

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

SunTrust Bank Building
2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200
Thursday, April 4, 2013

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

Tony Park	Wayne Tedder	Ryan Wetherell
Gabe Menendez	Charles Hargraves	Alisha Wetherell
Rodney Cassidy	Dave Snyder	Bill Norwood
Theresa Heiker	Gary Phillips	Tom Vieth
Harry Reed	Autumn Calder	Stephen Hodges
<i>Jodie Cahoon</i>	Junious Brown	Susan Tanski
Jay Townsend	Margie Quillman	Debbie Lightsey
Alan Rosenzweig	Angela Ivy	
John Kraynak	Debra Schiro	

Charles Hargraves called the meeting to order at 1:08.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications. However, the order of the agenda was changed due to the City Stormwater representatives being late to the meeting.

III. Consent

Item #2: TCC Meeting Minutes: October 16, 2012

Theresa Heiker noted her name was misspelled in the body of the minutes.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #3: Capital Circle SW Right of Way Adjustment

Charles Hargraves gave a brief summary of the agenda item and introduced Ryan Wetherell with Kimley Horn. Mr. Wetherell gave the history with FHWA of the two 4f properties owned by the City and the US Forest Services (USFS).

Tony Park noted that the typical sections included in the agenda did not include the service roads at the outside edges of the 230-foot ROW. He requested that the adopted typical section be the one presented to the IA. Mr. Wetherell stated that when Kimley Horn (KHA) began the PD&E study in 2006 they used the typical section available at that time. Since it did not have service roads, nothing in the course of the PD&E evaluated service roads. KHA's understanding from conversations with the Airport was that the Airport intended to improve the service roads on their property. Given the USFS

property and that the Airport was making improvements to the existing service roads, Mr. Wetherell was not certain that they could present a strong case for the necessity of including them at that time. It would also require a big step backward in the PD&E process to evaluate the additional impervious surface.

Gabe Menendez spoke in support of Mr. Park's point. He stated that the 230-foot ROW was to reserve space for not only service roads but multi-modal transportation components. Mr. Tedder stated that there was no development through the National Forest. Mr. Park stated that the IA should see it to understand why the 230-foot ROW was initially established. As well as, to preserve the 230-foot ROW from Springhill Road to Crawfordville Road where there would be the potential for development.

Debra Schiro stated that the width of the road varied near I-10. If there was a legitimate reason for that variance then it would be a defensible position. In the original "blue book" that section of Capital Circle was discussed as having a 200-foot ROW with different uses within that width. If the IA wanted to maintain the 230-foot ROW, the difference could be taken from the south or Airport side given that the City owns that land already. There would be a process to it but it could be done. Mr. Wetherell stated that KHA evaluated the Airport impact. Taking from the south side would encroach on the revenue generating facility at the exit of the parking lot and would take the frontage road that looped around that lot as well as require the replacement of those structures. It also prohibited going up toward Compass Point and impacted karst features in that area. The combination of those impacts made the project potentially unviable. Although the City manages the Airport, the majority of the land was purchased by funding from the FAA. The hoops to go through to purchase it back made it as challenging as acquiring it from a private entity, if not more.

Harry Reed questioned if the only exception to the 230-foot ROW was the segment of 4f land. Mr. Wetherell confirmed that it was the only area that would be reduced to 180-feet. Mr. Park reiterated that he wanted it made clear to the IA what the impact would be compared to the 230-foot ROW that was adopted for multi-purpose use.

Furthermore, Mr. Reed recommended that Blueprint communicate to the IA that currently the ROW would be 180-feet and annotate the overall intent of the Master Plan. Otherwise, they would encounter problems in the future with other locations because there were no plans ready. If Blueprint published the Master Plan showing the ultimate build-out they would have standing for changes in the future. He understood Mr. Park to say that what should be presented to the IA was the full build-out cross section (230-foot ROW) and the currently proposed (180-foot). Also, if it was decided to incorporate the other 50-foot section, it would be a separate PD&E 4f document.

Mr. Wetherell stated that the typical section that was included in the agenda item was approved by the IA and FDOT. It included a 50-foot natural area within the total ROW. Blueprint would be locked in to keeping that in perpetuity unless it was reevaluated in a separate PD&E. However the class of action would be different: FHWA's involvement

and review would be significantly reduced. Also, depending on funding they might not even get involved.

Mr. Tedder noted that the Comp Plan included future roadway ROW setbacks; that was a 230-foot setback as well. That, along with Mr. Reed's comments, put Blueprint in a good position for the future. Mr. Wetherell agreed. When the corridor presentation was completed, it balanced the impacts splitting the 230-feet equally along the exiting alignment. However, in the alternative the widening was all to the inside of the Circle instead of being split equally on both sides of the existing roadway; because of that there was not enough land preserved in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Wetherell stated that if Blueprint and the IA wanted FHWA to approve the PD&E the ROW had to be reduced to 180-feet at the 4f property. KHA could complete separate 4f documents, FHWA would review them, and it would cost Blueprint more money and delay the whole process. However, in off-line conversations with FHWA, they have flatly stated that they will not approve it. The reason for that is that the City stated that the golden aster preserve was important; the USFS stated that the Lake Bradford tract was important to them. Because of that FHWA is charged with protecting those two properties. Therefore, his recommendation to Blueprint and the City and County was to reduce the ROW to 180-feet; the Planning Department would then modify the Comp Plan to preserve the remainder of the corridor (50-feet) for some future, unidentified use.

Wayne Tedder stated that what he understood the TCC to say was that they accepted the 180-foot as the recommended alternative to move the PD&E forward. Also, to amend the Comprehensive Plan to state how right of way preservation was intended to function in the future. Finally, to provide the notation with the cross sections and the PD&E study for the future use of the area. Mr. Reed clarified that the ultimate cross section was for a 230-foot ROW however Blueprint would only be using a 180-foot ROW for the areas with 4f designations. Mr. Park stressed the importance of protecting the 230-foot option for future possibilities. Mr. Wetherell stated that the 230-foot ROW could be protected if it was coupled with a Comp Plan amendment for transportation setback.

Mr. Menendez stated that if the City opted to pursue use of the 50-foot in the future, the permitting agency could respond that twice the City had presented the position that the 4f land/golden aster preserve was important. Currently, it had only been put forward once. He felt that pursuing it now would make it more difficult to reverse in the future. Alan Rosenzweig agreed; once it was preserved twice it would probably never be developed.

Mr. Hargraves, with Mr. Wetherell's concurrence, stated that the projections in the PD&E indicate that the need for 6-lanes would be tripped in the year 2035. He questioned if Blueprint should spend another two years on individual 4f documents; for FHWA to not approve.

Mr. Wetherell stated that FHWA was charged by Washington, DC with protecting 4f property. When they asked the City and USFS how the properties affected them and

what their level of importance was, and received the responses they did the only choice was to protect the land. It puts FHWA in the position of doing something that is outside of what the owners asked them to do.

Mr. Tedder called for public speakers:

Debbie Lightsey stated that it was confounding to the citizen and local elected officials, she felt, who worked for years to refine a design to have it thrown out by FDOT. How was it that they could continue to encourage citizens to participate when their words were ignored? On the CCSW issue the citizenry looked for narrower ROW, reduced lanes by the airport, a bridge over the wetlands, and a connector over Lake Cascade and the remain Bradford Chain. Many of those aspects appeared to be threatened or disappearing. She hoped that the TCC would keep in mind the intent of the citizens which was to protect the lake system from noise, light, and water pollution; as well as the existing publically owned properties.

Alan Rosenzweig questioned if Ms. Lightsey's specific issue was to not give up the 50-foot, to reduce the ROW, as was currently being discussed. He questioned if she wanted Blueprint to maintain the 230-foot ROW. Ms. Lightsey asked Bill Norwood to address the committee.

Mr. Norwood stated that the (residents) watched the environment of the Chain of Lakes deteriorate. The original Blueprint plans included a potential re-routing of this road. Residents proposed multiple options but they were rejected. Their issues were that the Bradford Chain of Lakes were one of the most pristine areas near Tallahassee and the IA was about to do to it what was done to Lake Jackson. The lakes' ecology was based on water flowing through them and pushing the silt through. Grassy Lake was basically a stormwater pond now; Cascade Lake was silted in as well. Mr. Norwood further stated that after the completion of the last segment of Capital Circle, the residents were told that the segment past the Airport would be four-lanes only. Now that FDOT was involved, it was to be six-lanes which created additional impacts. Listening to the TCC, he did not feel like the residents could win. Saving 50-feet here or there might not seem like much to Planners but to the residents it made a significant difference.

Tom Vieth, a former property owner near the Tallahassee Museum, stated that local government asked for public input however they did not listen to what was shared. The lakes were suffering from the drought but also from development. He spoke against a 230-foot ROW. He further spoke on the USFS property being developed for a helicopter training facility. Mr. Tedder stated that it was not a Blueprint project and would not be discussed at the TCC meeting. Mr. Wetherell stated that information on the training facility was provided to KHA at a stakeholder meeting with the USFS in April 2011. The USFS was working to appropriate funds to allow them to move forward with constructing a 27-acre complex that would house all supervisory functions, maintenance operations, and educational aspects to be associated with the Tallahassee Museum. It was within the 4f property owned by the USFS. Mr. Wetherell suggested that Mr. Vieth contact his

congressman with his concerns about this project because the local government would not even have the opportunity to permit the project. The federal government owns the property, they can by-pass the local permitting process.

Wayne Tedder stated that the option needed to be vetted through the IA. The next meeting was in June, he questioned how that would affect the PD&E schedule. Mr. Wetherell stated that it would be delayed until then. As a point of information, FDOT had advertised and selected the design consultant for that section. They anticipated executing the contract before the end of the fiscal year and ready to move forward with activities beginning July 1, 2013. They would take the design to 50% plans before the PD&E was complete. It was noted that the IA meeting would be June 17, 2013.

Mr. Menendez questioned if the typical section that was included in the agenda was the one that would be designed to 50%. Mr. Wetherell stated that was to be determined. Mr. Tedder indicated that it would be a second IA discussion.

Mr. Reed questioned if Kimley Horn was the selected consulting firm. Mr. Wetherell confirmed that they were. Mr. Tedder stated, to be clear, that what the citizens preferred was a four-lane roadway instead of a six-lane segment. Mr. Wetherell included the preference for a bridge as well. He further stated that there was a public hearing remaining on the PD&E study plus two public outreach aspects to the design phase. Also the scope currently stated that there would be two briefings to the CRTPA Board and there would be a project briefing at every IA meeting during the course of the contract.

Mr. Tedder questioned if the decision of four or six-lanes would be made at the CRTPA. Mr. Wetherell stated that he thought the direction the IA wanted to take would occur there. It would be the responsibility of Blueprint to partner with FDOT to see that it occurred. FDOT has said that items over and above their typical designs, such as a bridge or landscaping or hardscaping features, they would look for a partnership with Blueprint to deliver those to the community. Where the decision would be made had not yet been determined. Mr. Wetherell stated that as the scope was presented it had every aspect that the Blueprint typical had: six-lanes, bike-lanes, 10-foot multi-use trail, 5-foot sidewalk, divided corridor.

Mr. Tedder clarified that before FDOT would move forward with the design, they would want clarification on the partnership with local government; which could impact the decisions such as four or six-lanes. Mr. Wetherell stated that those decisions needed to be made through an agreement with Blueprint and FDOT by the fall of 2013. The September IA meeting would be the latest at which Blueprint could have that direction.

Mr. Reed stated that the bottom line was that the CRTPA had the ultimate control. If the citizens or the Board did not want it (six-lanes) then it would not be put into the plan. Mr. Tedder stated that what he was trying to determine was who, which entity, impacted the design decision. It seemed that it would be the CRTPA.

Mr. Menendez stated that the PD&E recommended six-lanes through that segment. Mr. Wetherell confirmed that because the horizon year was 2035. Ms. Heiker questioned if the traffic routing accounted for the widening of Orange Avenue as an alternative to Capital Circle for traffic volume. Mr. Wetherell stated, no, not coupled; six-lanes on CCSW and four-lanes on Orange Avenue. At the outset of the study, KHA evaluated a realignment that took CCSW traffic up to Orange Avenue or Tyson Road as one route and the existing as another option. Never was it analyzed jointly because it was not an approved and funded project. Again it went back to the Blueprint typical section that was given to them in 2006 of a 230-foot six-lane section.

Mr. Rosenzweig questioned the action to date of the IA on the typical footprint. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it was a 230-foot six-lane section. Ms. Heiker stated the exception to that was the reduced section through Gum Swamp. It was a full six-lanes but the IA eliminated the interior median reducing the overall width. Mr. Rosenzweig stated that the IA needed to hear and understand the implications of the typical (230-feet) versus the proposed (180-feet) width.

Mr. Menendez and Mr. Wetherell discussed options. If the IA decided to reduce that segment to four-lanes it would not require a reevaluation of the PD&E because it would be a smaller overall footprint; unless the justification was the widening of Orange Avenue because it was not modeled in the PD&E. Debbie Lightsey stated that it would also be important that the citizens understood how the process would play out and how decisions would be made.

II. Information Items

Item #1: Capital Cascades Trail Segment 4 Design Coordination Update

Gary Phillips spoke on the material in the agenda item. Regarding the trail head located to the right of Mill Street, Wayne Tedder stated that the City Commission took formal action to relocate it near Lake Bradford Road. Gabe Menendez stated that with the FAMU Way project, the City was evaluation a pond site for off-line treatment, capacity, and future redevelopment in the Mill Street area. Subsequently, the City considered making the trail on the Lake Elberta side of the railroad.

Susan Tanski questioned if it was competing interests or if there was enough room for both. In recent conversations with FCT the northern site for a stormwater pond, in either case, the property would have to be re-purchased from FCT at the current appraised value. Any plans for stormwater ponds in any of the FCT location, she outlined them on the presentation, required agreement and management plan amendments. Given that, she recommended a coordinated approach to complete it all at one time. Mr. Menendez reiterated that it was not only the FAMU Way project but future redevelopment capacity as well. Also a large portion of that area was in the CRA. Ms. Tanski, stated that one benefit was that the amenities that the City agreed to build, through the original FCT purchase, were small and relatively inexpensive. Therefore they could be provided on

the remaining property.

Regarding the coordination with the City on the stabilization of the ditch from Gamble to Springhill Roads, Tony Park questioned if Blueprint would complete that before constructing the ponds sending water into Lakes Henrietta and Munson without any treatment compensation. Jodie Cahoon, speaking specifically on the stabilization project, stated that the FEMA floodplain had and would be reviewed again however there would not be any additional water moving downstream. The ditch would not be made smaller; in fact through stabilization it would increase in size slightly. The bottom would be filled in from some of the erosion however the top of the bank would be wider than what was currently there. He reiterated that there would be no additional waters downstream; both with respect to rate or quantity.

Theresa Heiker stated that as a member of the original committee, she referred to the history. Capital Cascades Trail from Black Swamp to East Tennessee Street was intended to add volume and improve flooding. Segment 1 was enclosed and no improvement was seen. In Segment 2, the County was seeing no improvement; nor in Segment 3. Blueprint was placing the entire burden that was intended to be distributed through all segments, on Segment 4. It would not be a functional project and she predicted it would fail.

Charles Hargraves stated that he understood Ms. Heiker's concerns, also expressed an earlier meeting, with flooding at Pensacola Street and College Avenue. However he begged to differ that no improvements had been made to the system. There were significant reductions in flooding within the corridor. Ms. Heiker agreed that within the corridor there were improvements. However everything she had ever heard regarding this was that the water at Springhill Road would remain the same. The problem was when all of the stormwater projects were combined, without having the storage or the opportunity to attenuate. She further stated that the issue was not water quality in that system, it was storage.

Wayne Tedder stated that regarding water quality there was an alum injection system in Segment 2; also 50% of Coal Chute Pond was retrofit. Mr. Hargraves also noted a number of properties that were no longer in the floodplain near South Monroe and South Adams streets. Ms. Heiker stated that the issue with Munson Slough was nitrogen; alum injection did not address that. Also, enclosing the ditch (in Segment 1) did not address the problem. Mr. Hargraves questioned if that was her only issue with Munson Slough. Ms. Heiker stated that the original idea that was presented as the "signature project" for Blueprint was to improve the situation. Mr. Hargraves and Mr. Tedder reiterated that Blueprint was providing water quality improvements; in fact that's the whole purpose of Segment 4.

Ms. Heiker stated that she did not believe that the limited area (Segment 4) that Blueprint allowed for treatment would provide any degree of improvement that was originally conceived. Furthermore, she did not believe that the wetland would survive because of

the rates and volumes it would see. There would not be the reductions that were intended; there was no opportunity for trash removal so it would be moving through the system and collecting in the greenspace areas.

Mr. Phillips questioned if there was any limitation to locating ponds within the corridor with options away from the ditch. For example, in the 7-acre parcel discussed earlier or other basins that were untreated. If Blueprint stayed within the ditch or stayed south of Springhill Road they would run out of land; Ms. Heiker was correct that improvements would be limited. Mr. Hargraves stated that the issue was a stabilization project for the City to address the channel. Blueprint was not suggesting that they would walk away from the project. The main point of the discussion was what Blueprint could do in conjunction with the City on the stabilization project to facilitate improvement on both sides.

Ms. Heiker stated that the original concept for inline was for attenuation to reduce the volume moving through the constrained segments; to reduce the rate that reduced the scour. It also reduced the flooding at Lake Henrietta and the flooding potentially to Lake Bradford; the east ditch would receive higher volumes because the water was moving through the central ditch more quickly.

Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint reduced the scour with a mile of boxed culverts that was an inherent quality. Blueprint did not intend to move forward with the design of Segment 4 until the construction of Segment 3 and FAMU Way were under way. In his mind, the focus of Segment 4 had always been treatment, attenuation, and water quality. He thought that when Blueprint was ready to begin designing Segment 4, an off-line meeting of key parties should occur to discuss exactly the issues Ms. Heiker raised. Blueprint needed to determine the best method and location for treatment and attenuation and revise the concept, probably significantly, based on maybe not having accomplished every aspect of the original intent of Segment 1 through Segment 3. Blueprint did not want waste tax payer dollars by not coordinating with the City on construction.

Ms. Heiker stated that she was repeating it because there had been discussion since Blueprint's inception of having a single, unified stormwater model. Blueprint designed Capital Cascades Trail piecemeal from the top, forcing it to the bottom and expecting a miracle from Segment 4. The County was seeing the problems it created at Lake Henrietta and had preached for years. Mr. Tedder agreed with the need for a unified model however he clarified that Blueprint's actions on design were carried out as directed by the IA.

At Mr. Park's request Mr. Cahoon reiterated that there would be no impacts with rates and volume. However there was significant impact to water quality in sediment and phosphorus. City Stormwater had monitored the proposed systems, similar to Megginnis Arm. It was really a large filtration system that removed much of the nutrients which was the concern. There were miles of treatment system put in when there was hard clays eroding out providing no treatment. It would also capture sediment in the voids of the

gabion system; they had seen them growing plants that helped with the nutrient concerns. In the majority of storms, 90% of the water would not make it to the wetland because it was being retained and attenuated. He listed various projects and improvements implemented by City Stormwater. Furthermore, given the slopes and depth of the ditch (in the renderings of the agenda item) they did not have the land available to build an online treatment facility; even if Blueprint acquired the parcels listed. There could be an opportunity for off-line ponds east of the system in untreated land. Mr. Cahoon stated that City Stormwater was at the point of acquiring land.

Mr. Hargraves stated that another option available to Blueprint was to acquire parcels that would be needed for Segment 4 purposes. In part so if land was needed by the City it could be acquired by Blueprint as whole takes and have a divided use. Mr. Tedder stated that money was available through the Land Bank; however acquisitions would be based on the current design. Mr. Menendez requested more information about threatened properties and if they were in the footprint of Segment 4. Mr. Cahoon stated that one was the Florida Rock property. Mr. Phillips indicated the properties on the projected map. Mr. Menendez stated that they would be acquired anyway under the current Segment 4 concept. Mr. Tedder stated that what he was hearing from the committee was that offline treatment should be considered rather than inline. That was a parameter to pass along to the design engineer.

Ms. Heiker and Mr. Cahoon discussed the FSU Regional Stormwater Facility and the percentages allocated for redevelopment. Ms. Heiker brought it back to perspective because the County did not include capacity for redevelopment in Lake Henrietta. When the concepts for Capital Cascades Trail were originally discussed there was no intention to support any new development. Taking an area that was originally designed for full retrofit and allowing it to support new development that was taking away from the original concept. She was bringing it up again, so that when it was complete and there were functional problems south of Springhill Road; they were walking into it knowing what they were doing.

Mr. Hargraves stated that, excluding the FAMU Way portion at the upper end, there was capacity for future redevelopment of specific areas however it was not for development of new facilities such as FAMU Way. There were water quality options with those facilities to provide attenuation even if they were offline. Ms. Heiker questioned if one of the mentioned sites was the Bond Community. Mr. Menendez confirmed that it was. Susan Tanski indicated that there was another parcel that was approximately 5-acres that Blueprint owned; she identified it on the projected map (below the nature park), and stated that it was upland and could be used for a stormwater facility.

Mr. Menendez questioned if there was enough retrofit with was being constructed. Ms. Heiker stated that there was no model and it should have been a unified model from the bottom up. Mr. Menendez stated that retrofit had been captured upstream in Coal Chute Pond for example. Ms. Heiker stated that in Segment 2 there was a water quality variance because of the increase in impervious. Segment 1 was also an increase in

impervious over the corridor. Mr. Phillips stated that there was a slight increase in impervious however the whole park was a stormwater pond.

Mr. Park questioned if the singular model was any closer to being complete. Mr. Hargraves stated that the end of the current model was at the confluence just south of Lake Elberta and north of the railroad. When Blueprint moved to Segment 4 there would be a model for the upper end of the trail that would be combined with the City's model for the central ditch. Members of the TCC agreed, partner now.

Mr. Tedder questioned what timeframe would be needed for the model. Alisha Wetherell stated that it would potentially take two to three months. Mr. Tedder stated that he thought he could move it forward without going to the IA. Mr. Tedder requested that City slow their process by three to four months to allow KHA to do the new model and Blueprint to make a decision. Mr. Cahoon stated that was why they were there. He also put forth another element to be considered, the cost component of the Counsel property. Placing an online facility there would mean business damages, relocations, etc.

Mr. Tedder stated that another partnership decision would be regarding which acquisition process was used, Blueprint's or the City's. Mr. Phillips stated that there was potential for federal funds (as with Franklin and Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3A); if that were the case property would have to be acquired through the Uniform Act (federal relocation guidelines).

V. Citizens to be Heard

See Item #3 discussion on Capital Circle Southwest Right of Way Adjustment.

VI. Items from Members of the Committee

Autumn Calder, Tony Park, and Gabe Menendez discussed the details of calculating items the same way for the maintenance report to the IA to ensure that both the City and County were comparing apples to apples.

Tony Park noted that April 8 was the grand opening ribbon cutting for Franklin Boulevard. Also, April 18 was the ribbon cutting for Mahan Drive.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM.