

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, February 2, 2006
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 4:30 pm

Chairman, Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

Committee Members present:

Jerry Conger	Mike Sheridan
Anita Davis	Jess Van Dyke
Terence Hinson	Kevin McGorty
Dianna Norwood	Kathy Archibald

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Dave Bright
Phil Maher	Jerry Oshesky
Bill Little	Gary Philips
Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Jim Shepherd	Shelonda Gay
Angela Richardson	Jennifer Toth
Brandie Miklus	Lee Nunn
Mark Llewellyn	Joe Petrich
Peter Martin	Robert Charles
Rita Stevens	Rick Feldman
John Taylor	Evan Rosenberg
Jon Fredrick	Paco de la Fuente
Kelly Haulon	

Agenda Modifications

There were no modifications made to the actual agenda, however, items number five and nine were moved to the beginning of the meeting to accommodate travel schedules of the presenters.

Consent Items

Item #5: Acceptance of FY 2005 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2005 Operating Fund Balance

Phil Maher introduced Rick Feldman and Rita Stevens of City of Tallahassee Accounting Services. Mr. Feldman stated that in accordance with the Auditor General, Blueprint has an audit of their statements completed. The audit was done by the joint venture of Thomas, Ferguson and Monroe. They had completed their audit and, basically, there were three letters included. The first was the actual auditing report that basically stated that information was fairly

stated, unqualified statement in regards to the financial statements. The second was an internal control letter, which found no weaknesses of internal control in the operation of Blueprint 2000 or the City of Tallahassee, as the accountants. The final letter issued was a management letter, from the Auditor General.

Michael Sheridan explained to the Committee that in front of each was the draft audit report, which was the opinion letter with the fairness statement underlined; as well as the management and internal control letters. What they did not have were the actual financial statements that were audited. Phil Maher corrected him stating that the financial statements were included in the original agenda packets that were sent out. Dave Bright stated that they were at the very end of the original packet.

Mr. Feldman summarize that the three letters essentially stated that there were no instances of material weakness or matters that needed to be reflected on; the observations were as clean as they could be regarding the work that was done by the auditors. **Kathy Archibald moved to accept the CAFR; Anita Davis seconded the motion.**

Jim Davis reminded the Committee that it was the City's Accounting Services Department that completed the audit and thanked Mr. Feldman and Ms. Stevens for their support. He further stated that there was an additional auditor, hired by Blueprint, that double checks Blueprint's internal controls. Blueprint was very serious about it and felt that it was reflected in the report.

Kevin McGorty asked if there were any recommendations whatsoever. Mr. Feldman stated no, there were none. Mr. Sheridan reiterated that there were "no material weaknesses." Jerry Conger inquired as to whether the date of September 30, 2004, noted on page 16, was correct. Rita Stevens stated that all references to September 30, 2004 had been corrected to 2005. Mr. Conger requested staff define the category of Transportation on page 19. Mr. Feldman stated that for the purpose of that report, it was necessary to functionalize all of the expenses and essentially, all of the expenditures made by Blueprint are Transportation related; i.e. roads, drainage, etc.

The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Sheridan thanked the auditors, on behalf of the CAC, for their fine work and most importantly, Col. Davis and Blueprint staff. Mr. Maher stated that the thanks must truly go to Rick Feldman and Rita Stevens. For the previous two-years, Mr. Feldman and Ms. Stevens had received awards for Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting Program (CAFR). Mr. Sheridan thanked staff for their self-auditing practices and fiscal responsibilities.

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail: Design Team (Blueprint Map 3)

Dave Bright stated that, at the December 15, 2005, IA meeting, the Board had authorized moving forward with Segment 2 design for the Capital Cascade Trail. They also elected to extend the current Genesis contract; therefore staff was finalizing the Scope of Services for the contract and would begin fee negotiations within the next several weeks.

Mr. Bright stated that the Genesis team included several firms, which would be involved with the park programming task, overall design theme, and final design of the park through landscape architecture and hardscape. The firms included on that team were Carr, Lynch, and Sandell, Inc.

(CLS), Hargreaves Associates (both out of the Cambridge/Boston, Massachusetts area), RMPK, Genesis Group, Moore Bass, and Greenways, Inc. Additionally, Mr. Bright introduced the members of the team that were in attendance: Mark Llewellyn of Genesis, Peter Martin of CLS, Joe Petrich of Genesis, and Robert Charles of Akin and Associates. He further stated that staff and the design team would meet with the users of the park, as well as the City Park's staff responsible for maintaining it. From those meetings, and with the assistance of the team members, a concept would be created that would define, early on, what they wanted the park to be before the actual hard design began. Mr. Bright stated that Mr. Llewellyn and Mr. Martin would provide information on some of the projects previously worked on, primarily, by CLS.

On behalf of Genesis and the design team Mark Llewellyn thanked the CAC for their support and stated that they were anxious to press forward with the design of Segment 2. The first effort would be a park programming effort for which Peter Martin of CLS would be the lead. He stated that it would include members of the CAC as well as other major stakeholders from the community to help identify the elements of the park that that would be critical in ensuring the space, size, and uses would be appropriate. He hoped to have the contract signed by early March 2006. They were also moving forward with the programming effort, which would include workshops and community involvement in the three months following that. Formal design would then move forward in July 2006.

Technical issues prevented the PowerPoint presentation that Mr. Llewellyn and Mr. Martin intended to share with the CAC from loading. Peter Martin stated that CLS was based in Cambridge, MA and was founded by Kevin Lynch, 35-years ago. Fundamental to his approach was looking at the ways in which people see cities and the notion that it was a good idea to involve people in their planning. In addition to CLS's commitment to public participation they believed in getting acquainted with the community and to truly understand the place in which they were working.

Mr. Martin stated that CLS was a firm of planners, urban designers, and architects that had worked all over the United States. They produced and developed the Master Plan for the 20 miles of the Tennessee River through Chattanooga, Tennessee. They developed the Master Plan for the Prudential Center in Boston as well. Additionally, they have worked on projects in Los Angeles, at the Coliseum, Phoenix, at Rio Salada, Vermont, Boston, and Cambridge, Massachusetts. He stated that CLS was not a "cookie-cutter" firm; the projects they have worked on have been diverse and they were extremely excited to work on the Capital Cascade Trail project.

Jim Davis apologized for the problems with the computer hardware because Genesis and Carr, Lynch, and Sandell wanted to impress the CAC with what a quality team they had put together. He further stated that Blueprint staff and Genesis were looking for a world-class design team that could be formed to produce that particular product for the community. He felt they had done just that. CLS were the perfect representatives of that firm as well. He further stated that staff had spoken to the River City Company, the Blueprint 2000 organization of Chattanooga, so to speak, to ask them to name the top two firms from that design that they would use again. CLS and Hargreaves were their recommendation. Mr. Davis stated that, obviously, CLS were on board and that they were still talking with Hargreaves; there were a few outstanding issues there.

Jess Van Dyke asked if the presentation or the images could be made available through the Blueprint website; Mr. Davis stated staff would do that. Kevin McGorty stated that he had the benefit of seeing the presentation earlier in the day and felt that Blueprint staff and Genesis had done an outstanding job with the team. Michael Sheridan asked what stage the contracting process was in with the two firms. Dave Bright stated that staff was working on the Scopes of Services; both the unresolved issues of the first phase – the height of the water in the Capital Cascade area, additional capacity under South Monroe Street and in Segment 3 south of there, storage at Leon High School, and a pond in Myers Park. The actual Scope would be discussed by the TCC on Monday, February 6, 2006, with final comments expected back in one week. Following that, staff would begin final negotiations with Genesis Group for the fee.

Mr. Davis stated that the Board had delegated the authority to the City Manager and the County Administrator to negotiate and award the contract. This benefited all parties by not having to go before the Board again. Mr. Bright stated that staff had two meetings with the TCC sub-committee, the Stormwater and Growth Management people, and received comments from the key TCC members. Those comments were included in the draft Scope that was sent to the TCC with their agenda.

Michael Sheridan stated that he was at a Tallahassee Chamber of Commerce 2010 luncheon earlier that day and what he heard from the participants was that the main objective of many business leaders of the community was to be like Chattanooga. Given that, he felt that the credentials of CLS would serve them well.

Mr. Sheridan also asked if there was any action required of the CAC. Mr. Bright stated no, that it was simply an opportunity to introduce Peter Martin and Joe Petrich while they were in town. As well as to assist the committee to begin to thinking about the process the staff, the team and the CAC and public would follow over the next several months, as they began to develop the needs and design of the park. Mr. Sheridan stated that he hoped staff would issue a press release when the contract was signed. Based on the comments he heard at the luncheon the business leaders and others around the community, there was a shared vision of the park and they were anticipating attending shows there in the near future. The press release would be valuable in updating them on where the process was and was not; as well as what the next steps would be.

Informational Items

Item #1: Land Swap with the United States Forest Service (Blueprint Map 4)

Dave Bright stated that the item was in the agenda as informational only. Ray Youmans stated that there was no additional information to add at that time. Mr. Bright opened the floor for committee questions.

Kathy Archibald requested staff elaborate on the line in the last paragraph that stated, “In addition, there are other acquisition possibilities which would allow Blueprint to secure necessary right-of-way with no cost to the program.” Mr. Bright stated that it was related to obtaining a road easement through the Forest property and asked Mr. Davis to elaborate.

Mr. Davis stated that staff was merely trying to keep all options open and therefore it was intentionally vague. Staff was, as the agenda item stated, investigating a land swap between Blueprint and the US Forest Service. However, there was too great a difference in the cost of the two properties for it to be a unilateral exchange. There were two other sections of land owned by St. Joe, as well as property that the City and County owned, that the Forest Service would like to have to fill in some of the "missing puzzle pieces" in the National Forest puzzle. He stressed that Blueprint was simply the facilitator of the process, however they were trying to keep it as an option. Mr. Davis further stated that staff had met with the US Forest Service previously regarding the easement. If the Forest Service succeeded in having the "flea market tract" added to the list of 13 parcels that could be sold out right, and they sold it to someone else because it could not be worked out with Blueprint, Blueprint would already have the roadway easement secured.

Ms. Archibald stated that if Blueprint secured the "flea market tract" and it ended up being where the County wanted to relocate the Fair Grounds, she would strongly urge that the design of the road include the appropriate ingress and egress to accommodate the possible additional traffic. Mr. Davis stated that staff was considering that, as well as the positioning of stormwater ponds to maximize the backside of the property; should the Fair Ground option not materialize and the property be designated commercial and how to enhance the commercial value.

Terence Hinson asked what the estimated timeline was, as well as the cost, because the price of land was rising and if it was too far into the future and it needed to be reappraised, that would also impact the price. Mr. Davis stated that, to be quite candid, staff did not have a timeline nor was it very high on the list of priorities due to the other projects. They were working with the US Forest Service and, unless there was a land swap agreement, the out-right sale of the land would require Federal legislation. Staff was also working with Congressman Allen Boyd's office on the issue. However, the variables were out of Blueprint's control but it was being pursued. As far as price was concerned, that was largely based on the delta in value; which could be impacted if Blueprint secured the easement.

Furthermore, Mr. Davis continued, there were other issues with Growth Management, for example, the long-leaf pine and high quality successional forest that was on the property. The property could be unusable as commercial, for all intensive purposes. Kathy Archibald stated that she had always heard from Dr. Bruce Means that the area was one of his favorite salamander sites. Mr. Davis stated that the issue was the Biologists from the US Forest Service saying, "It is okay to sell it," and the Biologists from the City of Tallahassee saying, "No, it is extremely sensitive! You cannot do anything with that property." Mr. Davis stated that there were considerable amounts of work yet to be done but it was an active project for Blueprint.

Item #2 Construction Cost Escalation in Florida

Bill Little, Engineering Manager for Blueprint 2000, stated that Florida had experienced dramatic increases in construction costs. Blueprint experienced it firsthand when they re-evaluated their project cost estimates. (He noted that many of the slides in the Power Point Presentation were from a FDOT presentation.) The bottom line, he stated, was that the construction market was saturated! The demand for construction had significantly exceeded the supply of construction services. In addition the cost of materials had increased and there were more and more restrictive and costly project requirements on transportation requirements.

Staff listed five basic or common transportation components: Earthwork, Asphalt, Concrete (structural), Steel (structural), and Steel (reinforcing). Mr. Little stated that each of those five items had seen an increase of at least 35% statewide over the past two years. Earthwork for example, which was a major component of road building and civil works, was up 65%, last year alone, in Florida. Earthmoving was a very energy intensive activity and everyone was aware of what had happened with energy prices. Asphalt, also energy related and derived from oil, oil prices had been increasing; over the past two years asphalt prices had increased 36% statewide. Structural concrete had seen an increase of 33% statewide. He also noted that the worldwide demand for structural concrete was up; Demand in China in particular had been in the press a lot, and it was affecting the US. The same was true with structural and reinforcing steel.

Mr. Little further stated that in addition to the reasons he had previously listed, Florida in particular and the Southeastern United States in general, had experienced eight major hurricanes; which further drained the material supplies and construction resources. If, Mr. Little stated, one compared all of the FDOT districts in the state, District 3, north Florida, had experienced an increase of 21% in the past year.

Kathy Archibald asked why District 3 was so much higher and for clarification on how China's need for concrete and steel was affecting the US. Mr. Little stated that there had literally been reports of cargo ships, loaded with construction materials, bound for US ports that were out bid, while in route, and were diverted to China. Some reports place the number as high as 80% of the world's cranes were currently in use in China. As for the significant increase in District 3, Mr. Little stated that he was not sure of the exact reason but would assert that it was based on the hurricanes. Mr. Davis seconded that opinion and added that possibly the construction of the new I-10 bridge was affecting it as well.

Terence Hinson asked for clarification on the location of the other districts. Mr. Little stated that District 1 was Southwest Florida, the Ft. Myers area; District 2 was Northeast Florida, the Jacksonville area. Mr. Little also stated that one thing that should be considered too, was that the market in those areas could be larger and have more capacity than District 3's market.

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Little to speculate, in regards to the hurricane factor, if the 2006 season were fair, which was not predicted, but if it were, did he think it possible for the prices to decrease. After all it was a supply and demand situation. Mr. Little estimated that he would not anticipate a decrease in the next five years. In fact, the best, he felt, could be hoped for was that the rate of growth slow to the 3-5% increases experienced over the previous 10 years (1995-2005). Kathy Archibald stated that rebuilding efforts from Katrina had not begun in earnest yet. Once they did they would really be sunk.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he was not sure how the members of the committee felt regarding what he was about to propose and he certainly did not want to add to anyone's workload. However, he felt that the issue fell into Mr. Maher's area, but at a future meeting he would like staff to opine on the "over and under trends" for costs, materials, and right-of-way escalation in relation to the leveraging efforts and successes. He felt it would be a great philosophical discussion for the committee.

Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Maher would discuss the Master Plan with the committee later in the meeting. The good news, associated with the cost escalations, however, was that Blueprint project schedules had not been materially affected. The reason for that was that staff was extremely conservative in the estimates they presented in the Master Plan in the first scenario. The first priority of the \$64 million dollars, Mr. Davis stated, was to ensure that all of Blueprint's existing projects were solvent. That would be reflected in the Master Plan and he felt Mr. Sheridan would receive what he was asking for during that discussion later in the meeting.

Mr. Sheridan asked if it was a current view or a long-term view. He thought Mr. Maher would outline a longer-term view. Mr. Maher stated that it was long-term but the numbers were based on current costs with the estimates for increase (that Mr. Little presented) carried out. He further stated that Blueprint was lucky because they had two major contracts that were already let, and in effect, the cost escalation would be transferred to the contractor. With Capital Cascade Trail, different concepts were adopted than what staff had originally estimated and budgeted for; staff over estimated based on the worst-case scenario so they netted out fairly even with the exception of the early years. Staff was asking for additional dollars for those years, he concluded.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he did recall comments from early on to the effect of "...it would not cost that much." Jerry Oshesky stated that Blueprint had received some criticisms regarding their contingencies in the range of 25% two-years ago; staff held their ground with that number and were glad they did. The committee agreed. Mr. Oshesky further stated that those types of contingencies were necessary especially when the program would span multiple years.

Item #3 Capital Circle NW/SW Expanded PD&E Study Update (Blueprint Map 2A)

Jim Shepherd stated that the purpose of the maps and update were to show the CAC the two significant changes that had changed from what was presented to them at the November 17, 2005 meeting. At the December 15, 2005 IA meeting, the Board directed staff to design six-lanes to the vicinity of Delta Industrial Park transitioning to four-lanes south of there. Additionally, at the CRTPA meeting in January 2006, Blueprint was asked by the CRTPA to narrow the median width from 36-feet to 22-feet. These changes were made to narrow the footprint in the vicinity of the lakes.

Jim Davis stated that the intention of the Board was to minimize the impervious surface at the southern end of the project, the most sensitive area near the lakes. Especially, in light of the fact that the PD&E had not been completed for CCSW; where the road might veer east in the vicinity of Tyson Road and therefore we would not need six-lanes south of where the cut-off would be. Mr. Shepherd continued, it was both a reduction in the median width and a reduction in number of lanes. However, staff believes it would still carry the traffic at Level of Service C to the Airport. Mr. Shepherd stated that the traffic sub-consultant was reviewing the traffic in relation to the four-lane section and will provide a determination of LOS in the near future.

Mr. Sheridan stated that, of course, all of it could change and it would look very different. Mr. Davis stated that, if they recalled, that four-lane portion would be constructed several years prior to anything on a new alignment going along Tyson Road. That was the reason for four-lanes versus six and the narrower median, through that extremely sensitive area was an important consideration during that interim period.

Jess Van Dyke stated that the plans appeared to take approximately one third of the property at the Dollar Car Rental facility; was there any chance of acquiring the remainder of that property? Jim Shepherd stated that, staff would (like to) acquire the entire parcel to use as a pond site or as a trailhead. Dianna Norwood requested Mr. Shepherd help her become oriented with the map. Mr. Shepherd identified the proposed frontage road that would begin at the Jackson Bluff Town Homes and connect again near Orange Avenue. He stated that the southern end had previously been shown as a merge ramp, however, with the reduction of lanes, from six to four, it created a merging problem as traffic approached Orange Avenue. Staff changed the design to more of a 90-degree angle, forcing traffic to stop rather than merge with south bound traffic. He stated that although there were two-lanes of traffic one was a southbound lane continuing on Capital Circle, and the second becomes a left turn onto Orange Avenue. Staff felt that a merge so close to Orange Avenue in that area would be undesirable. Consequently, staff redesigned the frontage road's southern exit so that vehicles are required to stop prior to entering traffic on Capital Circle, which would be a safer maneuver. Mr. Shepherd stated that the rather odd looking bubble at the exit was to accommodate the turning radius of large trucks.

Mr. Davis emphasized that it was a concept only at that point. Staff was also analyzing other issues regarding where the exit should actually be constructed; indicating possible areas on the map as he spoke. In that work however, staff was trying to minimize the impact to the wetlands, which were very close to the roadway. Ms. Norwood agreed that they were very close, in fact, she stated, closer than it appeared on the graphic.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was caught in the proverbial between a rock and hard place because they originally proposed to place the roadway and additional right-of-way on the east side, as far away from the lakes as possible. It was not supported by FDOT or by many members of the community, either. Furthermore, the National Forest Service had stated to Blueprint that on the west side near Orange Avenue, where it was currently proposed to be, would not be classified as 4F. Based upon those factors Blueprint modified their recommendation to the west side. By virtue of that however, the roadway was closer to the lake.

Ms. Norwood asked how the discussions were proceeding regarding the purchase of the Delta Industrial Site. Mr. Davis stated that they were, yes, without disclosing Blueprint's "hand" in a public forum. Mr. Sheridan interjected that discussions were in process. Ms. Norwood stated that it could possibly solve some problems. Mr. Davis stated that staff was cautiously optimistic that they would be able to bring something to the table. FDOT was receptive to allowing Blueprint to acquire the entire 117-acres using SIS funds because it would take virtually the entire area for the stormwater pond because it would be so shallow due to the water table. Ms. Norwood stated that it could be reverted to what it used to be, wetlands.

Kathy Archibald stated that she was still trying to "get a handle" on the events of the December 15, 2005 IA meeting and where that left the CAC. If one read the minutes from the November 17, 2005 CAC meeting, one would comment, "whew, what a meeting!" However, the agenda item that was before the committee, which came out of that December IA meeting... Ms. Archibald trailed off and Mr. Sheridan stated that he unfortunately was not aware that any CAC member had attended that meeting to provide additional "flavor" of it.

Ms. Archibald stated that the CAC made an impassioned discussion about the IA action that was taken on January 31, 2005 that was in conflict with their (the IA's) previous action. The CAC tried to "set the record straight;" that the CAC voted not to design the road south of Blountstown Highway until after the PD&E study for CCSW was complete. If that was all that was communicated to the IA for what the CAC did, she felt they might not have been fully informed.

Mr. Bright interjected that the IA members were given the full CAC minutes of the November 17, 2005 meeting in their agenda packet. Ms. Archibald stated that it did not mean that the Commissioners read them due to the size of their agenda. She further stated that the CAC had held a discussion regarding staff briefing the Commissioners, prior to the IA, and expressing their (the CAC's) concerns about the whole series of actions that transpired. However, the approval that happened appeared to be the full design. In other words, the IA did not do what the CAC recommended, correct? Mr. Davis stated that was correct. Ms. Archibald stated that the IA moved forward with the full design. Mr. Davis, again stated, that was correct. Ms. Archibald asked what the story was, then, with the PD&E study because there was concern over moving forward with the full design due to fear of being "locked into" that alignment. How much closer did that move them to Corridor 1 being the foregone conclusion as opposed to any of the other alternatives? That was the biggest concern of the CAC, she stated. She did not see that communicated in the recommendations to the IA. It might have been conveyed verbally, she acknowledged, however it was not reflected in the option that was printed.

Mr. Davis stated that, in his opinion, the Board fully understood the CAC's logic and recommendations. In many cases, he continued, he had personally reiterated the fact that it was staff's initial recommendation not to move forward with the design south of Blountstown Highway. At the December 15, 2005 meeting the Board, by a majority vote, directed staff to design through Orange Avenue to expedite traffic flow to the Airport. From that standpoint, the compromise was, not to skew the placement to the existing alignment but to veer off north of the Orange Avenue intersection in the vicinity of Tyson Road. Mr. Davis stated that he believed that was a viable concept, that would be studied, so as not to have to use the existing alignment. Furthermore, he felt confident that the commissioners did as well.

Mr. Davis reiterated that staff had conveyed the CAC's recommendations to the Board and that they (the Board) understood their (the CAC's) logic. Staff articulated the recommendations in the agenda item; however, it might not have been concise enough as some members would have preferred. However, there was a significant contingent of the Board that wanted to get (from the Interstate) to the Airport as quickly as possible. They construed "getting to the Airport" to be the Orange Avenue intersection. Mr. Davis stated that the four-lane versus six-lane option, just discussed, was the compromise they reached.

Ms. Archibald asked where the roadway would transition back to two-lanes. Mr. Shepherd identified the area south of Orange Avenue as the transition area. Kevin McGorty apologized for having missed the November 17, 2005, CAC meeting, but applauded the committee for having their backs against the wall and under threat of losing federal funding, for restating the Blueprint design principals of the project. At the September 19, 2005 IA meeting, there was tremendous consensus among the public that attended and the CAC in terms of the preferred corridor being number three. Most importantly, however, was that there was consensus among the members of the IA for corridor 3 versus the existing alignment. What threw a wrench into it, Mr. McGorty

continued, was the threat of losing federal funding, even though federal dollars were not part of the current mix, Blueprint was required to follow the guidelines on it. He stated that they were aware that both corridors would be studied, however, if the study was a prelude to construction along Corridor 1, in his humble opinion, it should not be a Blueprint-funded project. The reason for that was because Corridor 1 was in complete opposition to all of the principals that the EECC presented to the voting public.

Mr. McGorty further stated that they would have the opportunity to readdress it upon completion of the study of both corridors. He reiterated that as a community, there was considerable consensus from political leadership, the citizens, and the CAC. If it were not for the threat of the loss of federal funding, after twenty years, they would have been in a direction of moving forward. It was a stumbling block, he concluded.

Dianna Norwood asked if when "they" agreed to do the design it added another \$650,000 to that portion for a total of \$750,000 in money that would be expended between State Road 20 and Orange Avenue. Mr. Shepherd stated that the issue of cost was becoming unclear because of the Delta Industrial site, however, Ms. Norwood was correct; approximately \$750,000 would be spent between Jackson Bluff Road and Orange Avenue. Michael Sheridan stated that it seemed to be inconsistent with what the consensus of the CAC had been all along and that he echoed Mr. McGorty's comments.

Item #4 Capital Cascade Remediation Coordination (Blueprint Map 3)

Gary Phillips stated that the Cascade remediation project began approximately two weeks prior to the meeting and Blueprint continued to coordinate some of the design and construction activities with the City's remediation team. He stated that the first area of concern was the location of the former landfill and the team's proposal to EPA was to cap that area and protect the embankment. The option the City Remediation Team proposed to EPA was a filter point liner in a trapezoidal shape designed to meet the 25-year/8-hour storm events, as well as the 100-year event, with a geo-textile fabric on the slope surface. The fabric would protect the water, in the channel, from the landfill soil.

Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint was not in favor of the geo-textile fabric as it was not aesthetically pleasing. If the Team were to proceed with that option, Blueprint staff would request that they add fill over the top of it. Blueprint would, in turn, add more fill and landscaping as well. Dianna Norwood requested Mr. Phillips identify the railroad tracks on the graphic and what the distance was between the tracks and the channel. Mr. Phillips did and stated that they were approximately 45-feet from the channel.

Kathy Archibald asked for clarification of the appearance of the filter-point liner and geo-textile fabric. Ed Ringe stated that the City of Tallahassee had used the filter point in other projects around town and explained that it had a pillowy appearance and was filled with concrete to various thicknesses; the proposed thickness was 6-inches. The appearance would be very close to sandbags. Ms. Archibald asked if it was white because the channel would not always have water in it. Mr. Ringe stated that it would "bleach out" but, generally, it would be white. He further stated that the geo-textile fabric would be along the surface of the slope of the embankment. Due to the steepness of the slope the landscaped area would be only at the top of

the embankment. Dianna Norwood asked if teenagers or children would be able to access that area. Mr. Phillips stated that it would need to be fenced.

Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint's option of a box culvert was more appealing aesthetically, more efficient hydraulically, and practical in terms of park usability. The box culvert would replace the channel, in that area, with fill and landscaping as well as provide more flexibility in the placement of the trail. The proposed size for the box culvert would be a single, 8 foot by 16 foot, which would connect to the double, 5x10, at Monroe Street. That option would also keep the trail away from/out of the CSX right-of-way.

Kathy Archibald asked if the single box culvert would have enough capacity for the 25 and 100-year flood events. Ed Ringe stated that the 25 and 100-year events were both estimated to be approximately 800 cubic feet per second (CFS). Staff anticipated the capacity of the culvert to be capable of handling 1200 CFS without surcharge; a free water surface would remain inside the culvert. The single box culvert was much more hydraulically efficient, he reiterated.

Mr. Davis stated that the single box culvert was large enough to accommodate the existing water as well as future development. Ms. Archibald stated that the existing water was a problem already. Mr. Davis concurred and further stated that it would continue to be a problem until Blueprint dealt with the conveyance of water downstream. Ms. Archibald asked what would happen with the water when it could not move through the box culvert. Mr. Davis stated that it would back up into the park, which would be designed to accommodate that. How long, asked Ms. Archibald and suggested reviewing "worst case" scenarios.

Mr. Ringe stated that the supplemental agreement between Blueprint and Genesis, requested a review of the anticipated flood stages within the pool to study what would be necessary to construct downstream to accommodate each. However, the 1200 CFS that was selected most likely represented well over the 100-year event. Ms. Archibald suggested staff model some of the previously experienced scenarios of the past few years (multiple inches of rain in a few short hours). Mr. Ringe stated that in all of the contractual arrangements with Genesis, Blueprint staff required them to analyze all of those types of conditions. In the initial modeling, they found that the "one-hour" rain event was within hundredths of a foot of the design condition.

Mr. Davis stated that once the entire system was in place all of those issues would be resolved. The problems, however, would be in the interim. When Segment 2 was completed, but not Segment 3, and because Segment 4 was not yet completed, there might be some problems with flooding. The water in Capital Cascade Park would rise rapidly and significantly. As soon as the remaining "pieces" were in place downstream then the staging of Segment 2 water could be managed more efficiently. Once the project was complete, he continued, the system would have the capability of moving the water, from a 100-year rain event, as well as additional capacity for future development. In the interim, however, it would be interesting, no difficult, he stated, to watch what would happen.

Jess Van Dyke stated that he did not think it was the "end of the world" to have portions of the park flood occasionally, in fact it should be part of the design. Capital Cascade Park should be designed holistically, so that it was both a green space and capable of handling extreme flooding. One big issue for Tallahassee, he stated, was flooding. In an event similar to the rain event of

1948, hundreds of homes would be inundated by water and would stay that way for a long period of time. Ms. Archibald stated that she was not suggesting that staff build to accommodate that, but they should model the event to see what would happen. The general public should understand that the park was designed to flood and was prepared for that inevitability. Mr. Van Dyke stated that he felt some people would be disappointed if the park was not capable of handling extreme flooding.

Mr. Davis stated that staff had made efforts to be exceedingly clear, with whomever they were speaking, that Capital Cascade Park would be a floodable park. The improvements to that area would not eliminate flooding but would greatly reduce the incidents of it and where it occurred. Michael Sheridan stated that, every single time, anyone spoke about Capital Cascade Park, that message needed to be included because there were several people, in important positions, that did not want to hear that, do not accept it, and have their own spin on it. Mr. Davis assured Mr. Sheridan that any presentation given by any member of Blueprint 2000 regarding the Capital Cascade package included that fact. Mr. Sheridan commended him for doing so and stated that he also "preached to the people" telling them it was a floodable park even though they did not want to hear that. Ms. Archibald stated that the majority of the time there would not be very much water at all, but that could also be bad as well if people were expecting a lake but there was none. Mr. Davis agreed and stated that they might need to pump water through the system.

Kevin McGorty stated, as a side bar, once the Remediation Team began the excavation a tremendous, noxious plume inundated the Myers Park area. He thanked Blueprint and City of Tallahassee staff for their prompt attention to the matter.

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint was limited in their channel design options due to the landfill and the Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EECA), which did not allow for that area to be opened once the remediation was complete. Therefore the two options presented were the preferred options at that point. Staff was preparing the final cost analysis and would move forward with a decision in the next week so that there was sufficient time for ordering and manufacturing the box culverts.

Mr. Phillips stated that the second area of concern was the "big dig" area. The Remediation Team would remove the contamination to a depth of approximately 40-feet. Their intent was to add fill and install a liner at approximately the 72-foot elevation. Blueprint suggested the Team add less fill, place the liner lower then cover it with approximately 2-foot of fill. That would allow Blueprint to come in at a later date to expand the pond to a larger size or whatever is called for in the design, and not impact the liner.

Mr. Phillips stated that it was vital for Blueprint to coordinate these efforts with the Remediation Team because the project would be delayed if Blueprint had to go through EPA rules and regulations, that the City of Tallahassee has spent years negotiating. He further stated that Blueprint was doing everything that they could to avoid impacting the liner.

Mr. Davis added that the Board had approved for Blueprint to expend \$2 million of the Capital Cascade Trail budget to work with the Remediation Team, City of Tallahassee and WRS, to implement a final solution that was acceptable to Blueprint. Additionally, there had been no issues with that coordination process.

Consent Items

Item #6: CAC Meeting Minutes: November 17, 2005

Kathy Archibald moved to approve the November 17, 2005 minutes; Terence Hinson seconded the motion. Kevin McGorty thanked the Blueprint staff for the level of detail in the minutes. It helped to communicate the full discussion for people that were not in attendance. Dianna Norwood asked to be updated of the status of Gregg Patterson's request regarding a press release for the election of officers and the newly appointed CAC members. Dave Bright stated that an e-mail was sent to Bruce Richey of the Tallahassee Democrat on November 18, 2005; evidently, the Democrat elected not to publish the information. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion/Action

Item #7: CAC Performance Report Publication

In the absence of Gregg Patterson and Charles Pattison, Dianna Norwood addressed the CAC regarding the draft report to the community. She stated that the sub committee had met once since the November 17, 2006 meeting; Phil Maher and Dave Bright were also in attendance. The sub committee discussed the limited budget that was available to them. They were disappointed because the cost of one advertisement would use the entire budget. She stated however, that she had not seen or heard of any movement on the draft report since that meeting.

Phil Maher stated that, following the sub-committee meeting, staff turned the information collected over to Uzzell Advertising, one of the GEC sub-consultants. They were instructed to develop a brochure and advertisement. The "mockups" were delivered the previous day, for staff and CAC review.

Mr. Sheridan stated that, for clarification purposes, that there was an allocated amount in the Blueprint budget for the CAC Performance Report Publication. He asked if there was any reason why they could not use the full-allocated amount. Mr. Davis stated that, as he understood, that was what was proposed. Mr. Maher stated that the initial budget was \$3,500, however he made some adjustments, which brought the allocated amount to \$6,000. Mr. Sheridan asked if the proposal by Uzzell Advertising would utilize the full budget. Mr. Davis stated that would and more if they were not careful.

Mr. Maher stated that the bottom line was advertising; depending on which day, weekday versus Sunday, or two days the advertisement was published. Mr. Sheridan stated that issue was not so much the money but the most effective use of the budget. Dianna Norwood asked what Mr. Maher had found the cost of the brochure to be. Mr. Maher stated that Uzzell Advertising had not yet provided Blueprint with the cost; however, the previous year's report was approximately \$2,700 for a comparable product. Therefore, he anticipated this year's cost to be within the same range.

Dianna Norwood stated that the sub-committee had also discussed having the brochure design also made into display boards, which would be placed in bank lobbies, City and County public

offices, and any other public area that would allow them. Production costs of the display boards would also be a factor too.

Kathy Archibald questioned the purpose of the brochure. Mr. Maher stated that in the previous year the brochures were mailed out to citizens in their utility bills. Dianna Norwood also stated that staff used them as handouts at presentations.

Mr. Sheridan asked about the status of the performance audit, and if interviews were still being conducted. Mr. Davis stated that the draft performance audit was complete. Mr. Maher stated that the performance audit that the report was based on was completed in September 2005; however, the new performance audit was underway and would be complete by the end of February 2006. Mr. Sheridan stated that one of the concerns of the CAC was the length of time between the performance audit and the publication of the report to the citizens.

Mr. Maher stated that the report was partially delayed because of the CAFR; staff wished to see the results of it prior to the publication of the citizens report. He also reminded them that it was a performance report, while it should use some information from the performance audit it did not need to be tied strictly to it. The role of the CAC, regarding the performance audit and according to the bylaws, was to make recommendations to the IA. The audit was dry, he stated, it did not explore the program issues or the projects and their status, which, was more interesting to the citizens and the information they wanted to know. The only issue from the performance audit that should be included was if there was something negative reported, in which case, that information should be brought to light. Mr. Davis stated that there were several commendations included in the performance audit that he would like to read about in the performance report. However, he acknowledged that Mr. Maher was correct; any recommendations for improvement should be in the report.

Jerry Conger asked if there was a time frame for when the report would be completed and ready for distribution. Dianna Norwood stated that unfortunately, no, they did not have an identified time frame. Personally, though, she felt that it should have already been "out the door." Mr. Conger agreed. Mr. Sheridan stated that the report should be completed and published as soon as possible. Ms. Norwood stated that since the proposed report was in a .PDF format, it could be e-mailed to the committee members for review and comment prior to publication. Mr. Sheridan stated that should be done and also suggested that the members not delay the process. If they chose to respond, please do so quickly, so the report could move forward.

Terence Hinson stated that while it was probably necessary it was an expensive endeavor. He asked what the possibility of a press release or press conference to relay the information was. Was the concern that it would not all be published in the newspaper if the information were distributed in that fashion? Dianna Norwood stated that Gregg Patterson had strong feelings about and had mentioned holding a press conference several times. She further stated that Mr. Patterson had said he would speak with the new editor of the Democrat. Mr. Sheridan stated that the local press was very much in tune with the activities of Blueprint and the CAC and their reports had been quite accurate and expansive. He stated that prior to each CAC meeting he receives a phone call from Bruce Richey of the Democrat, to discuss the upcoming meeting. Staff e-mailed a copy of the agenda to Mr. Richey and he was quite familiar with it when he

called. The committee could certainly give them more information but they were on top of it, Mr. Sheridan concluded.

Mr. Hinson stated that the whole reason for asking was an attempt to save money by having a press release to give the information to them versus purchasing an advertisement. Kathy Archibald stated that if the Democrat did the reporting it would not be in a concise picture like the brochure. It would be in an article that might not have a photograph of the brochure. Furthermore, the press would only report on what they wanted to and might not necessarily include everything the CAC wanted included. Ms. Archibald further stated that the best way to communicate the information would be through an advertisement but it could be in conjunction with a press conference or even a segment on the evening news.

Mr. Sheridan stated that one of the issues was the cost of an advertisement; one full-page advertisement in the Sunday paper would cost approximately \$5,200. The total budget for the performance report was \$6,000. The CAC voted on that budget. He further stated that, with everyone's permission, he would like to figure out a way to move ahead with what they were going to do so that they could get back to the agenda, because there were only 30 minutes remaining. Mr. Sheridan asked Ms. Norwood if she had a recommendation of how they might proceed.

Dianna Norwood stated that one of the things Mr. Patterson had mentioned was to purchase an advertisement that was 2/3 of the page in hopes that the Democrat would also include an article, relevant to Blueprint, at the top. She noted that the price for that size was not listed however, she assumed it would fall in between the half and full-page price. It might also mean not printing it on Sunday; that had been a debate amongst the sub-committee all along. There was significant competition in the Sunday paper but some people only subscribed to the Sunday paper or would actually take the time to read. She asked for the opinions of the committee.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he felt the committee should defer to staff but have Ms. Norwood stay on point to assist with it being published as soon as possible. He also hoped that everyone would concur with the fact that they set a budget. If they made the wrong decision with the budget, it could be addressed for next year's report. He asked if that would be acceptable to everyone.

Mr. Maher stated that the key was that the CAC needed to draft the language for the brochure. Mr. Sheridan stated, "okay, get it to us." Mr. Davis stated that if he was asking Blueprint staff to complete what the sub-committee was tasked with, staff could not do that. The sub-committee needed to take the lead on it. Ms. Norwood stated that she would speak with the members of the sub-committee and see if she could get them motivated. Mr. Sheridan asked if the sub-committee could get the draft out for review and comment. Ms. Norwood stated that she felt the sub-committee would find it easier with the mockup from Uzzell; it would give them something to work from.

Kevin McGorty commented that the substance of the text was quite important and it was critical that they not shy away from challenges that the public needed to understand. They were the citizen oversight committee. They were not trying to spin anything from a public relations standpoint. Mr. Maher stated that was exactly why it was the responsibility of the CAC to provide the language for the brochure. Mr. Sheridan stated that they needed to move forward.

Item #8: Reallocation and Appropriation of Supplemental Funds in the Master Plan

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint was quite fortunate through the summer of 2005 to have received substantial funding, including approximately \$16.1 million in the Federal Transportation Bill. Of that it appeared that FDOT would receive approximately \$14.2 million. He stated that Attachment 1, Allocation of Additional Funds, indicated the years in which Blueprint anticipated actually receiving the funds. They had further reduced that by 1%; the County's Federal Lobbyist had indicated that FHWA would possibly withhold an additional one percent.

Mr. Maher stated that from SAFETEA, staff had "freed up" or had additional funding of \$14 million. Under SIS, Blueprint received a grant for \$42 million for Right-of-Way. However, because Blueprint had estimated ROW at \$27 million it would only relieve that amount, in the years it was budgeted. Mr. Maher stated that the difference between \$27 million and \$42 million that would still be budgeted in for ROW for that section. He further stated that Blueprint was successful in receiving TRIP funding, \$4.3 million toward acquiring ROW for CCSE, Woodville Highway to Tram Road. TRIP funding required a fifty percent match.

Staff presented an agenda item to the Board at the September 19, 2005 IA meeting requesting the Board to identify their priorities in allocation of any new funds. Mr. Maher listed the priorities as defined by the Board:

1. Leveraging funds as much as possible.
2. Completion of the PD&E Studies for Capital Circle including the section from Springhill Road to Orange Avenue.
3. Consider moving in Greenway and Stormwater dollars that were for CCNW/SW from I-10 to Orange Avenue.
4. Land bank.

Staff also included cost increase information from the GEC to ensure that all currently funded projects were solvent.

In review of the priorities, Mr. Maher stated that regarding leveraging, staff matched the \$4.3 million from TRIP. They had also allocated money to be used as a possible TRIP match for construction for "next year." There was an additional \$1 million that was included for grants through FDEP that was targeted for the 214-acre parcel, known as the Atkinson Property. There was also \$980,000 match for FCT grants for four Capital Cascade parcels. The cost for the PD&E Study for CCSW from Springhill Road to Orange Avenue would be spread across several years. Mr. Davis stated that technically the PD&E extended to Crawfordville Highway.

Mr. Maher stated that regarding Capital Circle Northwest Greenways, (the Atkinson property would be \$6.5 million) staff allocated \$1 million for FY2006 to match a grant. If Blueprint was unsuccessful in securing the grant, the remaining funds were budgeted for FY2007 and FY2008. The property could be acquired in installments over those years.

Mr. Maher stated that the final priority was the Landbank but directed the CAC's attention to the Cost Estimate Adjustments. The estimates were for FY2006-2010 for the CCSE – Woodville Highway to Tram Road, Capital Circle – Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway, Capital

Cascade Trail Segment 2, and Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4. All of which, he concluded, totaled the \$42 million he began with.

Kathy Archibald asked if those numbers were reflected in the Master Plan. Mr. Maher stated that they were. Ms. Archibald questioned the funding for Capital Cascade Trail. Mr. Davis stated that it was completely funded but Segment 1, for example, was only funded in the "out years." Mr. Sheridan stated that with as much publicity as there has been, if Capital Cascade Trail was not fully funded the citizens might lynch staff and the CAC. Mr. Davis reminded Mr. Sheridan that the Board had instructed staff not to fund Segment 1, however, staff was able to put enough money, in the out years, to fund it. He further stated that staff felt confident in the numbers for the next five years. Beyond that point, well, they would not take any bets on them. One of the reasons they saw the \$8 million Land bank item in the budget was a "fudge factor." Staff put it in for contingency because no one knew what would happen in the future with project costs. Furthermore, staff's position was that the worst thing they could ever say to the CAC was, "we need to cancel "X" project because we need to move the money elsewhere."

Mr. Maher stated that staff would also relay to the Board that the Land bank was a contingency. And also with the proposal of a two-week moratorium on sales tax by the State House of Representatives, to Blueprint that would be a \$1.1 million shortfall. In reality, there was funding available for reallocation, however, staff would advise the Board not to. Mr. Davis stated that a moratorium on sales tax would have "busted" Blueprint in 2005 because they were within \$250,000 of the actual versus projected amounts. If \$1 million had been taken out of that, the budget would have been busted. Mr. Sheridan stated that on behalf of the CAC, it was fine if staff kept telling that story over and over again and to the public as well. Projections are irrelevant after approximately five-years.

Jess Van Dyke moved to accept Option one, and stated that he accepted the recommended allocation of additional funds and the appropriation of amounts reflected in the FY2006. Terence Hinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Citizens to be Heard

Lee Nunn, 1288 Fernhill Court, Tallahassee, FL 32312

Mr. Nunn stated that he would speak to items one and eight from the agenda; land swaps and their relevance to the budget. Mr. Nunn stated that there was litigation between the City of Tallahassee and a property owner; in his mind it was ridiculous and would only result in wasting taxpayers money. He stated that there was a parcel of land, between the Shell Oil Station and the National Forest on Capital Circle Southeast. In 1998 a plat was approved, while the property belonged to the previous owners, however, there were no interested buyer at that time and the plat expired.

The City Environmentalist at that time was Susan Tanski and germane to the whole issue is High Quality Successional Forest (HQSF) (related to sensitive flora and fauna) and timber rights. He stated that when Ms. Tanski completed her report there were not sensitive flora or fauna on the property; additionally, the Landowner agreed to set aside 25% for green space. When the current landowners returned to have a second plat approved, there was a new Environmentalist in that position and a new definition of HQSF. Therefore the litigation ensued.

Mr. Nunn suggested, for the purpose of bridging the delta on the Flea Market Tract and other properties, Blueprint might be able to obtain the afore mentioned piece of property at no cost. (If Blueprint could eliminate the litigation proceedings.) With the ongoing litigation, the City Commissioners were not able to speak openly regarding the issue, however, he suggested that the CAC could make a recommendation to the (IA) Commission.

Regardless of whose definition of HQSF is used everyone involved agreed that if the area were not burned the HQSF would "go away." If one was trying to make linear improvements for roadway the City was not required to adhere to their environmental code. If the CAC recommended to the IA, and the City Commissioners specifically, that the HQSF would no longer exist, without burning, why would they continue to waste citizens tax dollars in litigation when they had the opportunity to save millions of dollars and obtain more than one-half mile of "free" right-of-way. He stated that he thought staff, the CAC, and the Commissioners would see the logic of that.

He further stated that "common sense" was not being used in the situation and offered to disclose all of the details. "The current Owner," he stated, "would be more than obliged to help you out." Mr. Sheridan asked, "In exchange for what?" Mr. Nunn replied, "Nothing." Ms. Archibald stated with a questioning tone that he (the current owner) just wanted to be rid of it. Mr. Davis explained that the current owner wanted the lawsuit to "go away."

Mr. Nunn stated that he was privileged to a significant amount of information and the City would lose that lawsuit. Mr. Hinson stated for clarification purposes, that the lawsuit was between the City and the current landowner. Mr. Nunn stated that was correct. He elaborated though, stating that the former Owner reserved the timber rights. "Why are we fighting litigation when we... What owner is going to burn their property to render it less economically viable?" he asked. The HQSF would go away, the same as on the forestry land between the power line and Capital Circle. He concluded that the CAC might want to make a recommendation to the (IA) City Commission, as a portion of the Blueprint project, asking them (the IA) to review the situation and his proposal.

Mr. Sheridan asked for a staff response to Mr. Nunn's comments. Kevin McGorty suggested having Staff investigate it; Ms. Archibald agreed. Mr. Sheridan asked if staff had investigated it. Mr. Davis stated that he had spoken to Mr. Nunn previously and he was aware of the situation. However, he stated, for Blueprint staff to go forward and make recommendations. He trailed off but stated that Staff would bring it up to the Board members staff spoke with but they have heard it previously. Mr. Nunn stated that he had tried to speak with individual Commissioners, however, due to the litigation they were not willing to discuss it.

Mr. Sheridan requested Mr. Nunn to explain to the committee, specifically, how his request impacted the responsibilities of the CAC and Blueprint 2000. Mr. Nunn replied that they were responsible for large amounts of money and if they could obtain right-of-way at no cost and save the taxpayer's money it would be good and would be their (the CAC's) responsibility. Mr. Nunn stated that he was not speaking on behalf of the current owner but merely representing himself as a taxpayer.

Ray Youmans stated that, as the Right-of-Way person for Blueprint and having been in ROW for many years, he never had anyone offer to give ROW free. He was curious as to what was actually on the other end of the deal. There must have been something, he stated, and if not he would be happy to draft a deed as soon as possible. Mr. Nunn stated that "they" had met with the City Growth Management Director, the Concurrency Manager, and the Assistant City Manager, at the time of the request for the re-plat (under the previous owner), to offer 25% of the land for green space (when the City only required 10%) and one-half mile of ROW along CCSE. The City's response was that they could not do that.

Anita Davis stated that while the proposal sounded "shaky" to her there were legal persons that could explore the information. She wished to have Blueprint staff and the legal personnel consider the possibilities of "taking or giving" land before she could comfortably vote on it. Mr. Sheridan requested staff, if it met with the approval of the CAC, to investigate it, and report back, in the context of leveraging. That might require staff to become peacekeepers between the two parties. However, if it resulted in having ROW donated to Blueprint it could have leveraging possibilities for Blueprint; with free access to Mr. Nunn's knowledge that he offered as a citizen. Mr. Sheridan stated that the committee did not need to vote but asked if his statement met with the general consensus. The committee members responded with resounding accord.

VI. Items From Members of the Committee

Dianna Norwood stated that there would be a group photo taken for the brochure at the end of the meeting. She acknowledged that Mr. Van Dyke had to leave and asked if the photo would still happen that evening. Mr. Sheridan replied that they still had a quorum and that it was necessary for the brochure to be published prior to the next CAC meeting. The committee agreed with that timeframe. Mr. Hinson asked if the committee would have the opportunity to review the brochure prior to publication. Ms. Norwood stated that the review would occur via e-mail.

Ms. Archibald stated that it felt as though, by including a group photo, they were self-promoting. She suggested a graphic of a conceptual design of one of the projects rather than a group photo; possibly Cascade Park. Mr. Sheridan stated that people should provide options to Ms. Norwood, as Ms. Archibald did, of what they would like to see in the brochure. Mr. Maher stated that since it was scheduled and the photographer was waiting, that the committee have the photograph made in case they decided to include it.

Ms. Norwood stated that no one e-mailed her back. Mr. Sheridan interjected that if no one e-mailed her back she and the sub-committee should move forward with it as they saw fit.

Ms. Archibald asked if there were any "before and after" photographs available. Ms. Norwood stated that she was not sure but felt certain that the Public Involvement Office would have a photo album of the projects. Mr. Maher stated that was correct and the images that were used in the mockup were merely placeholders.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he had a separate item he wished to discuss with the committee. He stated that there was an attendance problem, quorum issues, and the by-laws stated that there were a few members of the committee that should be removed. He stated that he sent out an

email for 'amnesty,' however, in reality they did not have that right. The by-laws spoke for themselves. The CAC committee was a public body and, well, he understood that life changed. People make commitments, then something happens in their lives and they are not able to fulfill those commitments. Anyone who had ever served on the CAC was honorable, noble, and hardworking however, changes did occur. Ultimately, it was his responsibility to see that they lived up to their by-laws, and currently they were in violation of them.

Mr. Sheridan thanked everyone for being present that evening and suggested that they each take a strong look at the whether or not they truly wanted to make the commitment to reading the material, participating in the committee and various sub-committees and the six meeting per year. He stated that he would be sending out correspondence and rather than terminating people he would ask those who could not abide by the by-laws to submit their resignations. By asking them to resign there would be no dishonor, he stated.

Mr. Sheridan stated none of the past several meetings had started on time due to the lack of a quorum. In fact, one meeting in 2005 was held without a quorum and no business was transacted because of it. That was unfair to the citizens and the 250,000 people that are a part of that community. He wanted to know how other members felt.

Terence Hinson stated that many individuals represented groups. If Mr. Sheridan intended to correspond with the individual, he might consider copying the represented entity as well. They could then find a replacement representative. Mr. Sheridan stated that while that sounded reasonable he did not think they could do that. The reason they could not was that the group did not make the appointment only the recommendation to the IA. The IA, in turn appointed the individual to the CAC. If a person resigned from the CAC it would go before the IA to ask the group to make the change. There was no provision, he believed, for a proxy and under their by-laws a person was not allowed to abstain. They must vote unless they recuse themselves.

Kevin McGorty stated that as Chairman, Mr. Sheridan had placed the benchmark. He felt it was important that the CAC proceed forward with clear notice to the members. If persons were unable to uphold their commitment it should be stated prior to the March 23, 2006 meeting. Mr. Sheridan stated that he felt he had placed the benchmark in the email, to which he received several responses. However, he was also quite concerned with not enforcing the by-laws of a public body.

Anita Davis stated that Mr. Sheridan was doing exactly what he was supposed to do. He would send correspondence to those persons who are derelict in their duties that as of "X" date they should resign. She represented an organization on the CAC and if it happened to her, through the organization, someone could take her place. The letter would leave the door open but would also protect the CAC if they needed something to fall back on. She further stated that it was sometimes difficult to make the quorum and suggested the possibility of flexible meeting times. Mr. Sheridan stated that meeting times had been adjusted in the past; as long as there was sufficient notice to the public that was fine. He further stated that he did not feel that anyone objected to that if it seemed to be a lousy date.

Kevin McGorty stated that he felt Mr. Sheridan was handling it properly. He was concerned however, that there were a few instances of the meeting time being changed from the set without

a public notice, in one case. The rare occasion of a hastily called meeting was not always convenient for everyone to make that adjustment. Clearly, however, the calendar was set one year in advance, in terms of the main meeting; therefore members should make the necessary preparations for attendance.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he had reviewed one year of regularly scheduled meeting attendance, set one-year in advance, as well as special meetings. Without including attendance at the special meetings, he found that some were in violation of their by-laws based solely on non-attendance at regularly schedule meetings; that the committee had voted on the dates for.

Jerry Conger stated that since Mr. Sheridan had previously contacted the committee as a whole, his plan of action was to then contact the individuals that were remiss with the by-laws to request their resignation. Mr. Sheridan stated that he would like to be able to visit with the staff and amongst the committee but as he stated in the email, "let's do amnesty." However, he felt that he would need to ask for some form of commitment to no further absences or ask for their resignation. Mr. Conger stated that he liked that approach.

Ms. Archibald asked to have her memory refreshed; how many meetings were they allowed to miss without being in violation of the by-laws? Dave Bright stated he thought it was one-third of the meetings. Mr. Sheridan stated that would be two; they had had several misses. He realized that everyone was busy and acknowledged that he would not be in attendance of the September 2006 meeting. The work they were tasked with was too important and with meeting only every two months, it came at them too quickly.

Mr. Sheridan thanked them for their guidance and stated that no one was happy to do that type of task. With that, he called for a motion to adjourn.

VII. Adjournment

Anita Davis moved to adjourn the meeting; Jerry Conger seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.