

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 7, 2005

Ellis Building – Koger Center

2:00 pm

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 1:58 pm.

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

Jim Davis	Dave Bright	Mark Llewellyn
Rodney Cassidy	Phil Maher	Mark Thomasson
<i>Jim Lee</i>	Bill Little	Jack Diestelhorst
Gabriel Menendez	Jim Shepherd	Shuli Leonard
<i>Roxanne Manning</i>	Doug Martin	Linda Jamison
John Kraynak	Gary Phillips	E. Sawyer
Theresa Heiker	Ed Ringe	
<i>Benjamin Pingree</i>	Bonnie Pfuntner	
Tony Park	Angela Richardson	
Jack Kostrzewa		

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

Item #1: May 2, 2005 TCC Meeting Minutes

The May Minutes were approved with the following changes: Tony Parks noted that his name was absent from the attendees list. He also stated, as a side note that Sally Dalling had taken a position with The Liberty Consolidated Cleaning Commission in Hinesville Georgia. Theresa Heiker wanted it clarified that, regarding the second paragraph of page 3; her question was to confirm that the cost to secure the property was included not merely the cost to acquire it. Additionally on page 4, paragraph 5, president should have been precedent and finally on page 7, paragraph 1, Ms. Heiker did want to see access to Swamp Fox Road eliminated. Phil Maher stated that the clarifications would be made to the minutes.

Item #2: Capital Circle Southeast: Potential Design Build (Tram to Woodville)

This item was informational only.

Item #3: Approval to Award Contract for Design of Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Atkinson Property (West Tennessee Street west of Capital Circle)

This item was informational only.

III. Presentations/Discussions

Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design

Dave Bright stated that Blueprint staff was soliciting the committee's comments related to moving the project into the design of Segment 2. He further stated staff would be reviewing outstanding technical issues related to the TCC sub-committee's review, and comments the TCC had regarding the Scope of Services. Mr. Bright stated that the power point presentation would follow the agenda item order. He stated that for the benefit of the IA, staff would review the project's status, discuss issues to be resolved and request several actions as noted in the item.

Mr. Bright reminded the Committee that at the January 31, 2005 IA meeting the Board approved, without action requested in the item, a concept for each of the segments of the Capital Cascade Trail project: (Segment 1-Concept D; Segment 2-Concept E; Segment 3-Concept A; and Segment 4-Concept C) Mr. Bright stated that the concept graphics the Committee was viewing was the same as what the IA saw in January with the exception of a cross section of Franklin Boulevard that now included bicycle lanes. Additionally, staff was in the administrative process of moving construction of Segment 4 to Tier 1. The Board has also approved the construction sequence of Segment 2, 4, 3 and 1. Mr. Bright further stated that there would be a required super-majority vote at the September 19, 2005 IA meeting to move Segment 4 to Tier 1. Theresa Heiker stated that she thought the super-majority vote was taken at the May 16, 2005 IA meeting. Jim Davis stated that there were not enough Board members present at the May 16 meeting for a super-majority vote.

Mark Llewellyn moved into the PowerPoint presentation and also stated that attachment 1 was supplemental information for Segment 2-Concept E. Dave Bright stated that the graphic had been divided into three parts, the upper segment across from FDOT, the portion between Gaines Street and Gadsden Street, and the portion west of Gadsden which included the old Centennial Field. He further stated that the key components were the stilling pool in the upper segment, a Cascade recreation in the middle section and a large pond in the lower section, the Meridian Marker Plaza, and the initial site grading for the Centennial Field area. Mr. Bright clarified that according to the Board it was to be as flat a field as possible but not to incorporate a ball-field. He continued listing the key components: a multi-use trail from Lafayette Street to Gadsden Street with connecting sidewalks within the park, the removal of sections of Gadsden and Bloxham streets and raising a section of Gadsden Street from Suwannee Street west to near Meridian Street, reconfigure parking lots across Suwannee from FDOT and south of Gaines Street, remove FFWCC parking lot, and provide replacement parking on Suwannee and Meridian Streets.

Mr. Bright stated that one of the long-standing key issues of the TCC and others was the necessity of off site stormwater management. He noted recent discussions between Blueprint 2000 and Bill Montford, Superintendent of Leon County Schools had indicated

a willingness to work with the City, County and Blueprint in possibly developing a stormwater management facility on Leon High School (LHS) property. Mr. Bright stated that they were discussing the re-creation of a small wetland area in the southeast corner of LHS property. The parking area would be moved to the north and a soccer field would be installed as well. He stated that the small wetland area could have approximately 10 acre feet of storage, which was not much but would provide some early on storage as well as preliminary treatment.

Mr. Bright further stated that the TCC sub-committee had held several meetings to review the technical reports. He stated that some of the issues had been resolved while others had not, and some of the issues would be brought into the next phase for review prior to the design of Segment 2. Mr. Bright briefly touched on each of the issues the sub-committee had discussed. He stated that the second box culvert, which was proposed primarily for storage, in Segment 1 had been removed. Culvert and stream velocities were still a large issue as related to habitat and scouring. The peak water stage in lower Segment 2 was a key issue along with the possibility of providing additional flow under Monroe Street. The sub-committee desires to evaluate how it would affect the peak water stage in Cascade Park and what requirements would need to be completed early in Segment 3 in order to not merely relocate the flooding to FAMU Way or Adams Street. Mr. Bright stated that Segment 3 was not one of the early phases to be funded therefore additional options would be considered during Segment 2 design. He stated that one possibility included interim improvements in Segment 3 that would provide a lower peak stage in Segment 2. However, staff did not feel the rate of rise would be much different. Mark Llewellyn showed the Committee some graphics of what Mr. Bright was describing.

Jim Davis pointed out the relationship of the 25-year event and the sidewalks, noting that the sidewalks were not in the water. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the sidewalks would be underwater in the 100-year event. Theresa Heiker asked if the bridges were protected or would they be subject to substantial "over-topping." Mr. Llewellyn stated, no, the intent was to have the bridges above that level. He further stated there was enough elevation to support that as well. Mr. Llewellyn stated the biggest issue was the rate of rise in the lower section. He indicated on the graphic the 2-year, 25-year and 100 year water levels and noted there was not much difference between the 25 and 100-year events. Mr. Llewellyn explained the topography of Segment 2 and pointed out where the majority of the contamination was located for the Committee.

Gabe Menendez asked what the two-year rate of rise was. Mr. Llewellyn stated that for a two-year event it was 9.5 feet and would double to 18 feet in a 25-year event. Mr. Llewellyn further stated that it was a quick rate of rise but reminded Mr. Menendez that there was an elevation difference of 40 feet between Tennessee Street and the railroad. Jim Davis stated that the peak rate of rise was equivalent to one foot every seven minutes. Dave Bright stated that one also had to consider the water had 3-4 feet to travel out laterally not just up. Mr. Menendez stated that in a two-year event the water would be at 9.5 feet in approximately one hour. Mr. Davis concurred.

Dave Bright continued listing the sub-committee issues; he noted Railroad Square, FAMU Way extension and other project coordination, construction segment sequencing and parking removal and replacement. Mr. Menendez asked what the recommendation for construction sequencing was. Mr. Bright stated that it was 2, 4, 3, 1 and explained that 2 was first because Blueprint would like to coordinate with the remediation work in Cascade Park, 4 because that's what the IA revised it to in January based on citizen input and water quality, three and back to one. Mr. Bright stated that he did not think the TCC ever actually made a recommendation for construction sequencing but felt that everyone assumed the project would simply be 2, 1, 3, and 4.

Theresa Heiker stated that one of the issues that was created with moving Segment 4 up and Segment 1 off the table for construction was if any improvements addressed at LHS would require improvements in Segment 1. Thereby raising the question of why do interim improvements in Segment 1 rather than completing Segment 1 which fully address the transportation issues that were the original driving factor. She did not think the Board had considered that the interim improvements would be as extensive as it seemed would be necessary. Jim Davis stated that he disagreed because that was specifically discussed and the Board approved \$5 million for interim improvements for Segment 1. Dave Bright stated that as staff moved into the design of Segment 2 and LHS there might be things that must be completed to make Segment 1 work.

Jim Davis stated that he agreed with Ms. Heiker regarding the necessity of interim improvements, furthermore, for the LHS proposal to be functional the water must be moved down Franklin Boulevard faster than it currently could be. Otherwise the pond at LHS would flood, as might Franklin. It was imperative and in good faith that something would have to be done on Franklin Boulevard. In Mr. Davis' opinion, the minimum necessary improvement would be to increase the size of the box culverts underneath the existing road crossings to the size that was determined that they would eventually have to be when the box culvert runs the full length of the channel. Therefore it would not be just interim construction, but would have the necessary grade, elevation and size of the culvert for the remaining work. Therefore, when Segment 1 was completed, they could simply make the connections. It could also allow for the proposed closing of some of the existing crossings (College and Call Streets); they would only need to be removed.

Gabe Menendez questioned the efficiency of the downstream segments if improvements were made to the upstream early on. Mark Llewellyn stated that Segment 2 was designed to stand-alone and provide the necessary capacity. He further stated that part of the next phase would be to evaluate South Monroe Street to determine if there were any short-term improvements that could be made in Segment 3 to decrease the staging. Mr. Menendez asked if Mr. Llewellyn was suggesting to eliminate the flooding in Segment 1 by moving the water more quickly into Segment 2. He also asked how Mr. Llewellyn would control the rate of rise in Segment 2. Mr. Llewellyn stated that in his opinion the only way would be to increase (find) capacity upstream. That would be the only way to slow the water down. Mr. Menendez asked if it would help to move the water through quickly into Segment 3. Mr. Llewellyn stated that conveying the water into Segment 3 quicker would not change the initial flush, which is what causes the rapid rate of rise.

Theresa Heiker asked if Genesis staff had evaluated the current storage that occurred in the travel lanes of Franklin Boulevard. Mark Thomasson stated that Genesis did not have those numbers. Ms. Heiker explained that, at a minimum, that was the amount of water they were truly discussing and that it only occurred at the low point of Franklin Boulevard's cross section. Mr. Thomasson stated that he determined from the report that the rate of rise for the two-year storm from beginning to the peak was an average of 19 minutes per foot, approximately 3 hours. The 25-year event would average at 12 minutes per foot from the beginning to the peak.

Dave Bright stated that several discussions had been held regarding the water quality treatment and jurisdictional severance. He further stated that meetings to try to resolve some of those issues had also been held with various potential permitting agencies. Severance issues, obviously, would have a significant impact on the final design and whether any new water, from the trail's impervious surface or from new development along the Gaines Street Corridor would be accepted. He stated that the conversations with the agencies would continue, however, it would depend on what type of credit was received for treatment or what type of design was necessary for on-line or off-line ponds. He continued that it was an ongoing process with Blueprint, DEP, EPA, US Army Corp of Engineers as well as City and County Permitting to ensure the design would accommodate the old and new water.

Theresa Heiker stated that in a meeting Leon County Stormwater had with DEP regarding the construction of Lake Henrietta, it was explained that the construction of the improvements in line to the waters of the US and State did not require any exceptions or modifications to design. She stated that the design could move forward as it was. However, the question would ultimately be what credit could be applied to new and impervious. Therefore it would not affect the design schedule; it could be built as it was without severing jurisdiction. Mr. Davis stated that he was not aware of that. Ms. Heiker stated that it was only a question of if Blueprint wanted to apply any of that treatment credit to City projects or redevelopment on Gaines Street. That was the point staff would need to sever jurisdiction but as it was currently proposed, as a retrofit, it could proceed as it was. Mr. Davis thanked her for clarifying that point.

Mr. Menendez stated that the City of Tallahassee was moving forward with a contract for a Master Stormwater Plan for the Gaines Street area; basically Park Avenue to the railroad and Monroe Street to Lake Bradford Road. It would be used to determine what amount of development and additional impervious would support that, as well as how and when improvements would be necessary to for conveyance.

Mark Llewellyn stated that his staff was in the process of analyzing what the value or quality of the contributing wetlands were to the St. Augustine Branch. They would do the same thing with the lower, second drainage ditch, they would make a submittal to the Army Corp that identified the quality. The Corps would give them some indication of the potential for severance or not. If there was a strong potential for severance the next step

would be to move forward with some level of permit documentation in order to achieve that severance.

Dave Bright stated that the Planning Department completed a sector plan for that area, some of which was adjacent to the St. Augustine Branch. Other parts of the sector plan were as much as one mile or more away from the Cascade Corridor proper. Many of the Sector Plan's recommendations did not specifically address issues related to the Capital Cascade Trail, but were more in line with land use, infrastructure, crime and general quality of life concerns within the area boundary. However, Mr. Bright continued, staff was not designing anything that would preclude anything from being connected into the Capital Cascade Trail corridor. One of the Sector Plans major concerns was the compatibility of the Department of Corrections Road Prison on Springhill Road.

Theresa Heiker asked Roxanne Manning, the Planning Department representative, if she was familiar with the historical structure designations along the corridor. Ms. Heiker continued that she thought the Green Derby was located in that same area. Mark Llewellyn stated that they were within the right of way of that street. Dave Bright stated that before the owners opened their facility they spoke with Blueprint and Blueprint staff warned them of the coming construction. Mr. Davis asked if that was the church. Mr. Bright confirmed. Theresa Heiker stated that her only issue was if they achieved historical preservation status it would extend to the old B&W. Ms. Manning stated that she recalled meeting with that group several months earlier to discuss their renovations; at that time there was no conflict with Capital Cascade Trail.

Dave Bright stated that the items the IA will be asked to move on were authorization to design Segment 2 along with the other unresolved issues discussed. He went on to list the additional tasks that would be part of the next phase: additional capacity under South Monroe and how that affects Segment 2, and needed interim improvements required early on in Segment 3, concerns with karst features in Segment 3 and Segment 4, the required historical and cultural resources study for the entire corridor would need to be completed prior to approval of even one phase, and finally the issues that had been discussed regarding jurisdictional severance. (As a side note Jim Davis announced that the Tallahassee Museum was awarded a grant to study the history of the Cascade area.)

Dave Bright also pointed out that in Segment 4, Blueprint had applied for a grant to purchase four parcels of land, through the Florida Communities Trust (FCT), near the intersection of Springhill Road and Orange Avenue. Blueprint's application was the number one ranked project in the state of Florida (out of 85 applications). Jim Davis stated that it was for \$980,000 to be provided by FCT. Mr. Bright further stated that Blueprint and the County may want to consider an early on, grant funded project to restore the area, provide early pond locations or trail amenities adjacent to St. Marks Trail.

Ms. Heiker asked if the Davis parcel right at the intersection was included. Mr. Bright stated that it was included in the grant application, however, the corner may not be needed therefore it may be severed from the parcels west of the ditch or possibly

Blueprint could resell it. Ms. Heiker stated that that parcel was a remediation site and Superfund would look to recover that cost. Mr. Bright stated that he would prefer Blueprint avoid that situation, however, it might be possible to acquire it, sell it and pay off the Superfund remediation cost. The majority of the needed property was to the west of the channel. Staff did not plan to go through the process of sub-dividing prior to the FCT application process. Ms. Heiker stated that they were separate parcels. Mr. Bright stated that according to the tax roll it was a single parcel. Ms. Heiker advised him to investigate that further because sometimes the County would issue a single ID number for multiple parcels. She further stated that the restoration effort was mainly to the east side; they had to excavate 15 feet to remove the petroleum. That was an extremely expensive remediation. Mr. Bright stated that Blueprint only needed the western portion for the project. He further stated that detailed environmental assessment would be completed prior to closing.

Mr. Bright stated that those were some of the key topics and items to be included in the Segment 2 design. Staff anticipated that with the additional tasks that remained from phase 1, they would be requesting from the IA approximately a \$2 million plus 10% contingency. Staff realized there was significant amount of additional work to be completed based on early review, historical and cultural issues and the karst analysis in Segment 3 and Segment 4.

Mr. Bright presented the options for the IA Board: (1) Reaffirm the January 31, 2005 recommendations, authorization and negotiation of a contract with Genesis based on the current contract and have the TCC sub-committee comment on the Scope of Services. Mr. Bright reminded the TCC that since they no longer voted they would need to develop something they all agreed was the proper scope. Additionally, the Board would not vote on the Scope even if they gave their consent to move on to Segment 2. As a committee the TCC and Blueprint staff could work to complete the Scope of Services prior to extending the Genesis contract or (2) re-bid the project.

Lastly, Mr. Bright briefly discussed the proposed design team list that was included with the agenda packet. Mr. Bright stated that it was not a finalized list and that Mr. Llewellyn was still evaluating various firms. Some of the Commissioners had expressed their desire to have a nationally recognized park design firm as a member of the team. It was the desire of the Board and the Citizens of Tallahassee for Cascades Park to be the "Central Park" of the city. Jim Davis stated that Mr. Llewellyn had contacted two firms to discuss their participation on the project.

Dave Bright introduced Gary Phillips as one of the Project Managers on Capital Cascade Trail during the design phase. Mr. Bright stated that Mr. Phillips was an LPA employee and before that was with URS.

Theresa Heiker stated that the Scope only identified the City as owning right of way (ROW) permitting but some of the roads in the project area were actually County ROW. The permitting area of the scope was listed on page 10 for the Committee's reference.

Tony Park stated that a segment of Gaines Street, west of Meridian was County ROW as well as Franklin Boulevard and Meridian from Mahan Drive to Gaines Street.

Theresa Heiker also questioned the lake augmentation well plan listed at page 9, Section 4.16. Mr. Bright explained that if the base flow was not enough to maintain a decent water level in the lake it might be necessary to pump water into it during drier conditions. Ms. Heiker stated that any plan of that nature must be included in the hydrologic design. She continued that typically a long pond simulation would be used, therefore, if staff were not accounting for an inflow that was not a natural discharge the data would be a misrepresentation of conditions. Mark Thomasson stated that the purpose of the design was simply to maintain normal pond levels but not necessarily flow. Ms. Heiker stated that she understood however if staff were reviewing long-term modeling data that did not account for augmentation the model would create volume capacity that was not typically there.

Jim Lee stated that he had not had the opportunity to thoroughly read the scope however in regards to the permitting aspect staff went into great detail on City permitting but not much on DEP permitting. Mark Llewellyn stated that Genesis staff was working with DEP and that information would be forthcoming. Mark Thomasson clarified that the items that were listed as just bullets would be expanded on. Dave Bright stated that the headings that were listed without much supporting information were issues that remained to be analyzed and the scope developed.

Jim Davis queried everyone in attendance for comments regarding Capital Cascade Trail; none were received. He stated that based on the lack of comments he would assume everyone was satisfied and ready to move it forward. Dave Bright reminded the Committee that staff would be working with appropriate TCC members in order to have the scope fully developed over the next several weeks. Jim Davis stated that he thought the development of the preliminary review by the sub-committee was necessary prior to bring the item before the TCC again. Mr. Bright stated that there was one TCC meeting remaining in 2005, in November. It should fit with the time schedule for Blueprint proceeding with contract negotiations with Genesis.

Item #6: Capital Circle Southwest Corridor Study

In order to quickly bring the TCC members up to speed on the recent events of the CCSW Corridor Study, Jim Davis stated that as a result of everything to date there were 17 possible alternatives for realignment of CCSW. Blueprint staff had broken those 17 possibilities into three corridors to determine if any of the corridors could be eliminated from the PD&E process. He further stated that staff recommended eliminating Corridor 2, which transected the Apalachicola National Forest, but retain the existing alignment, Corridor 1, and Corridor 3, the area from Tyson Road and Orange Avenue to the southeast of Black Swamp.

Jim Shepherd stated that since the TCC had been briefed twice before he would simply provide them with a quick overview of the project. Mr. Shepherd continued with a Power Point presentation that would be shown to the IA. Mr. Davis interjected that,

regarding the matrix in the presentation, staff was consistent in the methodology of the calculation however the number were not exactly accurate and could possibly fluctuate. Mr. Shepherd continued with the presentation and explained the corridors to the Committee. He stated that Corridor 1 was the existing alignment of CCSW, Corridor 2 passed south and west of the Airport and contained alternatives 10-13, and Corridor 3 included Tyson Road on the north and Orange Avenue on the south and connected from Lake Bradford Road and Orange Avenue intersection southeast to Capital Circle east of Springhill Road. Mr. Shepherd further stated that Corridor 3 contained alternatives 2-5 and 14-17. He further stated that staff did not intend to recommend alternatives 6-9. Mr. Davis clarified for the Committee that it was never staff's intention for the new alignment to pass through the neighborhoods in that area either. He completed the presentation by stating that staff would recommend to the IA that Corridor 2 be eliminated and only study Corridor 1 and Corridor 3 as well as to authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to advertise, select and award a contract for the PD&E study for Capital Circle Southwest.

Tony Park asked why staff had selected 3 over 2. In his review of the matrix the wetland and flood impacts were greater as well as the overall cost. Dave Bright asked him to clarify if he was referring to Alternative 2 or Corridor 2. Mr. Park stated that he was referring to Alternative 2. Jim Davis explained how to read the Corridor/Alternative Map and compare it to the matrix. There was a brief discussion of possible ways to change the map to make it easier to read. Benjamin Pingreen suggested simply color code the legend to match the corridors. Mr. Davis agreed to the change.

Jim Shepherd directed a response to Mr. Park and stated he was correct in thinking that Corridor 2 was the most expensive of the three corridors. Mr. Park stated that he understood following the explanation of the map. Theresa Heiker stated that she was not clear on what had been authorized for design in construction on the existing CCNW/SW. Jim Davis stated that it would be explained in the next agenda item. He called for any additional comments regarding the elimination of Corridor 2 from staff's recommended options. Jim Davis stated that because the Committee no longer voted on issues the minutes and IA agenda would reflect that the TCC raised no issues with the staff recommendations.

Theresa Heiker asked Gabe Menendez if his department had an active map for the 4C, Tyson Road and Rankin Road at the City's barrow site. Mr. Menendez stated that he did not have an answer for her question. She stated that it was a brand new sand mine that the City had recently opened. Jim Davis clarified that staff had attempted to review each individual route but it became too time consuming. The decision was made to review three basic corridors that were quite distinct. Therefore staff did not intend to recommend any particular route merely which two of the three corridors should proceed to the PD&E phase. The route would be determined after the completion of the PD&E study. Things like the City's new barrow site would be evaluated during the study.

Mr. Menendez asked if he understood Mr. Davis correctly that the best route of both Corridor 1 and Corridor 3 would be determined during the PD&E. Mr. Davis stated that

there would be one best-recommended corridor and a “no-build.” The purpose of the PD&E was to determine the best route period not the best route through each corridor. Mr. Menendez asked if the study would evaluate 14 alternatives. Mr. Davis stated that no, the study would evaluate two corridors. Mr. Menendez asked, did that not constitute the remaining 14 routes. Mr. Davis stated that it could and he explained how staff arrived at three corridors again. The Consultant would evaluate the identified alternatives plus any other potential alternatives within the selected corridor. He would not be restricted to only the identified routes he would determine the best route to connect Orange Avenue to Springhill Road/Capital Circle.

Theresa Heiker asked if all of the corridors did in fact lie south of the Capital Cascade Trail project. She stated she remember, at one point, the corridor included Orange Avenue and Springhill Road. Jim Shepherd stated that the area had not changed and there was still potential for that area to be included.

Item #7: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E: Typical Section and Recommended Alignment and Extended Design Limits Approval

Jim Davis stated in response to Ms. Heiker’s question regarding what had been authorized for design in construction on the existing CCNW/SW. He stated that staff hoped the Board would approve the staff recommendation on the previous item, which would negate a portion of the problem. There would help eliminate some of the confusion because both alternatives would begin somewhere in the vicinity of the Orange Avenue intersection. At the January 31, 2005 IA the Board directed staff to build to Orange Avenue and use the \$22 million from Stormwater/Greenway retrofit from CCNW for construction. He further stated that the current agenda item would extend the H.W. Lochner contract through design through Orange Avenue, which was funded for construction.

Mr. Davis further stated that it did not preclude the Board from deciding that staff initiate the Tyson Road corridor north of the existing Orange Avenue intersection. Mr. Davis noted that the comment was one of discussion among at least some of the City Commissioners. That would not be a problem because of timing, he clarified. If staff determined to extend the corridor to include the area just north of Corridor 3 as it was proposed the only issue would be that the construction to Orange Avenue was not scheduled for completion until 2010 but there was no ROW money included in the Master Plan for the (hypothetical) area until 2018. Therefore staff did not feel it was critical.

Jim Shepherd listed the dates of the public meetings that had been held and stated that he did not intend to show the Committee the typical sections again. He further stated that staff would present the agenda item to the IA to request final approval on the typical sections on the NW/SW project, approval of the staff recommended Combination Alignment #2, and to Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to a) approve the outstanding issues listed in Section 4 of the agenda item, b) execute a supplemental agreement to the existing contract with H.W. Lochner, Inc for the continuation of the design to Orange Avenue.

Jim Shepherd displayed graphic of possible alignments for the Committee. Ms. Heiker noted one sinkhole located near one of the alignments. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff had been approached with questions regarding drainage in the transition area south of Orange Avenue. He explained some alternatives staff had regarding existing and proposed impervious, area within the ROW, area necessary for a pond with schematic, etc. Additionally, staff and Lochner employees want the proposed alignment to connect to the existing roadway to the east of the sinkhole Ms. Heiker mentioned earlier because it gave more flexibility if the route went down either Tyson Road or Orange Ave. However, the US Forest Service and the Tallahassee Museum had a Memorandum of Understanding to use a large portion of that same land for educational purposes. Therefore the Forest Service recommended the property be given 4F status meaning it could only be used for public recreation or as a wetland or wildlife refuge. If Federal Highway granted them 4F status Blueprint and Lochner staff would have to avoid that parcel. Members of both staffs were working toward an agreement with the Museum and the Forest Service to exclude the portion needed for the roadway. If they choose not to get involved or if an agreement can not be reached Blueprint would have to change the recommended alternative, purchase the ROW from the other side of the road, and adjust the configuration of all other components.

Theresa Heiker asked if staff expected that the existing alignment would be determined not to be sufficient in the long term. She stated that it was obvious improvement over the previous and also questioned if the intersection improvements, made by FDOT, were not viable. Mr. Shepherd stated that they were not because of the design; staff would be required to take the improvements through the intersection before making the transition back. Ms. Heiker asked Rodney Cassidy if Commissioner Lightsey had staff conduct further evaluation of the afore mentioned sinkhole as part of the FDOT project. Mr. Cassidy stated that Growth Management, Environmental had not completed one. Jim Lee stated that he thought another department might have. Ms. Heiker stated that, at one of the Board meetings, she understood Commissioner Lightsey to say that she wanted it completed.

Jim Lee stated that he was with Genesis at the time of the intersection improvement and had worked extensively on the project. The sinkhole was a large issue and he recommended that staff avoid it at all cost. Ms. Heiker stated that she thought "a lot of that stuff was on record already." Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint staff had spoken to several members of the construction crew from that project. They stated that during the high water period they were unable to work on the intersection. He further stated that staff clearly understood the necessity of working around the sinkhole. Furthermore, Lochner would be addressing that.

Jim Shepherd stated that staff was evaluating the alignment with left, right, and center alternatives. Staff would determine if it would be better for the roadway to be north of or south of SR 20 based on development. He further stated that staff was evaluation several alternatives for the Gum Swamp crossing. He stated that it was estimated if they bridged the entire swamp it would be approximately 1900 feet across and cost \$12.6 million. If,

however, a 100 foot bridge and 1800 foot cause-way would only cost approximately \$2.4 million. Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint staff was working with City and County Stormwater staff to determine mitigation options. There was the possibility of putting the difference between the two costs toward other projects. He further stated that Lochner had created a pond site and mitigation report that was under review at that time.

Theresa Heiker questioned if the vertical and horizontal curves at Swamp Fox Road were in compliance with larger vehicle needs. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff had used Auto-Turn for all of the curves but stated that he would verify that with Lochner. Ms. Heiker stated that was her reason for suggesting the elimination of Swamp Fox Road and establishing alternative access at the dump. Mr. Shepherd stated that in the Lochner report, they suggested Blueprint buy-out all property along Swamp Fox Road, with the exception of a few parcels. Mr. Shepherd indicated on the map graphic the areas in question. Dave Bright pointed out there was a Stormwater Management Facility in that area also. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was attempting to partner with them.

Mr. Shepherd reiterated the recommended action (by the IA). Jim Davis called for comments or questions from the committee. Rodney Cassidy pointed out that there was a small cemetery off Rankin property not far from the sinkhole. Mr. Shepherd clarified the location with Mr. Cassidy and stated that he was under the impression there were additional graves also. Mr. Shepherd stated that those issues would be considered in greater detail during the PD&E phase of the project.

Theresa Heiker asked if the service road would be south of SR 20 and if it was intended primarily for the future development of the townhomes. Jim Shepherd stated that it was primarily for business along the west side of Capital Circle. In the meeting with Delta Industrial Park, they stated that the service road did not fit within their design and were fine with it not being on the east side. Ms. Heiker further stated that the City had purchased quite a bit of property on the west side for noise mitigation for the Airport. Mr. Shepherd stated that the frontage road was considered from the perspective of lessening the necessity for driveway cuts in the road.

The question of Taltran's future plans for that area was raised. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff was coordinating with Taltran on the project; however, at that time Taltran did not service CCSW but could possibly expand their services. There was additional discussion amongst the committee members regarding bus lanes, the Swamp Fox Road intersection, the crossing at Gum Creek, and the School Board Maintenance Facility.

Due to a malfunction with the dictation equipment the remainder of the meeting was not recorded. The minutes that follow were generated from staff notes. *

Item #8: Harbinwood Estates Stormwater Enhancement Project

* See above regarding the record of the meeting

Dave Bright stated that the Blueprint 2000 Program Master Plan included funding for City and County Stormwater Management/Water Quality projects. The TCC was being requested to concur with the consultant's (ERD) recommendation that the Harbinwood Estates stormwater Enhancement Project be deemed eligible for Blueprint stormwater enhancement funding. Theresa Heiker explained that online treatment for the existing impervious would be included as well as the planting of vegetation for nutrient uptake. The committee had no objections to the recommended action.

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

*See above regarding the record of the meeting

Mr. Davis called for a roundtable discussion of each member's ongoing or upcoming projects. Tony Park spoke briefly regarding the Highway 90 east, from Capital Circle Northeast to I-10, redesign project. He stated that his staff would also compete for SIS funding.

Dave Bright explained to Roxanne Manning that he needed additional analysis for CCSW Corridor 2 and the comp plan information for the IA agenda. Mr. Davis stated that he had an email that contained that information. The three of them discussed the necessity of a more formal submittal of information.

Jim Davis stated that Blueprint was eligible for \$14 million in TRIP funds. He further explained that the best project to capture that funding for would be Capital Circle, Woodville to Tram. There was some discussion between Mr. Davis and Gabe Menendez on the subject with Mr. Menendez finally stating that he was hesitant to commit. He felt Blueprint would be "exposing" themselves. Jim Davis and Phil Maher stated they understood his point and explained how the TRIP funds would be allocated. Mr. Menendez was satisfied with their explanation.

Jim Davis provided the Committee with several updates on various Blueprint projects. Regarding Capital Circle Southeast he stated that there were significant issues regarding the stormwater ponds at Southwood. He updated the Committee on Blueprint's proposal to hire an in-house attorney; at a cost savings of \$180,000 per year. Staff anticipated

closing on Copeland Sink in the near future. He stated that Copeland Sink was a 50/50 match grant from Florida Communities Trust. He further stated that staff was pursuing a conservation easement for an adjacent parcel as well. Mr. Davis stated that the Patty Sink acquisition was resurrected but as a conservation easement. He also briefly discussed the proposed acquisition of the Booth property.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business Jim Davis adjourned the meeting at 3:58 pm.