

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 2, 2005

Ellis Building – Koger Center

2:00 pm

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:09 pm.

Attendees: (TCC Members in Bold)

Jim Davis	Hugh Williams	Jack Diestelhorst
David Bright	Chris Merritt	Nancy Miller
Phil Maher	Sally Dowler	Mark Llewellyn
Michael Wright	Wendy Grey	Doug Martin
Gabriel Menendez	John Kraynak	John Kraynak
John Buss	Theresa Heiker	Wayne Tedder
Shelonda Gay	Jim Shepherd	Jerry Oshesky
Tammy Peters	Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Angela Richardson		

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

Item #1 – March 11, 2005 TCC Meeting Minutes

Jim Davis stated there was only one correction he was aware of for the March 11, 2005 minutes; Mr. Olu Sawyer's name was listed incorrectly. When asked if there were any other changes there were no response from the committee.

Item #2 – Capital Circle SW Corridor Study

Jim Shepherd stated that the Capital Circle SW Corridor Study was underway. Blueprint 2000 staff developed and conducted preliminary analysis on ten alternative alignments. Those ten alternatives were based on the EECC routes, the Lake Bradford Sector Plan as well as options for utilizing Springhill Road or Orange Avenue. A map of the proposed alternatives was distributed to the Committee. The intended purpose of the proposed realignment was to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that flowed into the Chain-of-Lakes, to provide easier, more direct access to Innovation Park and to provide additional economic development potential to the adjacent areas.

Mr. Shepherd further stated staff was working to finalize its recommendations regarding the alternatives to be advanced to the next phase, the Expanded Project Development and Environment (EPD&E) Study. The goal of staff was to reduce the number of alternatives to three or four for the EPD&E Study. Additionally, staff would present their recommendations to the IA at the September 19, 2005 meeting for review and approval.

Michael Wright asked which alternatives were staff eliminating. Mr. Shepherd stated that segment 4A (alternatives 6-9) and alternative 10 would most likely be eliminated. Mr. Davis stated staff had met with the Forestry Department regarding several parcels of land in the area they were agreeable to "land swaps." Discussions of the map followed including the mentioning of a sinkhole, approximately 10 feet off the current right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Davis further stated the project was controversial in that there were heated opinions and emotions regarding the alignment from the public.

Theresa Heiker asked for clarification on which segment would traverse Black Swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated segment 3A skirted Black Swamp to the west and segments 2A and 2B skirted the swamp to the east. Ms. Heiker asked if the impact of those alternatives on segment 4 design of Capital Cascades Trail had been considered. Mr. Shepherd stated not at that time however, it would be reviewed during the PD&E study.

Ms. Heiker commented that segments 3A and 3B appeared to pass through a mobile home park. Mr. Davis clarified that staff recommendation to eliminate segment 4A was, in part, due to Jackson Bluff development, Innovation Park and FSU intramural fields. He pointed out several viable alternatives on the map and stated the consultant performing the PD&E would be given a sector to work within and allowed to offer their expert opinion on which would be the best connector between (hypothetical) points A and B. Furthermore, Mr. Davis reminded the committee that staff intent was to narrow the study from a \$5 million PD&E with ten alternatives to a \$2 million PD&E with only a few alternatives. He continued by stating the current alignment was the most favorable amongst residents also, the Lake Bradford area residents prefer alternative 10. However, it would be incredibly expensive and a detriment to the environment by the impacts upon endangered species of fauna and flora.

When asked if there was further comment regarding the corridor study for Capital Circle SW there was no response from the committee.

Item #3 – Leveraging Update

Phil Maher stated Blueprint 2000 has entered into a contract to acquire the Copeland Sink parcel (168 acres). The contract was for \$1,400,000 with \$660,000 coming from the Florida Communities Trust (FCT). The title to the property will be in the name of Leon County. Blueprint has also entered into an option contract for a conservation easement on 132 acres adjacent to Copeland Sink. The value would be determined upon completion of the appraisal process; it was estimated to be between \$200,000 and \$300,000. The Northwest Florida Water Management District would be responsible for 50% of the purchase price through the existing Agreement with Blueprint 2000.

Additionally Blueprint has submitted applications to FCT for grants for the Booth Property Phase II, which consisted of 160.5 acres in the Headwaters of the St. Marks River. The estimated total cost was \$1.4 million with a 60% share requested from FCT. Also Capital Cascade Segment 4, which consisted of four parcels totaling 24.8 acres. The estimated total cost was \$1,935,000 with a 50% match requested from FCT. John Buss asked which would have priority over the other. Mr. Maher explained the system

was based on points and if the applications were tied he was sure one would take precedence. Mr. Davis stated that was a good question; the Booth property would give Blueprint control of approximately 750 contiguous acres. It would be difficult to determine priority, Mr. Davis stated, both would require extensive review.

Theresa Heiker asked for clarification regarding cost; was it to secure the property only or to acquire. Mr. Davis stated it was only to acquire the property. David Bright stated the FCT grant would only fund the cost of the land, surveys, environmental, etc it does not allow funding to secure the property. There were other grants that could be applied for immediately thereafter to fund the amenities that were proposed in the FCT grant. Ms. Heiker and Tony Parks stated there had been complaints filed with the County regarding persons accessing the property for hunting and for dumping garbage. Mr. Davis stated that was one reason the owner of Copeland Sink was willing to let it go and that it would continue to be a problem.

Mr. Parks asked for clarification regarding "grant amenities." Mr. Bright stated with FCT grants proposed amenities earned extra points toward the overall score. After discussion with Craig Diamond and Steve Hodges, staff included passive amenities such as trails, boardwalks, a frisbee field or tetherball court, or a dog park. Staff would like to implement those types of amenities at some point in the future but there was currently no timetable for implementation. As for maintenance, Mr. Bright continued, that issue has been discussed from the beginning with the County Administrator and City Manager but it had yet to be resolved. Mr. Davis stated there was no funding for maintenance in the Blueprint budget merely capital funding for the projects themselves. He agreed that maintenance would be a major concern for everyone involved. Blueprint staff tried to be sensitive to that with each design, to minimize it as much as possible.

Mr. Davis, returning the conversation to the leveraging update stated there was approximately \$11 million in the House Reauthorization Act (federal legislature). Congressman Allan Boyd thought Blueprint would receive approximately half but, according to the latest word from the hill, it could be "most" rather than half. John Buss asked what it was earmarked for. Mr. Davis stated it was for Capital Circle NW, granted CCNW was fully funded by Blueprint dollars but that would allow staff to take that money out and divert it to other projects. Mr. Davis further stated there was approximately \$12.5 million in the house bill (state legislature), based upon a \$26.5 million request by both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County, as the number one transportation for both.

Mr. Davis stated the commitment from FDOT Secretary Abreu to assist with excess ROW cost on CCNW, pending additional federal funding that seemed likely, was still on the table. Additionally, District Secretary Ed Prescott designated CCNW from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue as the number one priority for additional funding for the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS); he has requested \$36 million from FDOT for SIS. Blueprint was significantly shortchanged on the first SIS allocation and have expressed that to many agencies.

Due to timing Blueprint borrowed \$22.5 million on a complete basis when the SIS funding was reviewed, the CCNW project appeared to be fully funded, although by a loan, it did not count in their analysis. Several elected and appointed officials are working to rectify that.

III. Presentations/Discussions

Item #4 – Approval to Award Contract for the Design of Capital Circle SE Woodville Highway to Tram Road

Doug Martin stated that Dyer, Riddle, Mills & Precourt, Inc (DRMP) was the consultant selected for the design of CCSE.

Jim Davis stated there was funding for design but, at that time, no funding for ROW or construction. He explained that particular project was utilizing a “funds follows production” strategy approved by FDOT and the IA. Staff was positioning the project to be fully designed and ready to begin ROW acquisition or, better yet, construction, in attempt to compete for FDOT funding.

Mr. Davis segued into Item #5 in his explanation of the funding possibility.

Item #5 – Design of Capital Circle from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway

Jim Davis stated the IA originally approved both segments, Tram Road to Woodville Highway and Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway. After review staff elected to position one segment, Tram to Woodville, the afore mentioned strategy; realizing there was the possibility of Southwood providing funding or for donated ROW.

Mr. Davis continued by stating recently Governor Bush proposed an optional \$0.04 sales tax counties across the state could impose without public approval. That has the potential to generate \$9.5 billion over the next ten years. Based upon that additional **potential** influx of revenue for the state but not knowing how it would be distributed or allocated, staff has evaluated the position of only completing Woodville to Tram segment and ask for permission to award a design contract for the Woodville to Crawfordville segment. That would put the projects in the position to compete for the **potential** funding. Staff would like to select the second ranked consultant from the competitive selective process that was just completed for the Woodville to Tram segment. The second ranked firm in that process was URS. The president has been done before, with the attorney selection. Blueprint did a competitive selective process for attorneys and hired the top-ranking firm; the NPO hired the second ranking firm. Michael Wright asked if would meet CCNA statutes. Mr. Davis replied he thought it would but would verify that it actually did.

Discussion followed the optional four-cent sales tax. Mr. Davis clarified that Blueprint was not assuming Leon County would incorporate the additional tax but other counties would thereby generating excess money in the system. DOT could potentially have additional funding for alternative distribution or allocation. By utilizing the “funds

follow production” strategy and having both segments positioned to more efficiently compete for state funding was a reasonable risk.

Gabe Menendez asked what the estimated cost of both segments would be. Jerry Oshesky stated that together they were approximately \$25 million. Mr. Menendez confirmed that was for construction only. Mr. Oshesky agreed. Mr. Davis further stated in the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway segment there was the possibility of an interim fix. Given the intersection designs at both Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Highway it was feasible to install four-lanes and expand to six in the future. That option, stated Mr. Davis, was save considerable amounts of money.

As a side note Mr. Davis stated there was an initiative underway with the National Forrest to acquire 103-200 acres south of the flea market. The County was also interested in it as a possible relocation site for the fairgrounds.

He further stated staff would appreciate comment from the committee regarding the possibility of this pursuing that strategy. Mr. Menendez asked if the scopes were similar. Mr. Davis replied they were the same. Tony Parks asked to be kept informed of the land acquisition process because any land Blueprint did not acquire the County would be interested in.

Item #6 – Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Typical section approval and extend design south to Orange Avenue

Jim Shepherd introduced Hugh Williams of HW Lochner the consultant conduction the PD&E study for CCNW/SW. Mr. Williams briefly discussed the typical sections for CCNW/SW that were distributed to committee members in the agenda. Michael Wright asked what the design speed was. Mr. Williams stated it was 45 mph. John Buss asked what circumstances the optional median treatment would be used. If the option were incorporated it would be a depressed swale with trees. Mr. Buss also asked if it would alternate between 22 and 36 feet in the median. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Davis stated that 36 feet was the standard and was used for CCSE. Theresa Heiker asked if Mr. Williams thought treatment could truly be accomplished in the medians. Mr. Williams stated it would not be the primary source of treatment but they would try for some in the more elevated sections. Mr. Davis stated it was not a lot of water but reminded the committee that every little bit helped.

Jim Shepherd stated the PD&E study covered the area south of Tennessee Street to south of Orange Avenue. In addition to the study Lochner would be designing approximately 60% plans, ROW maps and submit all the necessary permits for south of Tennessee Street to south of Blountstown Highway. He further stated that staff understanding of the IA’s direction form the 1/31/05 meeting was “to get to Orange Avenue as soon as possible.” That approach, he explained, would save both time and money as compared to advertising, selecting and bringing another consulting firm up-to-speed. Mr. Shepherd further stated staff intended to request the IA authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and supplement the existing contract with Lochner to prepare construction documents as explained above. However, because a final

decision had not been made regarding CCSW the work effort would be limited to necessary tasks only to meet the assigned schedule.

Jim Davis reminded the committee of the deal struck with the Federal Highway Administration. They mandated the PD&E be completed from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue, staff wanted to end the PD&E at Blountstown Highway because of the four way alternative. The agreed upon compromise was to complete the full PD&E but phase construct and end at Blountstown Highway. Mr. Davis stated the amendment was based on instruction from the Board to build to Orange Avenue to not loose the contract. Tony Park stated it was a minimal risk and Mr. Davis agreed.

Gabe Menendez asked in respect to the PD&E if public comment had been received. Mr. Shepherd stated the public meeting would be held in June 2005 but it was his understanding that the typical sections had to be approved by the IA and CRTPA. Mr. Menendez stated the CRTPA had NPO guidelines for the public hearing process. Michael Wright attempted to clarify by stating he thought Mr. Menendez was saying before staff stated the road had to be one way it should go through the public hearing process first. Mr. Shepherd stated he would follow up on that. Mr. Menendez stated if the process was not carefully followed the eligibility for federal funding could be lost. Mr. Davis stated staff would return to FDOT for guidance.

Theresa Heiker stated there was not a line item in the Master Plan for segment 2A for stormwater. She asked if that segment was not intended to have enhanced stormwater. It had been identified as a separate line item because it directly affected the Capital Cascades segment 4. She stated enhanced stormwater was critical to that constructions process. Mr. Davis stated that Lochner's contract indicated they were reviewing those potentials for enhanced stormwater. The \$11 million for stormwater and \$3.5 million for greenways were taken from that segment, by the IA, to fund construction of Highway 20 to Orange Avenue. Ms. Heiker stated the enhanced stormwater was listed as a line item for Blountstown Highway to Tennessee Street. Mr. Maher reminded Ms. Heiker the IA's direction was to move the money to construct the road, if any remained it was to return to the Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway segment. The funding for enhanced stormwater returned in the outer years on the Master Plan.

Ms. Heiker felt the IA did not understand that Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway was not as sensitive as Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue. Michael Wright stated, and John Buss agreed, the Board knew exactly what they were doing when that decision was made. Mr. Davis reminded Ms. Heiker the money shown in the outer years, beyond 2010, of the Master Plan was virtually "pie in the sky" figures. Ms. Heiker explained that was why she was concerned. She understood the funding associated with segment 2A was "hard money," finding out it was not she wanted to stress it was a known condition. Mr. Davis asked to table the conversation until Item #8's discussion on the Master Plan. There were no objections by the board.

Mr. Davis stated staff would verify the CRTPA and NPO guidelines for the public hearing process before moving forward to the next phase. John Kraynak stated he

understood from recent meetings regarding Gumm Swamp the goal was to reduce the footprint of the corridor. The typical sections presented to the committee were not consistent with that goal in his opinion. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Kraynak recommended the 10 foot meandering path, consistent with Blueprint design, be reduced to a 5 or 6 foot sidewalk. Mr. Kraynak responded if the sidewalk had to be included it should be reduced to at least those numbers. Mr. Davis clarified that was through Gumm Swamp only. Mr. Kraynak agreed. Mr. Menendez asked if there would be any side street access near Gumm Swamp. Ms. Heiker stated there was access at Gumm Road and Swamp Fox Road. Mr. Menendez stated it might be possible to reduce or eliminate the median, open it up at those two locations. Hugh Williams stated that would be possible with a long bridge but if a short bridge were installed there would not be enough room for the transition. Ms. Heiker did not want to see the access point at Swamp Fox Road eliminated. Mr. Davis and Mr. Shepherd briefly discussed the possibility of a service road through that segment but Mr. Shepherd stated he preferred to meet with committee members individually to discuss that option, as he did not have sufficient material with him at that time. Mr. Davis concluded with a summary of items staff would examine more closely.

Item #7 – Capital Cascade Trail Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design

David Bright stated the sub-committee had met to review technical reports 1 through 3 and while considerable progress had been made it was not yet ready for an IA vote. Staff hoped to have respond to all comments within the next 45 days and to have reissued the appropriate sections of the technical reports for the sub-committee to review again. The draft scope of services should be reviewed by the TCC by either the July or September 2005 meeting for the recommendations to move forward to the IA in September 2005. Mr. Bright also thanked the City and County Stormwater staff for the many hours of review.

Michael Wright asked if item(s) appeared to be a “deal killer.” Mr. Bright stated there were many outstanding issues mainly related to staging and velocity as well as permitting and pond sizes but it did not appear there were any issues that could not be resolved. Mark Llewellyn stated there had been significant effort put forth since the January 31, 2005 IA meeting. He agreed with Mr. Bright’s assessment regarding several issues that remain unsolved however there were no “deal killers” he could identify.

John Buss segued into Item #8 by reiterating concerns he had shared in the past. He felt the IA had “jumped the gun,” by adopting concepts, related to segment three before the TCC could come to closure on it. As a result he was not sure the Board heard people say that was not necessarily consistent with the original plan. Mr. Buss further stated he felt those issues became more germane in the context of budget however, in reviewing the Master Plan, he became confused. The cost estimates of the third (technical) report were substantially different from the Master Plan. Mr. Davis explained for the sake of consistency the numbers indicated in the Master Plan were based on the concept reports completed by Blueprint GEC staff, furthermore, the Master Plan was not updated with each new or changed concept. He further clarified he felt the Board gave a tacit approval of the concept for segment three but emphasized there was **not** an **approved** concept for

any segment of Capital Cascades Trail. Up to that point staff was working from multiple, contradictory directions and no longer knew how to proceed. The Board provided the necessary instruction staff needed to advance in the right direction. He further stated each concept would be presented to the Board in the future, either collectively or, probably, individually for approval. Based upon that the numbers could change.

Mr. Buss stated he felt the same way but did not want to “blindside” anyone. In his opinion, if the enhanced plan could be implemented for \$8.9 million more on a \$110 million project he felt it should at least be considered. Mr. Davis stated it was a \$180 million project. Mr. Buss stated it was with the numbers from the Master Plan but using Genesis’ numbers it was not. That was the question, what does the project cost? Mr. Davis stated when the project was narrowed to the approved concept staff would know better what the actual cost would be. Mr. Buss stated the project was estimated at \$90.5 million in 1995, adjusting those numbers for inflation, Mark Llewellyn’s project estimates were on budget. Mr. Davis stated he certainly hoped Mr. Buss and Mr. Llewellyn were correct. Mr. Buss stated he was certain the cost would increase but **strongly** felt concept B (or enhancements to concept A) should be considered for segment three for the reasons outlined in the comments regarding urban renewal, etc. Additionally, Mr. Buss’ comments regarding cost, in the report, were based on Mr. Llewellyn’s estimates. On behalf of those who may not have remembered, Mr. Davis clarified segment three was Monroe Street to Alberta Creek.

Mr. Menendez asked about Franklin Boulevard. David Bright reminded him that Franklin Boulevard, segment one, would be the last of the four segments to be completed. Mr. Davis reminded the committee of the sequence of construction, 2,4,3,1. Mr. Menendez questioned the \$15 million that was included in the Master Plan. Mr. Davis explained again, the sequence of construction and funding. He reminded the committee there was initially no funding allocated for water quality in segment four yet that was where most of the water quality for Capital Cascades Trail occurred. The Board instructed him to build segment four but there was no additional funding. That required moving segment four construction from tier 2 to tier 1 and a super-majority vote. In his opinion, because there was so much controversy regarding segment one, Franklin Boulevard the Board instructed Blueprint staff to reallocate the money from segment one construction to segment four, which would have left segment one un-funded. The SIB loans significantly reduced the amount of interest Blueprint was paying on the debt service thereby freeing up money for projects. When the Master Plan was organized it needed to be placed somewhere, it was not available until the out years, but staff arbitrarily put it in segment one. That was not consistent with the instruction of the Board but they did not know that money would become available. Of course, would have to be approved by them; thank again, they could direct Blueprint to use the money for Capital Circle.

Mr. Davis stated discussions with Leon County School Board (LCSB), regarding Leon High School (LHS) had begun and were going very well. It appeared very promising for stormwater treatment and attenuation at LHS. Details were not available at that time however Superintendent Montford was receptive to sacrificing some dirt to keep the remainder of the property high and dry as well as possibly moving the parking lot slightly

north of the current location and including a holding pond at the current parking lot site. John Buss asked if an engineer was involved with those discussions because in his opinion that did not sound permissible. Mr. Davis stated he did and by excavating the existing parking lot to capture and store the stormwater it would by default keep the other areas from flooding as much as they current do.

Displaying a map of segment two Jim Davis continued on with the Capital Cascades Trail discussion noting some differences from the earlier concept designs such as a plaza versus an amphitheater. He also pointed out, with Genesis latest work, the potential for an eight-foot fall to replicate the original cascades as well as five to eight-foot retaining walls, which allowed for the "flat" plaza area. Theresa Heiker and John Buss promptly voiced objections and concerns. Mr. Davis stated those were some of the on going amenities staff was reviewing that needed to be resolved.

John Buss stated that while not faulting at all, an extremely important part of any good preliminary engineering report should be able to go to the design contract and they know where everything was. Costs were important and if the numbers were not correct or some were omitted that need to be corrected, caught up or coordinated. It was difficult for committee members to comment on certain things...but they would get there. Mr. Davis stated he would not change the Master Plan numbers until such point in time as the concepts of Mr. Llewellyn's project were approved. Mr. Buss stated that was problematic because if the numbers used in planning did not match the engineering it caused him to question the other projects as well. Mr. Davis stated the most accurate numbers would certainly be the ones reflected in the Master Plan but until they were approved (finalized) the Master Plan would not change because he did not want to underestimated the cost of the project. Mr. Buss reiterated that with technical report #3 the project should be able to go to design and if staff did not know what the project cost was at that point there were problems.

Item #8 - Blueprint 2000 Master Plan and Capital Budget

Phil Maher reminded the committee of the Board's comments and recommended direction staff received at the January 31, 2005 IA meeting. He stated staff, over the past few months, had incorporated many of the comments into the Master Plan and in some places were able to exceed the Board's requests. The water quality and sensitive lands line items were not changed in the Master Plan however, the Land Bank was reduced approximately \$600,000. Mr. Wright asked if the Land Bank money was ROW money. Jim Davis stated it was for whatever was needed, for example, it allowed for the purchase of properties that were not budgeted or did not have ROW money.

Mr. Maher stated that Capital Circle I-10 to Highway 90 was fully funded. The Board recommended the allocations for greenways and stormwater be moved to the Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue segment. Due to Blueprint generating additional dollars staff was able to leave the greenways in that particular segment but it was moved out to 2015. The Highway 90 to Blountstown Highway segment remained the same with the exception of, again, the greenways and stormwater being moved

further out. By doing that staff was able to incorporate the segment from Orange Avenue to Blountstown Highway. As Ms. Heiker pointed out there was not enhanced stormwater for that particular section. The CCSE segment Connie Drive to Tram Road remained the same.

The Board agreed with the philosophy of “dollars follow production” therefore staff was able to maintain the CCSE Woodville Highway to Tram Road segment. In the 1998 land donation by Southwood to the State of Florida 150 feet of ROW was included from Tram Road to Woodville Highway. Mr. Maher further stated there was nothing prepared at that time for the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway segment however the costs would be similar to the Woodville Highway to Tram Road segment. Mr. Davis stated there was the potential for reallocation of funds; for example, currently staff had \$53 million allocated for ROW along CCNW. FDOT had recently stated they felt comfortable that \$45 million would be the final figure. If that became reality the remainder of those funds could be reallocated to the design of Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway. Mr. Maher continued with Springhill Road to Orange Avenue segment; staff retained the funding for the PD&E study. It was scheduled for design and ROW beginning in 2015. Mr. Maher also reminded the committee that projects funded outside of 2010 would change. Regarding Capital Cascades Trail Mr. Maher stated staff followed the sequencing outlined by the Board of 2,4,3 and 1 including as much corrective action, up to \$5 million, on Franklin Boulevard.

John Buss asked how staff estimated program management because it did not seem to be a constant percentage. Jerry Oshesky stated the constant of 3 to 5% based on the actual time worked. Mr. Buss offered for example, segment one of Capital Cascades Trail, \$330,000 in program management for \$840,000 of engineering was extremely high, not 5%. Mr. Oshesky stated that construction money was moved around but did not go back...he continued that it would be reviewed.

Mr. Davis asked John Buss and Theresa Heiker if they had reviewed the cash flow for the City and County's, respectively, water quality and were they still valid. Mr. Buss stated no, but now that Frenchtown had been broken free some of the funding that was intended for that area could probably be reallocated. He would review it for a more current estimate. Mr. Davis stated if he could that would help staff polish up the Master Plan. Mr. Buss asked what was the next formal action regarding the Master Plan. Mr. Maher stated the capital budget and Master Plan would be presented to the IA for their review and comments at the May 16, 2005 meeting. Any changes they indicated would be incorporated into the fiscal year 2006 capital budget and would return to them for final review in September 2005. Mr. Buss stated he need time to think about the cost implications, he felt uncertain about taking numbers to the IA ... Mr. Maher stated the IA would only appropriate funds for FY 2006. Mr. Davis stated the entire concept behind the Master Plan was to provide an overview of Blueprint. It provided a general timeline of when which projects would be started, completed and what money would be spent where. From a capital budgeting standpoint, as long as the Master Plan spreadsheet was accurate, was look to the literal bottom line each year for the capital budget (for all intensive purposes). Mr. Buss agreed and stated it was similar to the five-year plan

Stormwater utilized. It seemed, in his opinion however, the Board had a tendency toward far reaching decisions based on money shortages. Mr. Maher stated the only major change for FY 2006 was Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue. Mr. Davis, referring to the Master Plan spreadsheet, stated the budget for the next several years was committed to on-going projects therefore there was not much flexibility in those years. Mr. Wright also reminded the committee the budget was subject to change **every** year. Hopefully, Mr. Davis stated, the gross revenue would increase.

Following that segue Mr. Davis asked the committee to consider and offer input on. If Blueprint was successful in leveraging the dollars and generated an additional \$20 million, for example, where would the committee recommend it be allocated? The Chairman and the Board originally raised that hypothetical. Mr. Buss stated that was precisely why accurate numbers in the Master Plan were so important because that was the information staff was asking them to base their decision on. He further stated, as soon as possible, he would like to see the “real numbers” of the Capital Cascades Trail project.

Item#9 – Discuss and coordinate other related City and County projects

Mr. Davis reminded everyone that one of the major reasons the TCC was formed was for discussion and coordination of other related City and County projects and asked for a brief roundtable discussion of each member’s ongoing or upcoming projects. Mr. Buss stated that City Stormwater was reviewing a project that would address localized flooding problems near Gasden Street and Georgia Street. He further stated there was not much area to work and did not know where a pond might eventually be located. Also localized flooding below Lafayette Park near the storm sewer. It was their hope that those projects would assist with the flooding along Franklin Boulevard.

John Kraynak mentioned the possibility of his office relocating to the Renaissance Center which would make them closer to City Growth Management and Planning and that the County had purchased one floor of the building.

Tony Park stated they had begun construction on Orange Avenue between Blairstone Road and Capital Circle SE. Mr. Wright asked what the County was going to do at Lafayette? Mr. Parks stated there was no longer a Lafayette project. Mr. Davis what was the forecast for four-lanes on Orange Avenue to CCSW. Mr. Park stated it was not in the program. Mr. Davis stated that issue had arisen several times in the discussions of CCSW realignment possibilities. Mr. Wright stated if the realignment came out near the golf course there might be an impetus to build a connecting piece but he felt many of those present would be retired before that was completed.

Gabe Menendez stated that Gaines Street continued to progress and Public Works had several items that were to be presented at the following City Commission meeting. He further stated he would bring the City’s preferred concept for design back. Mr. Wright added there was an additional 15 acres of land that the City was intending to purchase.

Theresa Heiker stated the design for Capital Cascades Trail “segment five – Lake Henrietta Trail was nearing completion and should be open soon. Mr. Davis asked if that was done in conjunction with TPO or did the County do it unilaterally? Ms. Heiker stated it was a unilateral project. She also asked about an “un-know lock” on the gate at Sprinil Road; possibly belonging to the City, as it was similar in appearance to other City locks she had seen about town. Mr. Wright suggested it might belong to the Electric Department. Ms. Heiker stated the County needed to know because they have had problems with ATV’s at that site.

Mark Llewellyn reminded the committee that representatives from CSX would be in Tallahassee in the near future to walk the project (Capital Cascades Trail). Mr. Wright and Mr. Davis asked him to coordinate that meeting carefully due to other arrangements made at recent meetings between CSX, City of Tallahassee, Leon County, FAMU, etc. Mr. Wright suggested they discuss it in more detail after the TCC meeting.

Wayne Tedder stated the County was submitting several FCT grants the following week.

Jim Davis reminded everyone of the CCSE groundbreaking on May 3, 2005.

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business Jim Davis adjourned the meeting at 3:37 pm.