

**Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes**

Monday, October 30, 2006  
Ellis Building – Koger Center  
2:00 pm

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

<b>Jim Davis</b>	Dave Bright	Angela Richardson
<b>Rodney Cassidy</b>	Phil Maher	Debbie Dantin
<b>John Buss</b>	Randy Matheny	Ben Chandler
<b>John Kraynak</b>	Gary Phillips	Jack Diestelhorst
<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	Paul Hiers	
<b>Gabe Menendez</b>	Bill Little	
<b>Tony Park</b>	Margie Pelkey	

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

**I. Agenda Modifications**

There were none.

**II. Information Items**

There were none.

**III. Consent**

**Item #1: TCC Minutes: August 28, 2006**

There were no comments regarding the August minutes.

**IV. Presentations/Discussions**

**Item #2: Scopes of Work for Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Tram Road**

Doug Martin stated that the RFP was distributed with the agenda and requested comments from the review. Tony Park asked if it was any different from any previous Scope they had reviewed in the past. Jim Davis stated that it was not. In fact, it was modeled off of a previous RFQ, subject to a few “lessons learned.” It was actually an upgraded scope and he hoped it was better than the last.

Mr. Davis further stated that currently Blueprint was \$8 million short of being able to complete that entire segment of Capital Circle. He stated that \$7 million of the \$18 million encumbered was from TRIP that must be committed by June 2007. If it was not it would be lost; that was not an option, he stated. That was what forced Blueprint into the Design Build mode in the first place. Therefore, staff designed an option in the

contract that stated there was a \$26 million package (the entire project segment) or a \$22 million package. That package would stop construction short of Woodville Highway at the last drainage basin and not complete improvements to the Woodville Highway intersection.

Mr. Davis further stated that there were several things that were happening simultaneously. Staff would make the decision as to which option they would pursue prior to awarding the contract. He stated that he had spoken to FDOT staff, who indicated that Blueprint would receive additional TRIP funding during this year. He did not know how much because Ed Prescott fell ill and was unable to attend a previously scheduled meeting. He was confident, however, that Blueprint would have all \$26 million that was needed the option was included in the RFP simply as a contingency plan. He requested the TCC bear in mind that the project could, theoretically, stop short of the Woodville Highway. However, he felt that if that were the case Commissioner Proctor would find the \$2.5 million he had tentatively committed to the project.

Theresa Heiker stated that she did not interpret the RFP as an optional bid but rather a single bid. She asked if it was included in the RFP and she overlooked it. Bill Little stated it was listed in the RFP in the introduction; number one, sub-item G. Ms. Heiker stated that page 40 of 43, item IX, sub-item A, stated that there "shall be one lump sum price for the Project." It did not indicate that there was an option bid. Mr. Park noted that there was only one bid sheet included with the RFP. Doug Martin noted that those items would be corrected.

### **Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2: Traffic Operational Analysis Results**

Jim Davis stated that Blueprint staff continued to coordinate with FDOT regarding the parking situation in the Capital Cascade Trail. There were a couple of options that were under review. One of the unresolved issues, however, that the Board delegated to Mrs. Favors Thompson and Mr. Alam was how to deal with the intersections at Lafayette Street/Franklin Boulevard and Lafayette Street/Suwannee Street/Apalachee Parkway on ramp; whether or not it would be a roundabout and signalized intersection, two roundabouts, or two signalized intersections.

Debby Dantin, Traffic Engineer with Genesis Group, stated that in addition to the intersection analysis, Ben Chandler, would provide an update on the road closure analysis. She stated that following the August TCC meeting a sub-committee was formed to discuss the traffic operational issues. At that time there were three options for the intersections at Lafayette Street/Franklin Boulevard and Lafayette Street/Suwannee Street - a roundabout and signalized intersection, two roundabouts, or two signalized intersections.

Ms. Dantin shared several graphics which demonstrated the necessary configuration changes and potential problems each presented. She stated that as a result of the analysis of the detailed operations, the size of the roundabout, the geometric issue with the on-ramp (at Apalachee Parkway), and the close proximity of the west bound movement at Lafayette that roundabout was simply not large enough to handle the traffic at that

location. Therefore, the sub-committee eliminated the roundabout option at Franklin Boulevard and Lafayette Street at their September 14, 2006 meeting.

Ms. Dantin further stated that they analyzed the intersections and road closures (including Gaines Street) based on forecasted traffic for 2010 and 2030. She stated that Blueprint staff directed them to include the Suwannee Street extension (that connected to Bloxham Street) after the September 14, 2006 sub-committee meeting. That addition somewhat decreased the volumes on Meridian, however, it increased the volumes by 16-20% north bound on Suwannee Street. There were several issues that were the result of the comparisons; Ms. Dantin listed them for the TCC.

- Closely spaced intersections (less than 300-feet apart)
- Vehicle weaving with the use of a roundabout
- Vehicle queue between intersections (fatal flaw – east bound/left turn onto Apalachee Parkway cause traffic to back up into the roundabout)
- Apalachee Parkway on-ramp
- Pedestrian safety (mid-block pedestrian crossing on Meridian in conjunction with advanced overhead signage)
- Aesthetics to park entrance
- FDOT access and Gaines Street closures
- Signal control with ITS features (vehicle platooning)

The preferred option for intersection improvement was to have two signals at both Franklin/Lafayette Street and Suwannee/Lafayette Streets. Ms. Dantin stated that both intersections would be upgraded to mast-arm signals with advanced pedestrian enhancements, as well as CCTV traffic monitoring cameras.

Gabe Menendez stated that he had no objections to the recommendation however, he was curious if the ROW line (indicating the graphic) would be cleaned up or would it continue to cut into and out of the park and improvements. As it stood, according to the graphic, not all of the improvements were in the ROW. Mark Thomason stated that Genesis staff met with FDMS staff and they stated that easements would be freely given for the project. Mr. Davis stated that he did not feel that would be an issue. He further stated that in his meetings with FDMS they indicated they would comply as long as FDOT concurred.

Mr. Davis stated that the majority of the parking spaces would be removed from the park area, however, there was the possibility that some could remain; for approximately 50-75 vehicles. Currently, however, staff was encouraging FDOT to build a two-level parking garage behind the Burns Building for approximately 110 vehicles. Parking would also be provided in other places as well, including the possibility of angular parking along Suwannee Street.

Tony Park noted that Ms. Dantin's graphics were different from the graphics that had been included in the agenda packet. Ms. Dantin stated that the single lane graphic, which

was in the Committee's agenda, was the existing condition. However, all of their analyses for the queue, which was also in the agenda, included a left turn lane. She stated that the graphic has only recently been modified to show the left turn lane because they were proceeding that way with the design. The modified graphic indicated a left, straight, and right turn lane.

Mr. Park stated that the primary reason for Ms. Dantin moving forward with the recommended option was because of queuing. Ms. Dantin confirmed that. Mr. Park asked if the queuing problems were during one peak hour only. Ms. Dantin stated that yes; it was during the afternoon peak hour. Mr. Park asked if it (the roundabout) functioned in the other 23 hours. Ms. Dantin stated that they had not analyzed to that level of detail. He stated that he felt certain that a Commissioner would ask a similar question because of the park setting and he did not think they would want "platooning of traffic" through the park.

Furthermore, in review of the Option Comparison Matrix, included in the agenda, items 2 and 3, Safety and Other, was much more positive, for a park setting, to recommend Option 2 with the roundabout. It listed slower speeds, improved aesthetics, decreased maintenance costs it even appeared to improve the vehicle crash numbers or severity.

Ms. Dantin stated that the vehicles queues were the greatest problem with those intersections. They reviewed various signal timings to control the queue lengths and felt that it could be optimized in the future with signal timing. She agreed with Mr. Park regarding vehicle speeds, aesthetics, etc. She further stated that that by 2030 it was not unrealistic to consider peak hour spreads of possibly three to four hours in the afternoon or even at midday. If the traffic patterns changed there could be issues in the morning as well. Mr. Park stated he felt that the patterns would change because no one would drive down there if they were not careful.

Jim Davis stated that his opinion of analysis was "a fatal flaw was a fatal flaw" and by definition that ruled out the use of the roundabout. As was proven by the analysis and indicated in the graphics the roundabout would be gridlocked during the afternoon peak hour(s). He agreed that while it was near the park and would be visible but would only be on the peripheral of the persons in the park itself. In his opinion gridlock of the roundabout was unacceptable.

Mr. Park stated that what Ms. Dantin was presenting was different than what was presented at the sub-committee meeting. At that meeting all of the queuing occurred to the west of the roundabout. The presentation to the sub-committee did not reflect queuing between Suwannee Street and the roundabout. Mr. Parks asked if that was created because of the Suwannee Street extension. Ms. Dantin stated that was partially correct however, the queuing had always a little bit beyond the 300-feet that existed between the intersections. She stated that at the sub-committee meeting the discussed the likelihood of the queue being in the vicinity of 400-feet in length. It was not as drastic however, once the volume was added to Suwannee Street (via the extension) it created more demand for the northbound movement; the volume increase by 16% because of the

connection to South Monroe Street via Bloxham/Oakland Streets. Mr. Park asked if improvements would be made to those streets. Ms. Dantin stated that could be considered part of the FAMU Way project. Gabe Menendez stated that was where FAMU Way tied into...

Mr. Park asked if there were any improvements planned east of Suwannee Street to encourage that movement for the left turn. To divert some of the traffic so that it followed the route described. Ms. Dantin stated that they had not completed a full analysis on the Suwannee Street extension. Gary Phillips stated that the intension of Suwannee Street was to provide an outlet for the Myers Park residents with the closure of Gaines Street. Mr. Menendez stated that the fact that it created congestion did not mean that it would be any safer. Congestion would create slower speeds but would increase driver frustration would take over however.

Mr. Park noted, however, that up to that point every presentation included a roundabout. Jim Davis stated that both options, a roundabout and a signalized intersection, were presented to the Board. Mr. Park stated that he was going back to the development of the Blueprint 2000 concept total and everything up to that point included some concept of a roundabout. Mr. Davis concurred and stated that, as a follow up, Franklin Boulevard was off in the future; it was funded but not until 2018. By the time the final improvements were completed on Franklin they would have the opportunity, having observed the traffic at that intersection for several years, to address the roundabout at that point in time. Dave Bright stated that the majority of the projects that were current variables in the analysis, Gaines Street, FAMU Way, redevelopment of downtown properties, would have been completed by then. Mr. Davis stated again that staff would have the opportunity to revisit it in the future.

Ms. Dantin stated that the current conditions of the Franklin Boulevard and Lafayette Street intersection, without any improvements would be operational through 2015. Mr. Davis stated that that information begged the question; "Why do anything until we do Franklin?" Would they need to make any improvements at all or was it worth the investment as compared to 2018? Mr. Menendez stated that improvements would be made for the Trail anyway. Mr. Davis agreed. Ms. Dantin state that the mast arms would assist with the aesthetics and that the CCTV cameras were necessary for traffic monitoring.

With no further comments regarding the intersection recommendation, Ben Chandler, Genesis Group Inc. presented the updates on road closures. He identified three scenarios (A) the existing closure of Gadsden between Van Buren and Bloxham Streets. They used that as the base condition for current patterns based on counts that were taken during Summer 2006. From there they evaluated the existing Level of Service (LOS) issues were at the intersections in the study area. From there they factored in other scenarios; (B) closed Bloxham Street and Meridian Street; (C) closed Gaines Street between Meridian and Suwannee Streets. The analyses, he stated, at that point did not include the extension of Suwannee Street.

The existing conditions have created deficiencies at the Monroe and Gaines Street intersection as well as the Gaines and Meridian Street intersection. The LOS is either E or F for both intersections, Mr. Chandler stated.

Mr. Chandler further stated that the 2010 analyses, with the closures at Bloxham and Gaines Streets, created new deficiencies at additional intersections. By the 2030 analyses there were multiple deficiencies at multiple intersections in the study area. Mr. Davis asked if the deficiencies indicated at Gadsden and Gaines took into consideration that Gadsden would be closed to the south of Gaines. Mr. Chandler stated that their analyses did not factor in the proposed closings of roads between Bloxham and Gaines Streets. Ms. Dantin stated that the analyses also did not include the City's recent improvements to Gaines, Madison, Pensacola, Virginia, and Call Streets. Mr. Menendez noted that the scenarios presented were best case scenarios. Once the City completed the improvements they were making to afore mentioned streets the congestion would worsen as would the LOS.

Mr. Chandler stated that the analyses were completed on a micro level. Whenever they analyzed a closure and diverted, they kept all of the traffic in the study area. They made no assumptions that traffic would simply not come to that area any longer. This was done in an effort to create a worse case, micro level. He proceeded listed the results of his analyses.

- Suwannee Street extension
- Minor intersection improvements recommended at
  - Franklin Boulevard and Lafayette Street
  - Suwannee Street and Lafayette Street
  - Meridian Street and Gaines Street
- Currently TCEA and proposed MMTD
- Future capacity deficiencies with road closures
- Analysis did not include addition City of Tallahassee road closures

There being no questions or comments regarding Mr. Chandler's presentation, Mr. Davis stated that it was staff's intention to recommend to the Intergovernmental Management Committee (City Manager and County Administrator) that the roundabouts not be included. Staff would recommend that they precede with the intersection improvements that were reflected in the presentation.

#### **IV. Citizens to be Heard**

There were none.

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

John Buss stated that, in reference to Item no. 2 the Scopes of Work for Capital Circle Southeast – Woodville Highway to Tram Road, in reference to the stormwater section it

was possible that Blueprint staff might encounter a problem with changing regulations due environmental resource permit. He did not feel that it would stay on schedule; however, FDEP hoped to have the stormwater rules in effect by April 2007. It could, potentially, have dramatic impacts on the stormwater design for that project. He asked if the stormwater ponds had been completed. Mr. Davis stated, no, they were at 60% design. Mr. Buss stated that FDEP had reported to City Stormwater last week that if the permit was not in hand when the ERB went into effect then projects would need to be designed to the ERB.

Phil Maher, Gabe Menendez, and Jim Davis each offered snippets of information based on information that was distributed at the most recent staff meeting held by Michael Wright. Mr. Buss stated that he was not certain what the impact would be but it was evolving and he did not know if the specifics mentioned would be retained or not. Furthermore there was some discussion that the language was not consistent with the direction provided by the Legislature. Mr. Menendez noted that the CCOC had responded to FDEP via a letter that basically stated that they should follow the St John's Water Management District. Mr. Buss stated that would lead to multiple stormwater ponds that were not very deep.

Mr. Buss stated that, in his opinion, Blueprint staff should acknowledge it with the contractor and direct them to monitor the rule making and address it in the plans. Mr. Davis concurred and noted that it was the responsibility of the contractor to secure all of the permits, etc. However, they could be caught sideways because Blueprint had given them 60% plans. Mr. Buss stated that the Scopes did not even mention the ERB. The Scopes of Work stated that they are designed by the FDOT manual and the City of Tallahassee EMO; neither of which would meet the ERB. Therefore, the contractor could deliver a product that could not be permitted.

Tony Park noted that the segment of Orange Avenue between South Monroe and Blairstone Road would be opened Saturday, November 4, 2006; including the roundabout.

John Buss requested clarification from Gary Phillips on the jurisdictional severance letter from FDEP. He stated that the letter did not give him much confidence because in his opinion the upstream conditions were not applicable in that situation. Mr. Buss suggested that the sub-committee should meet to discuss it further. Mr. Phillips concurred.

## **VI. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.