

Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: December 2, 2019
To: Technical Coordinating Committee
From: Benjamin H. Pingree, PLACE Director
Subject: Summary Minutes for August 19, 2019 TCC Meeting

Committee Members present:

Ken Morris	Ben Pingree
Steve Shafer	Autumn Calder
Jodie Cahoon	Rodney Cassidy
Greg Slay	Theresa Heiker
Cherie Bryant	

**substitute*

Committee Members absent:

Wayne Tedder	Brent Pell
John Kraynak	

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Max Epstein spoke in opposition to the proposed 3DB Regional Stormwater Facility and removal of trees.

Steve Urse expressed his concern about the TCC agenda not being on the website or having the material on the 3DB Regional Stormwater Facility included in the agenda.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Autumn Calder noted the additional presentation of the Comprehensive Report on the Existing Blueprint Relocation Policy and Procedures Manual and Eminent Domain Incentive Offer Program and Affordable Housing.

II. PRESENTATIONS / INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. Draft Fiscal Year 2020 Operating Budget and Fiscal Year 2020 – 2024 Capital Improvement Program Budget Presentation is on file at Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency

Autumn Calder provided a brief presentation on the draft budget material and noted the Intergovernmental Agency Board (IA Board) would hold a workshop on the material on August 20, 2019. There were no comments by committee members.

- Presentation of the Comprehensive Report on the Existing Blueprint Relocation Policy and Procedures Manual and Eminent Domain Incentive Offer Program and Affordable Housing

Kirsten Mood provided a brief presentation on the Blueprint Relocation Policy and Procedures Manual, Eminent Domain Incentive Offer Program, and Blueprint's support of affordable housing.

Ken Morris questioned if Blueprint recommended modifications to the policy to align with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) or other industry standards. Ben Pingree stated that it was a reasonable expectation following the report to the IA Board, as requested. The FDOT policy was proven to support those impacted by eminent domain acquisitions. Furthermore, Blueprint was proud of the history of going beyond, as reflected in the data presented, through the incentive offer program, paying more than appraisal values, and in finding suitable and safe replacement housing.

Greg Slay questioned if the statute or ballot language specifically referenced affordable housing. Kirsten Mood clarified that it specifically stated, "...any other uses by Florida law."

Michael Parker spoke to the opportunity for Blueprint to collaborate with the City and County, as did many other agencies, in support of affordable housing. Land was an important element in promoting affordable housing and could be useful to both governments through the Community Land Trust. Involvement in the strategies on the front side would be useful in assessing capacity in the market or if it would be necessary to create opportunities because, by all accounts, there was a shortage of affordable rental housing in particular, through the community. Collaboration and pooling resources could be an important part of the program.

III. **CONSENT**

The TCC is a non-voting committee serving to provide professional advice and technical expertise on Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency projects.

ACTION TAKEN: There were no objections to the presented Consent items.

Regarding the budget, Steve Shafer suggested two adjustments to the allocation to Bannerman Road from the Significant Benefit Project Fund and to the Northeast Gateway project, but did not discuss the reimbursement schedule. Autumn Calder stated that she would email the schedule to Mr. Shafer and review the Bannerman Road project budget.

2. Approval of the June 10, 2019 Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes
Option #1: Approve the June 10, 2019 meeting minutes.
No Commentary

3. Acceptance of the FY 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2018 Operating Fund Balance

Option #1:

No Commentary

4. Acceptance of the Status Report on Blueprint Infrastructure Projects

Option #1:

No Commentary

IV. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

5. Acceptance of the Status Report on the Blueprint Public Engagement and Acquisition Processes for the Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Project

Autumn Calder stated that typically staff presented a draft item that would move forward through the Citizens Advisory Committee to the IA Board. However, staff was still working through the analysis that would be presented to the IA Board on September 5, 2019. They sought the TCC's input on the data and assessment of the proposed alternates. The presentation would focus on the intent of the regional stormwater facility, the consistency with the original Blueprint 2000 project goals, and the expectations of the TCC. Cameron Snipes, the project's Engineer of Record with Kimley Horn and Associates, provided a brief presentation on the 3D-B Regional Stormwater Facility alternatives.

Ken Morris questioned why the trash collection system was limited under Alternative 3. Cameron Snipes stated that the collection system worked with an inline pond; however, Alternative 3 included a branched system.

Theresa Heiker questioned where treatment for FAMU Way stormwater would be provided if the pond were removed and the boxed culvert extended to the Central Drainage Ditch. Cameron Snipes stated that stormwater for FAMU Way was permitted separately from the water for St. Augustine Branch. The primary goals of Segment 3 were to provide treatment for retrofit development and improve water quality.

Jodie Cahoon questioned the basis of the 10% and 40% reductions. Cameron Snipes stated that the percentages were reductions in permanent pool volume and were based on resonance time. Both of which led to reductions in water quality.

Greg Slay inquired to the \$500,000 Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) line item listed on the alternatives. Cameron Snipes stated that based on the current design of the 3DB Regional Stormwater Facility, Blueprint received a \$500,000 springs protection grant from FDEP. With Alternatives 1 and 3 the project would no longer meet the qualifications of the grant and Blueprint would have to return the \$500,000.00. With Alternative 2 required re-evaluation by FDEP to determine if the project still met the qualifications.

Regarding Alternative 1, inclusive of a retaining wall to save the larger tree (on site), Ken Morris questioned how accessible the tree would be for the person that wanted to sit underneath it for example. Autumn Calder stated that staff deliberately designed the pond to maximize safety near the RR therefore accessibility to the tree would be discouraged to reduce interaction with the RR. Other than a 20-foot maintenance-berm required by the City of Tallahassee there would be no other access.

Ben Pingree questioned if pedestrian use would be limited to a footpath around the pond. Cameron Snipes stated that (the footpath) was not encouraged or created with the design, amenities, or signage. Autumn Calder stated that the original pond design included a 20-foot landscaped buffer between the railroad track and top of the maintenance berm. In the analyses of Alternatives 1 and 2, the northern boundary of the pond shifted north, towards the railroad tracks, to take full advantage of space and pond volume to maximize the goal of water treatment yet also working in scenarios to preserve the trees. Tree-preservation was the reason for the retaining walls as well.

Ben Pingree questioned if the oaks immediately adjacent to the stormwater pond would create any concerns regarding maintenance. Jodie Cahoon stated that presented no particular maintenance concern; it improved the aesthetics and attracted birds and other wildlife. Theresa Heiker stated that her hesitation would be the fluctuation in water levels would have a tendency to drown them out if it staged up for too long. Rodney Cassidy noted that they trees in question were live oaks and without data on the staging of the pond it was difficult to answer.

Cameron Snipes stated that the tree would be at a 63 to 64-foot elevation with peak staging of the pond at 63-feet (normal pond stages are designed at 48' to 50' elevation). The trees would not be inundated or covered by water at any time. Rodney Cassidy noted that they needed significant space underneath to absorb enough oxygen. That was why live oaks were found in upland areas not low, wetlands. Autumn Calder noted that the landscape plans for the 3D-B Regional Stormwater Facility were mostly cypress trees. Mr. Snipes confirmed that there would be more than 100 cypress, hollies, and other items with approximately 300 trees in the total landscape design.

Autumn Calder stated that Mindy Mohrman, the City's Urban Forester, assessed the trees at the pond site. Regarding the 76-inch oak, Ms. Mohrman noted that the tree had good vigor and a nice canopy however, the structural integrity of the tree was questionable. The tree needed further assessment to determine if the structural integrity was such that people could safely be allowed under it. The two 52-inch trees were candidates for preservation, according to the assessment, however there was no discussion regarding the safety of people gathering beneath them.

Rodney Cassidy questioned the number of days per year that the pond would stage at the peak elevation. Cameron Snipes stated that he could send the data to Mr. Cassidy and noted that the water quickly receded to approximately 50-foot elevation, within a couple of days based on the models. Mr. Cassidy stated that he was concerned that spending \$250,000 to save a tree, stage water on it in a stormwater pond, and reduce treatment and water quality gave him pause.

Autumn Calder reiterated the goal of input from the TCC regarding each of the alternatives to share up to the IA Board. Jodie Cahoon stated that it was essentially a balance of interests in trading water quality, reduced flooding, floodplain compensation volume, and treatment of stormwater with trees. He did not recommend trying to save all three trees at the expense of water quality. Ben Pingree outlined the current design as well as the three alternatives, the cost differences and the impacts to treatment. It was a balancing act but he was looking for a recommendation, based on the science and technical analysis, to take to the IA Board.

Theresa Heiker stated that she recommended the current design. Two years of hard work by the Stormwater Working Group were invested in determining the maximum amount of treatment in the system. Speaking on behalf of the County and Lake Henrietta, the facility north of Lake Munson, the more frequent treatment provided further up in the watershed, the better able to recover (water quality) in Lake Munson. Not even looking to Wakulla Springs but improving the health of Lake Munson.

Ken Morris questioned if there was a significant impact to Lake Munson with a 10% reduction. Moreover, if a reduction in treatment at the 3D-B Regional Stormwater Facility would increase scope and cost of another project, downstream, in the future. Ben Pingree stated that there was only Segment 4. He was not sure what watersheds could be reached by the Airport Gateway project nor was the cost of stormwater retrofit factored in that project.

Jodie Cahoon stated that the Central Drainage Ditch already met treatment criteria; of course, more could always be done concerning water quality, but the City was meeting the standard. Regarding Wakulla Springs, everything that was improved upstream supported that. Many City and County stormwater evaluations indicated that the St. Augustine Branch though, was a miniscule contributor to issues with Wakulla Springs; especially when the focus was on nutrients. Trying to balance interests and maintain the primary benefit of the pond, improving water quality and discharges to Lake Munson, Alternative 1 with the incorporation of advanced treatment systems could work. The 10% lost in that alternative could be regained through the inclusion of a Bio Activated Material system.

Steve Shafer stated that his concern with Alternative 1 was the viability of the trees if they were inundated with water. Jodie Cahoon stated that he was less concerned with the staging of water but was not sure that the trees could survive when the water receded to 50-feet or less. Furthermore, construction of 25-foot retaining walls would be another stressor on the trees. Rodney Cassidy concurred and recommended further professional evaluation before investing hundreds of thousands into it plus losing treatment and volume capacity of the pond.

Ken Morris recommended framing comments around the volume, water quality, and threats (to tree health) with construction. The IA Board would determine the outcome for the TCC however, the recommendation needed to be based on value.

Ben Pingree stated that of the three alternatives, the TCC was comfortable with noted concerns for the long-term viability of the trees through construction or staging (of

stormwater), continuing with the recommendation to move forward to the IA Board with Alternative 1.

TCC members expressed support for maintaining the currently approved design for the RSF, but noted that Alternative 1 was potentially viable, but needs further investigation.

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDAED ITEMS

Danielle Irwin spoke in favor of Alternative 1 and the inclusion of smart pond technology.

Michael Rosenthal expressed his concern on the landscaping of roundabouts of FAMU Way. Also, in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project.

Steve Urse spoke to the preservation of the trees and supported further evaluation.

Max Epstein spoke of the online petition for the support of the trees.

VI. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no speakers to be heard.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 2:45 pm.

