

**TALLAHASSEE-LEON COUNTY  
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY**

**Meeting Minutes  
May 16, 2005, 2:00 PM  
City Commission Chambers**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**County**

Commissioner Ed DePuy  
Commissioner Tony Grippa  
Commissioner Bob Rackleff  
Commissioner Jane Sauls  
Commissioner Cliff Thaell, Vice-Chair  
Commissioner Dan Winchester

**City**

Commissioner Allan Katz  
Commissioner Debbie Lightsey  
Commissioner Mark Mustian, Chair

**CITY/ COUNTY STAFF**

Parwez Alam, County Administrator  
David Bright, Blueprint 2000  
Jim Davis, Director, Blueprint 2000  
Shelonda Gay, Blueprint 2000  
Anita Favors-Thompson, City Manager  
Theresa Heiker, County Public Works  
Vince Long, Asst. County Administrator  
Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000  
Gabe Menendez, COT Public Works  
Angela Richardson, Blueprint 2000

Dan Rigo, County Attorney's Office  
Debra Schiro, City Attorney's Office  
Wayne Tedder, TLCPD  
Patrick Twyman, City of Tallahassee  
Karla Weaver, Blueprint 2000  
Bill Woolery, City Engineering  
Michael Wright, Asst. City Manager

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Jeff Burlaw, Tallahassee Democrat  
Wayne Chalifoux, DRMP  
Jack Diestelhorst, Capital Cascade Council  
Donald Downey  
Paco de la Fuente  
Holly Elliot, Seminole Manor Resident  
R. Patrick Elliot, Seminole Manor Resident  
Mark Fletcher  
John Forney, Raymond James  
Michael Kasha  
Jack Kostrzewa, CRTPA  
Bryant King, DRMP

Mark Llewellyn, Genesis Group\*  
Gerald Losey, Gateway Advisory Comm.  
Doug Martin, The LPA Group\*  
Chris Merritt, PBS&J  
Bill Norwood  
Jerry Oshesky, The LPA Group\*  
Bill Peebles  
Bonnie Pfunter, The LPA Group\*  
Jim Shepherd, The LPA Group\*  
Del Suggs

\* Indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

Chairman Mark Mustian called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

**I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**

Mr. Davis stated that there were two agenda modifications that were provided to the Board for clarification:

- Items 8 and 9: Infrastructure Funding - References to \$9.5 B in funding

He stated that the agenda items reference a potential revenue source of \$9.5 billion dollars having to do with funding State infrastructure needs. This funding was not approved by the Florida Legislature. He further stated that Senate Bill 360 is being investigated now as a potential revenue source as it does include some funding through a Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP).

He further stated that an additional item was added to the agenda, which was requested by Commissioner Grippa.

- Approval for Additional Median Opening for Capital Circle Southeast at Midyette Road

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

1. Authorize the staff to proceed with the proposed median access change to Capital Circle Southeast contract.

**Commissioner Grippa moved to remove Items 7, 8, & 9 from the consent agenda to be voted on by the Board since they are contract items.**

**II. INFORMATION ITEMS**

The following items were presented to the Board for information only, therefore no action was requested. The Board did not discuss the items. For further information on these items, please refer to the agenda items which are available at the Blueprint 2000 offices.

1. **Headwaters of the St. Marks: Property Acquisitions**
2. **Florida Communities Trust Applications**
3. **Capital Circle SW Corridor Study Update**
4. **“Golden Web Award” for Blueprint2000.org Website**
5. **Capital Cascade Trail Update**

**III. CONSENT**

6. **IA Meeting Minutes: January 31, 2005**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve Minutes as presented

Commissioner Katz moved approval of item the consent agenda as modified. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. **Initiation of the Bond Documents for an Early FY 2006 Bond Sale**

Phil Maher presented the item to the Board. He stated that based on cash flow pro forma prepared by the financial advisor that the program would need to sell \$25M in bonds in fiscal year 2006 and that he was requesting approval to begin preparing the bond resolution for Board approval at their September 19, 2005, meeting.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

Authorize Blueprint 2000 to begin the process of preparing the bond resolution and Raymond James being named as the senior firm on a negotiated sale.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he had two concerns regarding this agenda item. The first is that the item should not be on the consent agenda. The second is that there is not a minority bond firm as a part of this proposed sale.

**Commissioner Grippa moved approval of the item, however he requested that staff bring a back minority bond underwriter for the Board to review when the item is presented to the Board for approval, if time permits.** The motion was seconded.

Mr. Davis stated that for clarification, a certified MBE firm must be located within the four (4) county area, and that he was not aware of any minority bond underwriters in the area. Commissioner Grippa moved to waive the requirement that the firm be within the four (4) county area and that a minority vendor be added to the list of firms submitted for approval.

Commissioner Rackleff asked why staff was waiting until 2006 to issue the bonds with interest rates on the rise. Mr. Davis stated that the money would not be needed until 2006, therefore staff did not want to borrow the money until it was needed. Mr. Maher stated that the resolution would be brought back before the Board in September, however the actual time of the sale would be based on the recommendation of the finance committee as to when funds would be required. Commissioner Rackleff asked if there was such a thing as a commitment letter that would lock in the interest rate for the bond sale.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that City Treasurer Clerk Gary Herndon is currently working to find qualified minority MBE investment firms for use by the City.

Mr. Davis stated that staff would bring back a full package to the Board in September regarding this issue.

The motion carried 8-0. Commissioner Mustian stated that he would abstain from voting on this issue since his firm represents bond underwriters.

**8. Approval to Award Contract for Design of Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Tram Road**

Mr. Doug Martin, project manager, stated that staff has completed the process for selecting the firm to complete the design of Capital Circle SE, Woodville to Tram. An outline of the process is included in the agenda item. DRMP is the selected consultant.

Commissioner Grippa stated again that large contract awards should not be on the consent agenda. He asked who selected the firm. Commissioner Grippa further asked if there was already an engineering firm working as a general engineer for the Blueprint program and what their role was. Mr. Davis stated that the selection committee consisted of a representative from both the City and the County staff, a representative from the general engineering firm, Mr.

Martin, and it was chaired by Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000 Capital Program and Finance Manager. Mr. Davis further stated that the city representative had to drop out. Mr. Davis stated that the selection of consultants for each project is made on a case-by-case basis through an RFP and competitive award. Mr. Davis mentioned that the Blueprint 2000 General Engineering Consultant (GEC) is authorized to do small projects that are less than \$50,000. He stated that since this was a new contract and above \$50,000 staff brought this contract to the Board for approval. He stated that the Board delegated authority to the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) to negotiate the contract and implement change orders. Commissioner Grippa asked why the GEC was not handling this project. Mr. Davis stated that the GEC team only does project management. He stated that the membership of each selection committee changes for each project. He further stated that he GEC could do the design on this project, however it would be a conflict of interest and they were prohibited from bidding on projects that they manage. Commissioner Grippa asked if staff could provide him with further information on how the Blueprint 2000 bid process works in relation to the GEC and the protocols that are followed.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

1. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award a contract with the number one ranked firm, DRMP, Inc.
2. Appropriate \$1,306,142 (\$859,739 of this amount was appropriated in the 2005 Capital Budget. Remaining \$446,403 required) for the design.

**Commissioner Lightsey moved staff recommendation.** The motion was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

**9. Design Services for Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road**

Mr. Davis stated that at the January 31, 2005 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting the board reaffirmed the decision to pursue the leveraging strategy of “money follows production”. He stated that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) strategy is to fund projects that are ready for construction. He reviewed the information that was provided in the agenda item. He further stated that if Senate Bill 360 were signed then it would be prudent to have the design complete and ready to compete for funding.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

1. Initiate the RFP process for selection of a consultant to design the Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road. The TCC will not be requested to review the Scope of Services since it is identical to the previously reviewed Scope used for the Tram to Woodville segment.
2. The design be consistent with the Multimodal Design Guidelines and the design established for Capital Circle Southeast, from Connie Drive to Tram Road and Tram Road to Woodville Highway, and consistent with the completed PD&E Studies.

3. Authorize a budget of \$1,360,000 plus a ten percent contingency (\$136,000). Funding would be diverted from the Right of Way budget for Capital Circle Northwest (I-10 to US 90) to fund the design.
4. That the Intergovernmental Management Committee be authorized to negotiate and award a contract to the selected firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.

**Commissioner Thael moved approval of the staff recommendation.** Commissioner Winchester seconded the motion. Commissioner Thael stated that the scope of services for the design of CCSE, Tram to Woodville was very similar to this segment of the road. He asked why the same firm was not being used to do both jobs. Mr. Davis stated that although the segments were similar they each required certain things that would have to be done on an individual basis, such as surveys, research and design. He stated that they each required about the same amount of man-hours to design regardless of the similarities. He further mentioned that he believed that it was the Board's desire to use as many local firms as possible.

Commissioner Winchester asked staff to provide a copy of the design consultant's cost breakdown for the design of this segment in comparison to the cost of CCSE, Tram to Woodville. Mr. Davis stated that as a part of the bid for the design the firms would provide this and he would pass it along to the Board. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IV. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS**

##### **10. Election of a Vice Chairperson**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

That the Agency conduct an election for a Vice Chairperson in accordance with the approved By-Laws.

**Commissioner Katz nominated Commissioner Mustian for the position of Vice Chairman.** Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

##### **11. Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Typical Section Guidance Regarding Policy Issues**

Mr. Jim Shepherd, project manager, provided the Board with an overview of the roadway drawings of proposed typical roadway sections that were a part of the agenda item and that are a part of the official record. He stated that the various proposed sections changed based on the area of the roadway, such as roadways, through Gum Swamp and bridges over railroads and bridges over the swamp, etc. He stated that he was working with the appropriate staff to develop the proposed options for the typical sections and the crossing of sensitive areas.

He further stated that there were two preliminary frontage road concepts for Capital Circle SW between Orange Avenue and Blountstown Highway. These frontage roads will concentrate the turning movements on Capital Circle by eliminating numerous driveways and median openings.

Mr. Shepherd stated that these concepts would be presented to the public at a public meeting that was tentatively scheduled for June 30, 2005.

Commissioner Grippa asked what the zoning of the property was for this area of the road. Mr. Davis stated that to the best of his knowledge this was a commercial area. Commissioner Grippa asked if there would be dense residential community development along this road in the near future. Mr. Davis stated that there was currently a plan for townhomes in the area. Commissioner Grippa stated that he did not understand why this area of the roadway needed to be so wide since this area would mainly be residential. He further stated that the width of Blair Stone Road would be more suitable for this area since it is more pedestrian oriented.

Commissioner DePuy asked if the purpose of the proposed frontage roads was to cut down on the number of cuts in the roadway. Mr. Davis stated that the proposal was for a six-lane road keeping in mind the Board directive to get to the airport as fast as possible. He further stated that the frontage roads would be much safer because the vehicles entering and leaving businesses and residences would be using the frontage roads and it would reduce the friction on the roadway. Commissioner DePuy stated that since that was the justification for the frontage road that it would make more sense to have the bike lanes and pedestrian on the frontage roads. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff recommendation was alternative "B" which does have the sidewalk on the outside of the frontage road rather than between the frontage road and Capital Circle.

Commissioner Rackleff asked if there would be other sections of Capital Circle that would have frontage roads. Mr. Shepherd stated that one other area under consideration for frontage roads is the segment between Crawfordville Highway and Woodville Highway where there are businesses along the north side of the roadway. Commissioner Rackleff asked what the alternative to frontage roads. Commissioner Winchester stated that the purpose of the frontage roads is for access management and safer internal circulation. Mr. Shepherd stated that with the 230' wide of the roadway, the frontage road also allows more flexibility for future transit corridors, such as bus stops. Commissioner Rackleff stated that he agrees that these roads could be used for internal circulation if during permitting the new developments were required to construct roadways on the eastern side of the developments for internal circulation and interconnectivity. He further stated that he would not like to see this roadway turn into another Thomasville Road because of the traffic problems that it experiences. He mentioned that the applications for permits on Highway 20 are for dense residential developments.

**It is the recommendation that Option 1 be approved.**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

1. Approve the proposed typical section subject to validation in September after public comment.
2. Provide a six-foot straight sidewalk and a ten-foot meandering sidewalk, where appropriate.
3. Provide a four-foot bicycle lane along the outside of both the northbound and southbound roadways (consistent with Policy 1.8.1 of the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan and the Draft CRTPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan).
4. Present the proposed typical sections to the public for review and comment at the Alternatives Public Meeting.
5. Continue using the proposed typical sections for design until the September IA meeting.

**Commissioner Thael moved Option 1 with the requirement that staff bring back more detail on sidewalks being on the outside of the frontage roads as shown in alternative “B”.** Commissioner DePuy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Winchester asked at what point the Board would review the impact analysis for the Lake Bradford chain of lakes and the neighborhoods that would be impacted. Mr. Shepherd stated that the roadway alternatives public meeting would be held on June 30, 2005. He stated that at that meeting staff would present the left, right and center alignment concepts, the combination alignments, the typical sections and an analysis matrix that will detail the impacts. Mr. Davis pointed out that the segment being reviewed ends at Orange Avenue. He stated that when the PD&E study was completed it would evaluate the impacts on water quality and the neighborhoods. Mr. Shepherd stated that the impact analysis would be completed by June 30 and that staff would provide the Board a copy at the next IA meeting. Mr. Shepherd stated that the purpose of this item was to get the Board’s comments so that they could be incorporated into the typical section to be presented to the public.

Commissioner Lightsey stated the width of the road would generate stormwater that needs to be stored someplace other than in the lakes. She stated staff should be conscience of the fact that this is a sensitive area and that if the study indicates that the roadway is too wide to accommodate the amount of stormwater then it would have to be narrowed in this area. She stated that staff should not feel that they must have a 230’ width if it can’t be accommodated because of special circumstances along the route.

Commissioner Mustian stated that the original purpose of the median width was to preserve a location for a future transit lane. He stated that with the addition of the frontage road, that it could potentially be the future transit lanes then the medians do not need to be as wide in this area.

Commissioner Lightsey stated there was a meeting regarding the vesting of the Delta Industrial Park. She stated that the issue of whether they are vested against the environmental ordinance is still up in the air; therefore the type of development that they have proposed may not be feasible. She stated that it would be ill advised to construct a frontage road if in fact the development potential and density is limited and does not occur. Mr. Shepherd stated that this was conceptual and that the frontage road did not have to be built on the eastern side if it is not justified.

Commissioner Grippa stated that it is important that the route to the airport is widened as quickly as possible. He stated that there are roads that need to be pedestrian friendly, however this area needs to be a beltway for economic development purposes. He stated that Blair Stone Road is 130’ wide and it is a wonderful road that moves traffic efficiently. He further pointed out that the cost savings for a narrower roadway would insure the funding of other projects. Commissioner Grippa stated that Commissioner DePuy made an excellent point having to do with the sidewalks being placed along the backside of the frontage road.

Commissioner Rackleff asked if there is a separate standard the calculation of stormwater volumes and treatment for sidewalks versus roadways. He stated that the quality of the runoff from roadways was different from that of sidewalks. Mr. Jerry Oshesky stated that both sidewalks and roadways were calculated as impervious areas and that the codes did not create a differentiation. Commissioner Rackleff stated that if there were a differentiation then this would

be a way to reduce the scale of the stormwater facilities. He further pointed out that this would be a road that would be used well into the future and that the aesthetics of the roadway would be very important to attract business, etc. to the area. He mentioned that when the Capital Circle was originally built that the previous commissioners did not foresee the growth of Tallahassee and therefore did not purchase enough right of way to expand the roadway as needed now. Commissioner Rackleff stated that it is very important that this Board get it done right and think of the long-term uses of the roadway.

Commissioner Thaeff stated that the typical section of Blair Stone Road does not include the right of way required for the stormwater facilities and it has different topography as well. He further stated that the concept for the Blueprint program was for a holistic integrated approach that would include stormwater management as an amenity instead of an eyesore. Commissioner Thaeff noted that the agenda item stated that the plan was to minimize the median width to keep fill out of Gum Swamp. He asked why there would be fill in Gum Swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated that was one option, and the median width was to match the width of the typical section. He stated that they were working with the County to determine how the road would be built, whether there would be a bridge over the entire swamp, a short bridge, or several culverts as well other alternatives to keep fill out of Gum Swamp.

The motion carried unanimously.

## **12. Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Extend Design South to Orange Avenue**

Mr. Davis stated that the Board had reviewed this issue as related to the limits of the PD&E study for this segment of Capital Circle. At that time the FHWA stated that in order to receive future federal money on this segment that the PD&E study had to extend south to the intersection of Orange Avenue. The FHWA further stated that they would allow Blueprint to build this segment of the road in phases to compensate for this requirement. At the January 31, 2005 meeting, the Board directed staff to construct the roadway to this intersection as well. Mr. Davis stated that this would require a modification to the contract with H. W. Lochner to complete the 60% design plans, the right-of-way maps and the submission of permits for the segment from SR 20 to Orange Avenue. He stated that there was a risk to this action because the alignment has not been determined south of SR 20. He referred the Board back to agenda item #3, Capital Circle SW Corridor Study Update. He mentioned that staff was working with the public and had developed 10 alternatives for the route of this segment of the road. He stated that the Board is risking approximately \$100,000 in funds since the alignment of this segment has not been determined. He stated that risk is minimal because 2 of the alternative use this alignment. He further stated that alternative 4A was probably not viable because of the current developments proposed in that area (Jackson Bluff townhomes, Delta Industrial Park and FSU's plans for intramural fields). Mr. Davis stated that the reason for bringing this item before the Board for action before the CCSW alignment had been determined was because waiting until after the alternatives were reviewed would cause the Board to wait until the September 2005 meeting. This would add approximately 9 months to the project schedule. If the Board authorizes this action it will allow the IMC to authorize beginning some items in this study south of SR 20.



**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1**

1. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and supplement the existing contract (Contract No. 772) with H.W. Lochner, Inc. to prepare construction documents (approx. 60% design plans, right-of-way maps and submit permits) for Capital Circle from SR 20 (Blountstown Highway) to SR 371 (Orange Avenue). The work effort will be limited to necessary tasks to meet the above schedule, until the IA makes a decision on Capital Circle SW.

The floor was opened to the public for comment.

Mr. Pebbles, resident of the Lake Bradford neighborhood, stated that the problem that he saw was that staff presented alternative studies in one way during the public meeting and another way to the Board. He further stated that the citizens were told that all of the alternatives would be considered and that none would be ruled out or prejudged to be ruled out. He stated that alternative 10 would make the airport a more competitive airport. He stated that the making the decision on this item presupposes an outcome for the alternatives and rule out 2 of the 4 routes. He stated that ruling out alternative 10 would be short sighted because it would have long-term economic development potential.

Mr. Michael Kasha, FSU professor and resident of the Lake Bradford neighborhood, stated that the Sierra Club endorsed a report that he had written in 1988 and that was the origin of Alternative 4A. He stated that he and 20 other scientist and engineers spent 5 years to develop the report. Mr. Kasha stated that Capital Circle was used mainly as a throughway. He further stated that FSU had planned to develop the area and this caused 4A to be eliminated in April. However, due to this development a highway would be needed. He further stated that this brought about alternative 10. Mr. Kasha stated that in the past growth was greatly under estimated as well as the "assault on nature". He stated that the life chain has greater intensity around water bodies. He further stated that the density of wild life is much lower in the forest because it is dryer. He provided an aerial photo of the Lake Bradford chain of lakes. He pointed out that they were completely surrounded by roads and that a car rental business on the edge of Cascade Lake and stated a lot of run off was related to this type of business. At the April meeting, Blueprint presented a version of alternative 10 that was not what was advocated by the citizens who proposed this route. He provided the Board with a revised version with a dashed line bypass road with a northern connection to Capital Circle near I-10 and extending south to Springhill Road. He stated that this route would act as a relative throughway that would not be a hazard to the lake system. He stated that the majority of people traveling I-10 were not going to the airport and that most people on Springhill Road are going home or to work. Mr. Kasha stated that the purpose for the roads should be separated. Following the alternative that he had provided would create a through road that would facilitate growth.

Gerald Losey, resident of the Lake Bradford neighborhood and a member of the following citizen advisory groups: CRTPA Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Blueprint 2000 Capital Circle SW Citizen Advisory Committee and the Airport Gateway Advisory Committee. He stated that as a member of these groups he could see how things were coming together. He stated that he would like to advocate for alternate 10 because it would negate the necessity for 6-lanes of traffic going down the present corridor. He further stated that he felt that the advise

from the citizens on the boards should be taken into consideration, if not then they were a waste of everyone's time and money.

Bill Norwood, resident of the Lake Bradford neighborhood, stated that he feels that the process has not worked well. He stated that he felt that the citizens were being guided to a conclusion rather than reaching one from logical steps. He further stated that there were several examples of this. The first was a result of the first mail out to the residents. He stated that the alignment shown, a straight line, caused a big rift between the neighborhoods. He further stated that during the meeting the residents of the effected neighborhood were told that their homes would be condemned and their properties taken. He further stated that another example was that citizens were told that construction was many years away, however the funding for the construction was currently before the board without an alignment being determined. He stated another example was an article in the newspaper that stated that the roadway would be realigned. However, option 4A was eliminated because of the upcoming developments along the route, which had not even been plated. He stated that he felt that this option was presented as a way of creating a wedge between the neighborhoods and to force the citizens to choose the Orange Avenue alignment. He stated that alternative 10 as presented by the citizens was to go directly west of the airport and hug the airport fence line as close as possible up staying out of the forest and up Silver Lake and Aeon Church Road. That would lessen the impact on the forest, using Springhill for the first 3 miles turning and following Silver Lake or Dog lake Tower Road. He stated that the first drawing of the road did cut through the middle of the forest to which the National Forest objected. He stated that the impact is minimal in this alternative. He asked the Board to note where the Delta Office Park and the proposed townhome developments were located. He stated that the proposed site is within the wetlands. Mr. Norwood stated that using the current alignment the roadway would encroach into one of the lakes. He further stated that there were other residential neighborhoods that would be impacted by the alignment.

Mr. Mark Fletcher, resident of the Lake Bradford community, stated that one of his concerns was that agenda item #11, Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Typical Section Guidance Regarding Policy Issues, was separated from item #12, Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Extend Design South to Orange Avenue. He further stated that pervious pavement could be used beneficially to the project. He further stated that Mr. Davis' decision to eliminate option 4A had to do with future development instead of the existing development. He stated that the area's natural features are assets to the community and that they will increase in value. He further stated that with the consideration of the current oil situation there would only be a need for 2-lanes to the airport in the future. He further stated that the primary contamination was from the roadways and that larger holding ponds would not replace the natural features.

Mr. Del Suggs, resident of the Lake Bradford neighborhood, stated that he has been deeply involved in the community for several years. He further stated that he is the president of the Tallahassee Museum and he has served on the planning commission and on the Blueprint 2000 Capital Circle SW citizen's committee. Mr. Suggs stated that his home could be viewed from Capital Circle SW and it was directly off of Orange Avenue. He stated that building on the current alignment or on Orange Avenue would be a bad recommendation as that route affected Black Swamp. He stated that the current alignment was one the reasons that Blueprint 2000 was created, as the report included a recommendation to realign the road to save the sensitive areas. He stated that it would not be possible to build a 6-lane road using the current alignment without impacting the lakes. He further stated that using Orange Avenue is a bad alternative as well, because instead of crossing the lakes on

the west it would cross on the eastern side. He stated that it is one of the most expensive options and that it would destroy the most homes and displace the most families. Mr. Suggs asked the Board to direct the Blueprint staff to reconsider alternative 10 that would be closer in and that would be workable and cost effective. He further stated that the Blueprint staff was unfamiliar with historical landmarks of the area.

Mr. Patrick Elliott, resident of the Seminole Manor neighborhood, stated that his neighborhood was upset by alternate 4A and he was very pleased when it was taken off of the table. He stated that the source of the pollution to the lakes is not the highway it is the people who live on the lakes because they have docks, decks, piers and motorized watercrafts that are on the water daily. He stated that the docks, decks and piers have to be treated, painted, etc. He reiterated that the highway was not the only polluter of the lakes. He suggested that all of the homes should be removed and that roads should be closed to traffic. He admitted that there was no chance of this happening, however he stated that that suggestion was just as ridiculous as the others stating that this segment of Capital Circle was the only cause of the pollution to the lakes. He stated that the money to complete the roads was limited; therefore the current alignment was the best solution because the corridor is already there. He further stated that it had the least impact on homes and families and it was far less expensive. He stated that he was very much opposed to alternate 10 because it cuts through the forest and would upset the ecosystem of that area. He asked why destroy the forest to save a small segment of the lake that will not be destroyed at all. He stated that it would be far better to lose a few cypress trees and shrubs than for people to lose their homes and to unnecessarily open more natural areas to destruction.

Following the public comments Debbie Lightsey stated it was no secret she lived on Lake Bradford. Commissioner Lightsey further stated the residents of that area were of the opinion that certain of the corridor lines had been drawn to intentionally appear as non-viable or ridiculous or to pit one neighborhood against another. She felt that was unfortunate, however that suspicion was very strong. The problem was people unfamiliar with the area un-artfully drew lines on a map, not recognizing what was under the line, and it caused a great deal of concern and dissention. Whereas, if someone had actually walked through the area they would have seen immediately where Seminole Manor and Mabry Manor were and no one ever intended to put a road through those neighborhoods. Commission Lightsey continued by stating that was how it was drawn however; it was not where 4A was originally in the inception of the Blueprint discussion. Quite frankly, anyway one looked at the road, it was the most environmentally sensitive segment of the entire Capital Circle route. It was also the segment of the Capital Circle route that had the most neighborhood consequences to roadway construction. "If the road was done wrong it would only lead to environmental devastation. If it were done absolutely right it would only lead to environmental degradation." Commissioner Lightsey reiterated that is if it was done *absolutely right!*

Commissioner Lightsey felt the best solution was to keep all the alternatives on the table. She stated that only by receiving the impact statements regarding neighborhood, business and environmental impacts from the full PD&E from the variety of the corridors, could they possibly make the decision that would cause the least harm and adequately serve the transportation functions in the area, as well as create a route to the airport. Commissioner Lightsey further stated the best that could be done was harm. The concern stemmed from expending the requested \$100,000 presupposed the Capital Circle widening would continue on the current route to Orange Avenue. Which would leave out *some* version of 4A and 10. The citizens would see their option narrowed and their removal from the process, which would lead to the citizens to

have no confidence in the process because of the way it would have been handled up to that point. Commissioner Lightsey stated she did not feel it was intentional by Blueprint however it had worked out that way. Folks that were unfamiliar with the area drew the maps. She further stated Blueprint staff had told her alternative 4A was drawn, on the map, incorrectly but once the public saw it, such concern, anger and furor were created staff was never able to “get it off the table.” She suggested the Board look back at the broad corridor that began 1000 ft south of Highway 20 and not do anything at that point to indicate to citizens that viable options would be taken off the table. That action would be not to approve the expenditure of the \$100,000.

Commissioner Thaeff noted a point of order. The Blueprint 2000 bylaws required a quorum of both governments at a meeting before a motion could be taken or considered. The City currently did not have a quorum at the table and he felt the issue was mute because of it.

Commissioner Mustian stated he was aware of that, however, a public hearing was scheduled for that time and he was required to address the public hearing. Commissioner Mustian stated there were no speaker cards but he would open the public hearing, close it quickly and the Board could return to the discussion of Item 12. Commissioner Grippa requested a quorum call because local government had “punted on this for the last fifteen years.”

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARING: 5:00 PM**

### **15. Capital Cascade Trail: Addition of the Construction of Segment 4 into Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program**

Commissioner Mustian announced the public hearing, which was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. and asked if there were any speaker cards he had not yet received. Jim Davis stated there were no speakers scheduled to discuss moving construction of segment four of Capital Cascade Trail from tier 2 to tier 1. Commissioner Mustian stated he did not think it was a voting item. Mr. Davis stated it would have been however a super-majority vote was necessary and there were not enough members present for such a vote. Mr. Davis further stated the vote could be deferred until the September 2005 meeting. Mr. Davis noted that the requirement of two public hearings had been met, with one held at a County Commission meeting and a second at a City Commission meeting; all that remained was the vote. **Commissioner Mustian closed the public hearing.**

The floor was returned to Commissioner Grippa to continue discussing Item 12.

Commissioner Grippa asked Jim Davis who developed the alternatives for Capital Circle Southwest, Springhill to Highway 20. Mr. Davis stated Blueprint staff had developed the routes following input from various groups of people. Mr. Davis further stated there were some modifications made to alternative 10 however, in general, it was Blueprint staff. Commissioner Grippa questioned where staff was from and how long staff had lived in Leon County. Mr. Davis stated he had lived in Leon County approximately 10 years. Commissioner Grippa questioned Mr. Davis familiarity with the area. Mr. Davis stated he was vaguely familiar with it. Commissioner Grippa questioned if anyone from Blueprint staff visited the area prior to creating the drawings. Jim Shepherd approached the podium and Mr. Davis introduced him to Commissioner Grippa and the board and explained he was with Jacobs Engineering and a member of the Blueprint GEC Team as well as the project manager for CCNW/SW. Mr.

Shepherd offered to Commissioner Grippa that he had been a resident of Tallahassee for one year and had worked on the Crawfordville Highway PD&E study.

Commissioner Grippa questioned why the issue had not been raised before; stating the Board had asked staff to complete a task, he felt what the Board did not like was not the result, but the public out cry. He continued by stating the fact of the matter was someone would be upset, it would happen because there would be a road connecting I-10 and the airport. He asked the Commissioners to recall that in 1988 FDOT was paying for the corridor improvements utilizing the alternative route. In 2005, the City of Tallahassee was funding the road with FDOT "chipping in" a portion. Commissioner Grippa stated CCNW/SW was completely paid for (in 1988) but this Board sat, seventeen years later saying, "...no, hold on, it's too early to make a final decision, and we need more time." He further stated he would take no position on which alternative route would be best, in fact, he would defer that decision to Commissioners who lived in the area, however, he felt the Board should proceed to at least Orange Avenue "in case no decision was made." That way the traffic congestion would decrease and business, such as Anheiser-Busch, T-Formation and Innovation Park would not be lost to other cities. He further stated Tallahassee would be the embarrassment of the entire state to have an airport that was not connected to anything without a speed bump. Commissioner Grippa strongly suggested leaving the alternative for some other point in time but spending the \$100,000 now "to get most of the way to the airport." He further stated the project must make it to Orange Avenue; he did not feel there was any environmental harm in accomplishing that either. He agreed with staff recommendation to spend the \$100,000 because it was "money worth spending, seventeen years was too long!" He further stated he wanted his children to live in Leon County. He wanted to see economic development as well and he felt CCNW/SW would create that. He also reminded the Board the citizens voted and their number one priority was the connection to the airport.

**Commissioner Grippa moved to move forward with the expenditure of the \$100,000, leaving the decision of the alternative for a later date, which staff and the consultants had recommended just to get the project to Orange Avenue.**

Commissioner DePuy seconded the motion, for the purpose of discussion but also raised the following question. Was there a quorum present for the discussion and decision? Commissioner Mustian stated there was a quorum for approximately another fifteen minutes. Commissioner DePuy stated he wanted to ensure the Board was doing what was legal with the public's business. He reiterated he seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion and invited the Board to follow through.

Commissioner Rackleff requested clarification regarding the language of the motion. Commissioner Grippa stated the motion was simply to approve the \$100,000 expenditure to reach Orange Avenue; the remainder of the public discussion could occur in the future. **Commissioner Rackleff clarified that his motion was basically to approve option 1 of agenda item 12. Commissioner Grippa agreed.** Commissioner Rackleff stated he felt he could support that.

Commissioner Rackleff requested the members at the table, who were living in Tallahassee and/or Leon County in 1988 to please raise their hands. After compliance, Commissioner Rackleff stated most would then recall the history of the "so-called abandonment of a paid for roadway out to the airport" and remembered the history quite differently than their colleague had

stated. Given that longevity in the community seem to be an important criteria in decision-making, the 'abandonment issue' should be laid to rest. Commissioner Rackleff reiterated he could support the motion because it achieved one of the goals of the citizens, Blueprint and the Board and for reasons based on the philosophy of "money follows production" (should funding from FDOT and FDOT District 3 come to fruition). He further stated it would move the project to a point to work on acceptable routes or routes of least disruption. Commissioner Rackleff further stated he did not support segment 1A, which he felt would cause significant damage to Lake Bradford and the chain of lakes. Furthermore, the opportunity existed for staff to become more creative with an alignment that traversed from the end of 1B turning east to segment 3B or even 3A. He did not favor segment 10 because it would be a "slaughterhouse for wildlife" and it should be taken off the table.

Commissioner Mustian stated he too would support the motion and that he appreciated the passion of the residents, as well as the difficulty in trying to please all parties involved. Furthermore, he reminded the Board that the motion was merely to expend an additional \$100,000 to complete one part of the data collection process and would not foreclose the Board from any option or alternative. Commissioner Mustian agreed with Commissioner Rackleff in that he would also like to review other options. Also he did not like alternative 10 either but felt there were many possibilities. With that being said, Commissioner Mustian called for the vote. The vote passed (For: 3-County and 2-City (29 votes); Against: 2-County and 1-City (17 votes)).

While votes were being tallied Commissioner Thael stated he objected because he felt the discussion moved too quickly. Commissioner Sauls stated she did not appreciate the way the item was moved through so quickly either and that she did not have the opportunity to speak to it. She was not certain which would be the best alternative but wanted to see the alternatives left open and all to be given a full review not just a cursory look. She felt the proposed alternative 10 connecting at Geddie Road was too far west and suggested possibly Aenon Church Road would be a better option; she wanted to see due analysis and consideration of it. Additionally, if one of those routes became the preferred alternative, she wanted it noted, the Board had "thrown away \$100,000."

Commissioner Thael stated that Commissioner Sauls had summed up his thoughts. Commissioner Thael further stated he felt the citizens had done a good job of challenging the Board to consider their proposed alternative 10 as opposed to Blueprint's alternative 10; as well as giving the Board the opportunity to review it along with the associated issues. Also he reiterated he felt the decision came to quickly without enough discussion.

Commissioner Lightsey stated the issues involved were extremely complex. She stated that the residents of that area did not like the uncertainty either, therefore the notion of indefinite postponement was incorrect. The residents, she stated, wanted certainty, a final decision and to feel they played a role in the decision making process. When lines were drawn in fairly extreme locations, which was true in two of the alternatives, which staff had decided to "throw out" before it reached the Board, did create a loss of public confidence, when some modification of those two routes might have proven to be viable. The fact that they were drawn where they were and thrown out had narrowed the field so that only two alternatives remained, Orange Avenue and the existing alignment. Both of which had strong issues associated with them. She further stated she and her extended family lived in the area. If there was a 230' width for the corridor, at the intersection of Rankin and Orange Avenue West, Phase II of Cypress Cove would be taken

out; the are all affordable homes, the majority of which were owned by minorities and were first homes. She further stated either all or most of those homes or possibly Kingdom Hall Church at the corner would be destroyed. She further stated that following the Blair Stone Road example she continued, the City purchased everything where there was a structure within 100' of pavement. If the Board chose to follow the Blair Stone example they would have to spend the same type of money and build the road as carefully as it was. She reiterated all of Cypress Cove, Phase II would be taken out. She explained that was why the discussion of the typical section was so important earlier. Furthermore, 230' of ROW on the existing alignment would place the road in the water in Lake Minnehaha. She further stated it would be a hard decision but it needed to be made because the citizens needed some certainty. However, if the issue was pushed with such a sense of urgency that people felt left out of the process the Board would have the reactions they were presently seeing. The "quick, quick, quick" drive appeared to eliminate options that were considered viable originally and should have been included in the final study. Commissioner Lightsey stated the final study would take the same amount of time if all the options were evaluated. The time would not be lengthened but the public involvement would be satisfied as well as having real numbers associated with financial, environmental and neighborhood impacts.

### **13. Blueprint 2000 Master Plan and FY 2006 Capital Budget**

Mr. Davis stated that the Master Plan fully implemented the Board's previous direction and saved \$27 million dollars through the use of the SIB loans and other strategies.

There was no discussion of the item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

To provide comments on the revised Master Plan and proposed Capital Budget.

**Commissioner Grippa moved staff recommendation.** Commissioner Thael seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **14. Blueprint 2000 FY 2006 Operating Budget**

There was no discussion of this item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Review and comment on the proposed budget; no action required.

**Commissioner DePuy moved staff's recommendation.** The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grippa. The motion passed unanimously.

## **V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

There were none.

## **VII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Commissioner Grippa asked that staff look into placing a turn lane on Capital Circle SE at Monday Road instead of at Midyette Road as proposed. He directed staff to check into the request and see if there are any issues with DOT.

Mr. Davis stated that staff had already looked at the issue in detail and could not make a recommendation to move the turn lane to Monday Road because of the (southbound) dual turn lanes into SouthWood at Orange Avenue to the south. He further stated that because the proposed Monday turn lane is so close to Orange Avenue vehicles would have to cross the 2 stacking lanes where you store cars for turning into SouthWood. Mr. Davis stated that it would not meet the DOT standards.

Commissioner Grippa stated that if this was barred by DOT he understood. He stated that he was not sensing that this is not true.

Mr. Jerry Oshesky stated that the problem was the length of the turn bays for the dual left turn based on the future capacity requirements. He stated that even if it were shortened it would not meet the DOT standards. He stated that there would be an alternate route when the City extends Orange Avenue from Blair Stone Road to Capital Circle, and that would provide access that will not require a U-turn.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he would reserve judgment until he saw the drawings.

#### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Mustian adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.

**APPROVED:**

**ATTEST:**

---

**Mark Mustian**  
**Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA**

---

**Shelonda Gay**  
**Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA**