

Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: February 12, 2018
To: Technical Coordinating Committee
From: Benjamin H. Pingree, PLACE Director
Subject: Summary Minutes for November 13, 2018 TCC Meeting

Committee Members present:

Wayne Tedder	Ken Morris
Alicia Wetherell	Tony Park
Jodie Cahoon	Cherie Bryant
Rodney Cassidy	Greg Slay
Ben Pingree	Charles Hargraves

Committee Members absent:

John Kraynak	Theresa Heiker
--------------	----------------

Guests/Presenters/Staff present:

Autumn Calder	Patrick Kinni
Angela Ivy	Roger Cain
Junious Brown	Chris Wu
Susan Emmanuel	Bill Peebles

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

There were no Agenda Modifications.

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS

There were no Informational Items or Presentations

III. CONSENT

1. Approval of the September 5, 2017 and October 17, 2017 TCC Meeting Minutes
Option #1: Approve the September 5, 2017 and October 17, 2017 TCC meeting minutes.

There were no corrections to the minutes.

2. Acceptance of the Status Report on Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Infrastructure Projects

Option #1: Accept the December 2017 status report on the Blueprint infrastructure projects.

There were no comments on the status report.

3. Ratification of the Application for the Florida Job Growth Grant Fund

Option #1: 1. Ratify the Office of Economic Vitality's application for the Florida Job Growth Grant Fund.

There were no comments on the grant.

IV. GENERAL BUSINESS

4. Magnolia Drive Multi-Use Trail Design Concepts

Autumn Calder gave a brief presentation of the design concepts which included: right of way needs, analysis of trail and landscape alternatives, construction costs, utility relocation, and driveway impacts. Staff recommendation:

Option #1: Provide guidance on the selection of the design concept for the Magnolia Drive Multiuse Trail.

- Option 1: 10' wide multiuse trail adjacent to back of curb (existing trail design)
- Option 2: 8' wide multiuse trail with 4' landscaped buffer between back of curb and trail
- Option 3: 10' wide multiuse trail with 4' landscaped buffer between back of curb and trail

Tony Park noted that emails from neighborhood 'leaders' preferred more green area and therefore, the eight-foot sidewalk. Cherrie Bryant concurred. Rodney Cassidy offered the merging of options; to retain the 14-foot right-of-way but an eight-foot sidewalk which would allow more green space and flexibility in landscaping.

Ken Morris questioned the minimal width allowed by the State. Charles Hargraves noted that an eight-foot variance was allowed in low traffic areas however it should be listed as a shared-use path.

Tony Park stated that a 10-foot trail, with a two-foot buffer, allowed for park-like amenities to be added (at a later date) and would provide space for StarMetro benches as well. As for maintenance, with the exception of the apartment complexes, he thought most residents would mow the two-foot grass strip in front of their properties.

Wayne Tedder stated that Reese Goad was in favor of relocating utilities underground if it effected the design and improved reliability. Cost of course, was a significant variable. He stated that there could be cost sharing by the City however, Blueprint would be the primary funding source. Tony Park requested that City Electric provide a cost estimate. Ben Pingree stated that it was great news but Blueprint would need to understand the

cost implications and see if it would be feasible. Mr. Tedder requested that Blueprint staff provide him with details of the segment and utility impacts for his review.

Ken Morris questioned what delay a new design would have on the project. Autumn Calder stated that Option #1 was fully designed; Options #2 and #3 would require three to six months to design. However, Option #3 would require additional right-of-way which would increase the delay. The construction timeline was approximately the same for all.

Wayne Tedder did not recommend the 10' wide multiuse trail adjacent to back of curb (existing trail design)

Alicia Wetherell spoke to the impacts to driveways that a four to six-foot buffer would create. Charles Wu stated that the designers considered all options; while it was not included in the cross-sections, the impact would not extend beyond the profile. He also pointed out that currently, the Pontiac to Diamond segment had a two-foot buffer that was failing.

Tony Park supported the 8' wide multiuse trail with 4' landscaped buffer between back of curb and trail as it would also allow space for tree and yard debris to be stacked for pickup. Charles Hargraves noted that there would be shrubbery in some locations of the buffer too.

Charles Hargraves summarized that the Committee recommendation was a four-foot buffer with an eight-foot shared-use path. With it meandering to provide interest as well as minimize environmental impacts or utilities.

Wayne Tedder stated that underground utilities would allow for more than shrubbery to be included in the landscaping; trees could be included as well. Alicia Wetherell shared that the Utility preferred to be located under the sidewalks to provide additional protection of the system. Tony Park noted that the filtration system was located underneath the sidewalk.

The Committee concurred that staff would review the details and evaluate the cost of utilities in preparation for the March IA meeting.

5. Consideration of a Substantial Amendment to the Blueprint 2020 Airport Gateway Project

Ben Pingree gave a brief presentation of the agenda item and information shared at the community meetings.

Wayne Tedder questioned if citizen comments related to existing components of Lake Bradford and Springhill roads that might be inconsistent with the project definition and would that description need to be tweaked based on their comments. Ben Pingree stated that multiple opinions were expressed within neighborhood groups which created interesting discussions in the breakout groups. Staff recorded each of the key points from those sessions and shared them with the larger group to foster conversation.

Ken Morris questioned how college housing concerns could be addressed in the future as the south campus became more developed. Wayne Tedder stated that the majority of the area was zoned for multifamily homes with the exception of the residential preservation zones of the single family neighborhoods. Ben Pingree stated that staff acknowledged the zoning that was in place and also asked broader questions of the residents to learn the nuances of their neighborhoods.

Autumn Calder asked if the Southwest Area Transportation Plan indicate whether four-lanes on any of the segments be warranted. Greg Slay stated that until the detailed modeling was complete in the PD&E phase he could not fully answer that. Currently, however, Orange Avenue was the only road with traffic data to support four-lanes.

In the interest of preserving the existing project definition, Wayne Tedder suggested language that allowed the Southwest Area Transportation Plan to be completed prior to modifications to the cross section. He further questioned what it would take to prompt widening Springhill Road to four-lanes. Greg Slay thought it possible, the question was when; that would depend on future development. It was understood that, historically, the concept and proposed design of any four-lane roadway in that area would be Springhill Road. However, Mr. Slay stressed that the current traffic data did not support it.

Ben Pingree emphasized the importance of understanding which roads needed to be four-lane or not and allow the Southwest Area Transportation Plan and study inform and guide where those investments would be made.

Citizen Comment

Bill Peebles, resident, shared that he had personally worked to understand the goings on of the project since the original presentation to the Board by FSU. It seemed to him that FSU was stealing \$10-million dollars from a Blueprint project to beautify a road through their southwest campus. Their proposal was to eliminate the acquisition of right-of-way necessary to expand Springhill Road to four-lanes.

Wayne Tedder felt that there was not one single "Airport Gateway" it all depended on where you were traveling from or to as to which route would be taken. In that regard Capital Circle was as much of a "gateway" as Lake Bradford or Springhill roads. It seemed more of a "network" than "gateway." Secondly, it was necessary to protect the residential areas. There was little to protect in the expansion of Springhill Road corridor work there would be an enhancement. Lake Bradford, however, had more residential preservation zones that could be protected (WT says "controlled") by the corridor plan which would keep development to the Capital Circle end of Lake Bradford and FSU's campus. Lastly, it was essential to stay engaged with FSU throughout the process because they would be constructing a roadway in that area with or without Blueprint's involvement. To the extent that it was incorporated into other improvements through that area was the smartest move for the community.

Tony Park suggested that staff move the concept forward. There were no objections from the TCC.

Option #1: Recommend approval of the substantial amendment to the Airport Gateway project and recommend the IA Board approve the substantial amendment to the Airport Gateway project.

Greg Slay questioned the level of involvement that the City or CRTPA would have in FSU's revised Master Plan process because development of the southwest campus would drive much of the conversation. Wayne Tedder stated that once their plan was delivered, the City could determine the impacts to transportation, stormwater, utilities, etc. and a development agreement, with a funding plan, would follow that process. The role of the City would be to mitigate the impacts of development of FSU property.

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDAED ITEMS

There were no speakers to be heard.

VI. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no speakers to be heard.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 3:12 pm.

