution would not hurt it or the wildlife. Sedimentation would hurt it and it is critical that the construction process be well managed.

Nancy Miller questioned if the TCC members had mentioned that the City and county has experienced several pond failures in the sandy, southern parts of the County. Mr. Godfrey stated

that he was not familiar with pond failures. However, the water management plan for both alignments was quite conservative; using mostly dry ponds that were only two-feet deep with the exception of two wet ponds, one at the existing burrow pit and another to handle floodplain mitigation. In regards to mitigation, Ms. Miller stated that she did not see mitigation for Black Swamp in the provided information.

Scott Balog questioned what was calculated in the 1.9-acres of surface water for the Realignment. Mr. Godfrey stated that it was everywhere that ROW encroached on surface water (Lake Bradford Crossing, Munson Slough, etc). Mr. Balog wondered if it took into consideration the existing roadway, if the Realignment was selected. Mr. Godfrey stated that it had been and it was to the benefit of the Realignment because it would provide a reduction of direct discharge into Bradford Brook due to the proposed linear pond.

There was brief discussion as to the objective of the agenda item. Jim Davis stated that the purpose of moving through the process in great detail was because there had been significant changes to the matrix since the August 13, 2009 Public Meeting. Blueprint staff did not want to be subjected to criticizing claims that Blueprint pulled a "bait and switch." Staff was offering full disclosure to ensure that the CAC knew fully the way the process worked and understood staff's position. Mr. Davis reiterated from past meetings that the process was a quantitative methodology that did not (and should not) measure public will nor vision.

Nancy Miller stated that as she understood it Orange Avenue was planned to be widened. Mr. Godfrey concurred. Ms. Miller further stated that the impacts to floodplains, etc. would be felt anyway. Tom O'Steen stated that it was one of the points that would be tallied at the end of the matrix. In weighting, the Widening Alternative presumed additional road improvements that had impacts that were not factored in. Mr. Godfrey stated that the west ditch (as it traveled south of Orange Avenue and crossed Lake Bradford Road) would not be affected in improvements to Orange Avenue. The widening of Orange would follow the existing alignment and would have an affect extending the culvert underneath but with additional impervious surface and discharge resulting in associated water quality effects. Mrs. Archibald clarified that the widening of the existing alignment would not preclude the need for Orange Avenue to be widened in the future. Also, it would have a negative effect on the wetland. However, the Realignment did not factor in that Orange Avenue would not need to be widened in the future. Mr. Godfrey concurred. Furthermore, Orange Avenue would need to be four-laned to approximately Eisenhower, in conjunction with the presence of the six-laned widening of the existing alignment. With the Realignment Alternative Orange Avenue would need to be widened only east of the new Capital Circle corridor. Mr. Godfrey further stated that the PD&E did not factor it in the widening of Orange Avenue on the Widening Alternative. However, it did for the Realignment because the Realignment would take the place of [a segment of] Orange Avenue. Mrs. Archibald suggested that Kimley Horn evaluate and incorporate that into the matrix.

Regarding costs, Kathy Archibald suggested that the projected costs for widening Orange Avenue in the future be included as a consideration when analyzing the costs of widening the current alignment versus realigning. Tom O'Steen stated that Kimley Horn was required to follow a standardized process that had to analyze the cost of the roadway in the PD&E. That was why the data did not take Orange Avenue into affect. Mr. Godfrey stated that it was a reasonable request and could be annotated.

Mrs. Archibald stated that the Realignment Alternative would provide opportunities for economic development, but it would not eliminate the opportunity for development along the existing alignment. However, if the existing alignment were widened, all of the development opportunities would be restricted to one corridor. Mr. Godfrey acknowledged that Mrs. Archibald's concern was reflected in the analysis. There were 650-acres that could be accessed by the Widening Alternative; the 750-acres accounted for the land along both alignments. The Realignment only offered 100 additional acres of land for economic development because of lake and flood protection zones. The acreage in those zones was, for the sake of analysis, reduced by 50%. Therefore the intensity of development was substantially abridged.

Nancy Miller felt that the numbers for economic development reflected in the matrix should be increased by 0.5, even though the relative was not much greater, because of the overall combination of opportunity... Mr. O'Steen interjected that if the existing roadway were widened it would not really create more economic development opportunity. With a new corridor it would access new property in addition to the existing property and opportunity along the existing roadway.

Mr. Godfrey stated that in the Widening Alternative, Orange Avenue continued to exist, potentially as a four-lane roadway. It would provide access to a substantial amount of property that had not been considered in the PD&E. It would have economic development opportunity, not necessarily as great as if it were all connected by the Realignment Alternative. That was re-reasoning behind a score of 2.5 rather than 3.

Kathy Archibald stated that the bottom line of the Realignment was the opportunities were only as great as the vision of the IA. Looking at the area holistically, the opportunities were there for housing, trade, industrial or commercial, research, etc. Along the existing alignment, it was limited to industrial or airport related development. Mr. Godfrey concurred. Mrs. Archibald continued, discussing the difficulty in measuring the vision of a Commissioner. She felt there was a greater "bang for your buck" for economic development, more holistically, on the Realignment Alternative, but it required action of local government, in part, to create that vision. Mr. Godfrey stated that it would need, almost, a Community Development District!

Tom O'Steen stated, regarding recreational opportunity, that he felt the Realignment potential had been under rated. The conformance of the widening project with the Greenways Master Plan, he felt, only spoke to the fact that it was the road in place at the time of the Master Plan. It could be incorporated with the Realignment and open up new territories connecting to Alumni Village, Innovation Park, FSU Southwest Campus, and the Intramural Fields, etc. He felt there should be a larger distinction between the two alternatives in the matrix.

Mr. Osteen stated that he recalled that a number of households that were mobile homes would be affected by the Realignment Alternative. There was the potential to reduce impacts because they were relatively portable as compared to a site built home and could be relocated. Also there were several vacant mobile home lots in the area where the home could be relocated there. There was still some impact, but it was less than a site built home.

Mr. Godfrey stated that a portion of the matrix had been refined; there were 11, not 14, mobile homes. However, the total number of households was correct. Seven of the 11 were in Lake Bradford Estates and the condition of them was such that Kimley Horn was unsure if they could be moved or not. Three were in Paradise Cove; all of the lots there were filled. The last one was further south. Approximately half of the mobile homes were owner occupied and half were occupied by tenants. The total relocations were 28 on the Realignment, 11 of which were mobile homes; one of each was condemned however. On the Widening Alternative there were 14 households, one of which was a mobile home; none were condemned. Mr. O'Steen suggested an annotation that the same weight was given to all household sites, including the mobile homes that might be in such poor condition that staff did not think could be relocated to those that were still owner occupied. Mr. Godfrey stated that it had to be remembered that by the time ROW acquisition occurred it was impossible to predict what might be impacted.

Kevin McGorty suggested they move onto the larger recommendation to the IA. It behooved them to make a recommendation on the three alternatives. Kathy Archibald stated that she was in a quandary. She had a personal feeling of the outcome; however, the data did not support that. Part of the EECC's goal with the Realignment, other than it was based on a prior PD&E, was the opportunity for economic development, the negation of widening Orange Avenue, and the separate, more limited access to the Airport, etc. Nevertheless, with the results of the evaluation as they were, Mrs. Archibald could not recommend the Realignment Alternative any longer.

Tom O'Steen stated that when the EECC originally revived the Realignment concept it was based upon all the reasons given. However when it became a state road, it was subject to, with all due respect, a very engineering friendly PD&E process. To Mr. Davis' earlier point, the CAC's recommendation, while taking it all into account, need not feel harbored by that process. Even with a strong preference to the outcome, he stated, he was struck by, even under varying cost opportunities, that one could widen an existing roadway for approximately the cost of building a new one and keep the old one in place.

Lamar Taylor stated that he was finding it difficult to recommend the Realignment Alternative on a number of points, cost being one of them. He too was shocked that the costs for the roadways were comparable. He was concerned with ROW issues and that the cost of realigning was not fully anticipated. Furthermore, the existing/Airport access road would remain with no mitigation.

Kevin McGorty stated that he understood the passions involved with the proposal to relocate households for a highway system. However, what should be equally passionate, he stated, were the original values that the EECC had with the plan, as well as the multiple values of protecting the chain of lakes and the economic development opportunities for the south side. Therefore he was leaning toward the Realignment to accomplish that. The presentation, however, showed that all surface water quality was judged equally. While he highly respected the analyses and process, what were presented were highly quantitative mathematical formulas. The purpose the lakes served, the quality of their water, the service they provided to the aquifer, and the amount of tax payer money that had been spent to retrofit lakes, had been degraded by humans due to stormwater and transportation projects. He felt that Tallahassee was fortunate to retain an Airport access road while simultaneously providing economic development opportunities with the new alignment. While protecting the high quality of the lakes, some alteration and

restoration could be better served to take the overflow from the roads.

Jess Van Dyke stated that he was concerned with the relative weight they were giving the TCC. Prior to the TCC meeting the delta between the Widening and Realignment Alternatives was only three points. However, afterward, with their input, the Realignment was eight points worse than the widening. That was significant in his opinion, especially giving them clout without a biologist on the committee. If folks were truly concerned with long term water quality, the west ditch was the greatest threat to Lake Bradford. In major rain events stormwater blasted through Grassy Lake into Lake Bradford. Swamps were tougher and better able to mitigate the runoff than lakes. He foresaw with the Realignment a shifting of the west ditch that would take the polluted water to Black Swamp and protect Grassy Lake and shift the weighting to a more positive position. It was not an easy decision but the thought process all along had been to protect the chain of lakes and stimulate economic development.

Nancy Miller stated that in the beginning with the EECC, they thought in terms of the southern strategy, and even after years of meetings she still believed that the Realignment would be a more powerful force in the rebirth of the south side. It did not matter what the numbers indicated; it did not change her mind. She stated that she believed it would be a stimulus to the south side and that could not be measured.

Gregg Patterson stated that originally he supported the Realignment; however, he was concerned that with it they would be bypassing the Airport, an economic engine for the community. He felt there was more economic development opportunity along the existing alignment because of the Airport. However, water quality and natural resources were a legacy to be left to our descendents. He stated that he had been on both sides of the argument. However he cast his vote in favor of the Realignment.

Lamar Taylor stated that he respected the opinions given and that he supported water quality; if things were to sway him to take the risk on cost it would be water quality. Furthermore he had strong policy reason against government involvement with economic engines as it was market function. His personal views were that government expenditures should be spent for government works i.e. roads, water, schools, etc. If it was such that water quality was of that magnitude differential he was all for it. However, they would be leaving an existing road that would have no mitigation. If in fact, the vision came to fruition there would be further development along both roadways. He frankly felt the cost differential was such that he proposed moving forward with the Widening Alternative and using the savings to improve water quality in that region. He felt it was more realistic, more realizable, and more feasible, not to mention a more government policy driven decision than the Realignment Alternative.

Jerry Conger stated that he was not a member of the EECC and it was his impression that those who were and were presently on the CAC were disappointed by the outcome of what he viewed as a rather objective and thorough evaluation of all factors. He felt it was unfortunate that their views of the Realignment were not supported but that it was a viable outcome. The cost factor was relevant in the differences. The impact on the population in the alternative route was significant and of concern to him. He agreed with much of what Mr. Taylor previously stated but was torn because he had not heard anything that indicated water quality issues would be made worse or the lakes would be further degraded by one alternative or the other. His

conclusion was that it was a very thorough and objective study that could not be faulted. Therefore, he voted for the Widening Alternative.

Burt Davy stated that he was voting for the Widening Alternative without trying to convenience anyone. He favored it prior to the presentation and Mr. Van Dyke came close to the tipping point for him, but he returned to the Widening. The study had been under way for three years, and the data favored the Widening; he personally had approximately six-hours on the subject including the current meeting, therefore, he could not in good conscience vote any other way.

Windell Page stated that while he was the newest member of the group, times were difficult and everyone was being prudent with how they spent money. Staff had given it their best, and the data supported the Widening Alternative. He trusted staff's professional judgment, and based on what had been presented, he had to vote in favor of widening the current alignment.

Scott Balog stated that Mr. Van Dyke made a compelling argument. He was hung up on thinking that Realignment was the only opportunity to improve water quality. Adding to that the cost differential ... he had to vote in favor of the Widening Alternative. He supported Mr. Taylor's suggestion that with the cost savings the staff should consider investing in water quality and environmental concerns for that area.

Jess Van Dyke stated that unanimous decisions from a committee such as the CAC were powerful. He offered a compromise of widening the existing alignment and pursuing improvements to Black Swamp via acquisition, and to consider a realignment of the west ditch to keep water out of Grassy Lake. He felt that would truly change the quality of the Bradford chain of lakes. He felt that the Widening Alternative would reduce construction impacts due to the sandy soil; he was concerned about the clay soil to the north. He liked economic development ideas to the north, however, in keeping it simple, he stated that with Widening and the "full monte" of improvements to Black Swamp and to the flow into it they would have fair compromise.

Kathy Archibald supported that suggestion. True she wanted the Realignment Alternative to work because she believed in the economic development engine of possibility, but Mr. Taylor's point was well taken also. If something was not done to the existing roadway, the citizens would be stuck with the current situation, which was already degrading the lake. She disagreed that widening Capital Circle was the only way to get economic development to the Airport; rarely was a major highway seen directly in front of the Airport. An airport access road separate from Capital Circle gave opportunity for airport related industry to thrive. Mr. Van Dyke's suggested compromise would definitely provide benefit to the Lakes if indeed there was zero surface water impact. To relocate the west ditch and make improvements to Black Swamp, there would be a significant, positive spin on the mitigation of the existing roadway. She could support that recommendation.

Kevin McGorty stated that his priority for the project was not economic development but saving the high quality, magnificent, recreational lakes that serves many in the community. He would support the Widening Alternative with Mr. Van Dyke's recommendation and he added the following footnote, asking the IA to go one step farther to ensure the impact to the lake was minimized. Mr. Godfrey stated that the best way to accomplish that was to have it written into

the project document.

Jess Van Dyke moved to support the widening of the existing alignment of Capital Circle Southwest with improvements to Black Swamp and the redirection of the west ditch flow. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #8: Revised Citizens Advisory Committee Bylaws

This item was tabled until the next CAC meeting.

Item #9: Blueprint 2000 Stormwater Design Issues

This item was tabled until the next CAC meeting.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:43 pm.