

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 2, 2011

SunTrust Bank Building

2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

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

Wayne Tedder	<i>Steve Shaffer</i>	Gary Phillips
Tony Park	<i>Tom Ballentine</i>	Angela Richardson
John Buss	<i>Cherie Horne</i>	Marek Romanowski
Rodney Cassidy	Dave Bright	Debra Schiro
Theresa Heiker	Dave Snyder	Margie Quillman
Harry Reed	Jim Shepherd	Alicia Wetherell

Wayne Tedder called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications

II. Information Items

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

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Capital Circle SE PD&E Study Update

This item was informational only.

John Buss questioned how the west ditch became part of the study. Dave Bright reminded him that when the IA adopted the existing alignment for CCSW part of the motion, at the urging of the CAC, to get the water to go into Black Swamp versus going into Grassy Lake and back flowing into Lake Bradford. There was no money budgeted for construction.

III. Consent

Item #3: February 10, 2011 TCC Minutes

There were no comments regarding the February 10, 2011 minutes.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #4: Cascade Park Update

Gary Phillips gave a brief presentation that closely followed the agenda item, with current construction photos of the park.

John Buss requested to be notified if mature trees were scheduled to be removed; Mr. Tedder agreed. Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint's attitude was to preserve the trees as well; from a liability perspective there were some issues but Blueprint hoped to save them. He also agreed to keep Mr. Buss informed.

Tony Park questioned if the boxed culvert at Suwannee Street was to be constructed during that phase of activity. Mr. Phillips concurred. Suwannee could only be closed on nights and weekends because it was the alternative route. The contractor was working to minimize the impacts. Mr. Park asked if it would tie in further to the south (Cascade Park Lane). Mr. Phillips stated it was complete however Blueprint decided not to open that portion due to access into the construction area. Mr. Park questioned if any of the traffic was being routed through Meyers Park area. Mr. Phillips stated that there had been multiple discussions on that subject and the larger concern came down to traffic in the construction area. The amount of traffic using it on a daily basis was relatively small compared to opening the construction area to the general public.

Mr. Phillips noted that Gaines Street would remain open through Phase 2B. It could accommodate traffic during the temporary closure of Lafayette Street for sidewalk construction. The time frame was projected at eight months. Blueprint was planning an eight-foot sidewalk from the tunnel to Suwannee. Mr. Park requested one more closure meeting with the group involved. Harry Reed was to follow up the following week.

Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Update

Gary Phillips stated that FIGG Engineering conducted a Charrette in May for the public. The preferred concepts selected by the attendees were the canopied bridge, limestone abutments, LED lighting in the canopies, and the inclusion of solar panels in the canopies. The concept was estimated at \$2M and was funded by an FDOT Grant and sales tax dollars; budgeted for FY 2014 with money becoming available in July 2013. It would be presented to the IA on June 20, 2011.

Mr. Phillips stated that the boxed culvert would be extended 180-feet in the area from Monroe to Adams to create a safer outfall area for the bridge. The entire length was estimated at \$1.5M. Kimley Horn was doing the hydraulic design and it was at 60% completion. They were coordinating with Genesis to incorporate the additional flow from the improvements at Franklin Boulevard.

Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint had eight of the ten parcels necessary for Coal Chute

Pond. The design would be a wet pond bottom with side bank filters. Blueprint was not able to coordinate with Railroad Square; they would buy into the pond in the future with future development. Blueprint was providing treatment for 14-acre area so future allocations could include Railroad Square. Mr. Bright stated that Blueprint had accommodated all of the requests from the CRA and the City needed for development property on Wanish, Gaines, and FAMU Way. Mr. Buss asked if through the design iterations, there was a final capacity accounting report. Alicia Wetherell stated that it was under revision to take in the last bit of FAMU Way the resubmittal would be forthcoming.

The Segment 3 design was being done concurrently with the FAMU Way extension with 60% plans completed by October 2011. ROW would be acquired as necessary with the final design completed by middle to late 2012. Blueprint was not designing or building FAMU Way that was a City project. They were however acquiring the ROW. The project would be let as one, combined project in terms of construction. City Public Works with Genesis would be handling the calculations for stormwater management for the road. Steve Shaffer confirmed that Genesis was working closely with Kimley Horn to ensure proper calculations.

The Stormwater Master Plan model and calibration validation effort would be completed in June 2011 with the report completed by July 2011. There were meetings scheduled to review it with the City and County two weeks from the TCC meeting.

Mr. Philips stated that the Pond 5 Design had been put on hold until the Stormwater Master Plan had been resolved. Mr. Bright stated that Blueprint had acquired the large parcel adjacent to the County's property so there was more land to work with. Tony Park questioned if Blueprint anticipated discussions with the state for land if the prison road camp was closed. Mr. Bright stated that he was not aware of any but if it were to close...would Blueprint need more...? Theresa Heiker stated that it was at a choke point on the channel; the additional land would be beneficial and keep water out of homes. Mr. Park stated that they, including the County should think about it. Mr. Tedder agreed and recommended informing City and County management. Contamination would be an issue in that area. Mr. Bright reminded them that Blueprint turned down a parcel on the southwest corner due to extensive contamination.

Item #6: Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project

Marek Romanowski gave a brief update on the improvements to Franklin Boulevard that closely followed the agenda item.

John Buss questioned the 54" pipe would straighten out FEMA matters. Mr. Romanowski concurred. The 54" culvert would mean more water coming through. However, they were under obligation not raise the elevation in Boca Chuba Pond by more than one foot. The modeling indicated that even with the 54" pipe they would meet the elevation restrictions in Boca Chuba Pond. The pipe would only be opened after the CLOMAR was completed by Genesis.

Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint was under extremely tight construction constraints to meet the terms of the grant. Blueprint was coordinating closely with the City and County. However, if there were any issues, they needed to be addressed at the beginning of the process. Mr. Buss stated that he did not think there was an issue however he had not seen the plans. Mr. Romanowski stated that 60% plans had been received and distributed to the Utilities.

Mr. Buss stated that he and Tony Park had discussed sediment buildup and the potential of adding fillet in the bottom that would affect the hydraulics. He was not sure that access hatches would be sufficient to keep the line clean. He noted locations that had no problems but that FSU had horrendous problems keeping their boxed culverts clear of sediment. Mr. Romanowski stated that the models indicated that the flow should be sufficient to keep them clear in the 100-year storm. Mr. Buss stated that the culverts at FSU were similar but the flow of the 100-year event was not sufficient to clear the buildup from the smaller storms. He suggested again a fillet in the bottom to maintain a narrow channel / increase the flow for smaller rain events.

Mr. Romanowski stated that there would be a hydraulic jump at Pensacola Street that would give them eight-feet per second. Theresa Heiker requested a copy of the drainage report. Information she received indicated 15-feet per second in an annual event. Mr. Romanowski agreed and stated it was possible; he was speaking of the minimum. Ms. Heiker stated that 15-feet per second would be more than sufficient to scour the line.

Tony Park stated that the County would be responsible for the maintenance of the boxed culvert under Franklin Boulevard.

Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail, Segment 1 and 3: Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) Services

Jim Shepherd stated that Blueprint had multiple little projects all in the same project area that would be underway in the coming year. The intent was to group them together for purposes of CEI Services. Furthermore, the contract was worded so that, with IA approval, Blueprint could add or delete projects, such as additional work on Segment 3 or Segment 1 as necessary. The scope was identical to the one used on CCNW/SW with the exception of a few minor changes.

Theresa Heiker questioned if the CDBG would allow the addition of a non-CDBG project. Mr. Shepherd stated that the scope and RFQ had only been reviewed internally. He was sending it to DCA and FDOT for concurrence. She stated that it might be prohibited if it added 'undue burden to a participate.' If someone could handle a smaller project but not a larger one, it could be seen as an impediment to bidding. Mr. Shepherd stated that DCA was the next Agency to review the scope and RFQ. Also the multiple funding sources were stated for each project. They were crafting it to allow for the most flexibility because of lead time and cost of procurement was relatively small; less than \$1M for all four combined.

Item #8: Capital Circle NW/SW Construction Options

Latesa Turner gave a brief presentation that closely followed the agenda item and outlined the options. Mr. Tedder stated that with Board approval, Blueprint would put the contract out for bid and see what came in before rearranging any sales tax dollars. There was reason to believe they would come in lower than estimated. If the \$9.2M from FDOT did not come to fruition Blueprint would stop construction somewhere north of SR20 with the exception of what was necessary to comply with the FDEP Environmental Permit.

John Buss questioned the location of Pump Station 77. Mrs. Turner stated that it was on the Broadmore site. Also Blueprint was still working through the JPA to come to agreement on the cost. Mr. Tedder requested an off-line conversation with Mr. Buss to work that out. Mr. Buss agreed.

Regarding the Water/Sewer relocations Mr. Shepherd stated that the City had water and sewer improvements that were included in the contract. The City would be paying for any improvements that were constructed. To ensure that revenues and expenditures were clearly defined and keeping Blueprint money separated from City money. Mr. Buss stated that the \$450K shown for Pump Station 77 was included and was not adequate to do Blueprint's share. Mr. Shepherd stated that was different from what Mr. Buss' staff had told him. The \$450K was higher than the number they gave Blueprint for the demolition of the pump station and construction of the gravity sewer to replace it. It was Blueprint's understanding that they were only paying a portion of the construction of the gravity sewer, anything else related to that would be funded by the City. Mr. Buss concurred. Mr. Buss stated that he would meet with Sal Arnaldo; it might not be necessary for him and Mr. Tedder to meet after all.

Tom Ballentine requested clarification on the phasing of the project based on money available. Mr. Tedder stated that depending on the Board's guidance, Blueprint would construct the project with what funding was available. That could mean, grabbing money from another project, Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4, or scale it back. They had to complete the environmental work however to comply with the FDEP permit.

Tony Park asked for clarification on "scaling back" because it had always been discussed in terms of Phase 1 and 2. As he understood it, Mr. Tedder was saying the road would be constructed up to north of SR20 tying it into the existing intersection or build to Orange Avenue. Mrs. Turner stated that there was one more option, if Blueprint received the \$9.2M from FDOT they fully expected to get through SR20. They did not know if they would get to Orange with it. Mr. Park confirmed that regardless of the distance of the road construction, all of the stormwater facilities would be built. Mr. Tedder concurred.

Mrs. Turner further clarified that all of the environmental mitigation through the swamp must be constructed once they implemented construction through north of the railroad tracks. The stormwater management facilities, per the stormwater general permit, had to be constructed concurrent with the roadway construction that occurred in the basin that

went to the permitted ponds. As they implemented the roadway construction, they had to also construct the appropriate stormwater management system per the FDEP stormwater general permit. Meaning, if Blueprint constructed through SR20 they would be required to build the Delta stormwater pond. They will build the Delta wetland creation pond regardless. All of the mitigation would be constructed once they turned dirt on the project. The stormwater management facilities were a function of as the project was constructed.

Theresa Heiker questioned what the projected timeframe for the revised plans would be. Mrs. Turner stated that they would have to accommodate ... some of the issues that Blueprint was addressing with regard to the Broadmore pond would be dealt with regardless. Depending on how the bids come in and how the project would be phased would determine the plans submittal. Ms. Heiker asked if they would receive the information on the Broadmore improvements prior to it being advertised. Mrs. Turner stated that the issues that Blueprint was resolving were relative to Segment 1 construction. However, some of the resolution spilled over into the full project plan. Therefore what would be submitted to the County for clarification of their issues would reflect addressing their issues as well as what would be let for advertising.

Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint would not be able to provide the accounting the County was looking for until the JPA with Leon County School Board was ironed out and know for certain if the School Board would be participating and the changes at SR20 that could bring.

Ms. Heiker questioned the status of the Broadmore JPA. Debra Schiro stated that it was in Blueprint Legal office; she thought it was almost ready to be executed. The final order had been issued by FDEP upholding the recommended order submitted. There would be a 45-day appeal process under DOAH proceedings. Blueprint did not know if Mr. Gibby intended to appeal.

Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint would like to have everything (permits, designs, reviews, etc) resolved by the September IA meeting so that Blueprint could submit the final Capital Budget for FY12. It might be tight but that was the goal.

Item #9: Revised Blueprint Master Plan and Proposed FY 2012-FY2016 Blueprint Capital Budget

Wayne Tedder stated that attachment 1 listed the net sales tax revenue that was available for projects. He tried to simplify it to “here’s where we are” and “here’s where we may be in the future” to begin allocating it to projects. Attachment 2 indicated the projects that Blueprint would be working in for the next five years: N2, W1 design, C1, C2, C3 construction and C4. In the past, C3 and C4 was where additional dollars from sales tax proceeds were placed in the outlying years. When C3 costs were identified, real numbers would populate those lines.

Mr. Tedder anticipated three of the projects being completed in the next few years: C2 by 2012, Connector Bridge by 2013 and C3 by 2017. He was working with City Accounting to restructure the Master Plan to make it simpler to follow actual project costs, what was available and how it would be spent over what years. He used numbers consistent with City Accounting for the revenue projections. The number was low, he noted, but current through April 30, 2011. The projections for FY11 seemed to be on target for \$28M but he anticipated a decline in the economy after July 1, 2011. The priority projects were the Connector Bridge, Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 with FAMU Way, and CCNW as far south as they could.

John Buss asked about funding for Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 and that the spreadsheet was blank. Mr. Tedder stated that there was no project design and therefore no cost estimate for Segment 1. The number indicated there in the past was for program management or a guestimate. Mr. Bright stated that at one time Blueprint had guestimates based in the EECC concept report but staff had since determined as they moved through projects that they were not accurate. That was his concern, it appeared that Blueprint was building Segment 1 but they were not. Mr. Tedder noted that and stated he would clarify it to Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief rather than Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1.

Mr. Bright stated that if Mr. Buss were to compare that document to an old Master Plan he would see dollar amounts listed for Segment 1 in the out years (2017-2019). However, when the economy turned and revenues declined Blueprint had to cut money from those out year projects and some went to virtually zero, with the exception of program management. The \$4.2 from HUD funded the flood control project. Mr. Tedder concurred and continued that there was no construction, ROW or engineering funding.

Mr. Buss stated that he recognized the problem but nevertheless he had strong concerns. Real plans were being changed in terms of funding allocations that a lot of elbow grease went into. He was concerned that it would be too simple in the future to fund roadway projects over an environmental project. Mr. Tedder agreed and noted the projects that held a surplus once closed. Money had not been transferred from there because he wanted the input of the CAC as to whether it went to green or gray projects.

Mr. Buss asked if it would be too difficult to create a list of projects that would not be completed. Mr. Bright stated that he had something in narrative form that was requested by the City Commission Target Issue group. However, in it was listed all of the project languages from the Interlocal Agreement and their status. One could compare what was in the actual verbiage with what had been accomplished.

Tony Park asked about the numbers reflected on the line for the County Water Quality project. The numbers looked slightly lower than what he sent over as the projections for reimbursements. Mr. Tedder stated that he would double check it but was fairly certain they were the same. Mr. Park stated that they were using funding for Lexington Pond and Gum Pond Road Target Planning area. Mr. Tedder stated that he thought he plugged

the numbers verbatim from Mr. Park's email; he would have an answer for Mr. Park before he left. Finding a copy of the email in his papers, Mr. Tedder stated that there was a balance of \$8M currently in that fund that had not been allocated. What was programmed in over the next five years was what was needed. At the end of the day, the County would receive \$22,790,000.00. It was structured to meet the payment schedule requested by the County and the difference (\$2.3M) needed from sales tax dollars in the next couple of years.

Mr. Tedder stated that he continued to try to make it clear however it was a difficult task because the revenues fluctuated. Every year the numbers had to be juggled. Mr. Park stated that he was afraid that "juggling the numbers" was the problem from the public perspective. Mr. Tedder agreed and that was why he had not moved anything yet.

Mr. Buss questioned what "Budget to Date" meant on Attachment 3. Mr. Tedder stated that it was the amount of dollars that had been allocated to a project from all funding sources. Mr. Buss questioned, when the City and County were each allocated \$25M, why the County's line item showed only \$22.7M. Mr. Tedder stated that the \$25M was programmed over the life of Blueprint. In order to get the payout earlier, they lost money because of interest that built across the board. Mr. Bright noted that no matter how Blueprint's share of the revenues had been affected, the City and County portions had never fluctuated.

V. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

VI. Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:39 pm.