

ITEM #5

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
Friday, March 18, 2005
Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
12:00 pm

Vice-Chairman Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 12:07 pm.

Committee Members present:

| | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Mike Sheridan | Gregg Patterson |
| Casie Moran | Charles Pattison |
| Jess Van Dyke | Jerry Conger |
| Dianna Norwood | |

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Jim Davis | Phil Maher |
| Dave Bright | Jerry Oshesky |
| Ed Ringe | Ray Youmans |
| Steve Urse | Angela Richardson |
| Mark Llewellyn | Tammy Peters |
| Carolyn Kindell | |

Agenda Modifications

Mr. Sheridan, CAC Vice-chair, began the meeting by announcing agenda modifications: a revised Leveraging Update Agenda Item was distributed, and it was noted that Item 9 related to Segment 4 of the Capital Cascade Trail would need a CAC recommendation and would be moved up in the Agenda.

Informational Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

Phil Maher stated the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Office of Greenways and Trails recently approved Blueprint's grant request for \$300,000. Those funds would be used to purchase part of a 61-acre parcel on North Meridian Road. He further informed the committee the owner of Patty Sink was no longer interested in selling the property however, Mr. Barden might be interested in a conservation easement. It was noted that FCT had reviewed and re-scored the application, based on a conservation easement versus acquisition, and that Blueprint probably would no longer qualify for the FCT grant award. Therefore staff was preparing to contact the NFWMD regarding a partnership on the Patty Sink parcel.

Mr. Maher updated the committee on various land purchases on the horizon. Blueprint staff has received two appraisals on Copeland Sink and negotiations were underway with the owner. The

Timberlane Ravines parcels, which was the FCT grant the City of Tallahassee requested, would be removed from the docket because the owner of one of the parcels was no longer willing to sell.

Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint had advanced funded \$23.4 million to FDOT for right of way for the Capital Circle Northwest improvement project, with \$1.5 million reimbursement due in 2012 and \$22 million due in 2015. Discussions were underway which would provide this reimbursement on a more periodic basis. Mr. Davis stated that while the above information may not have seemed significant it would save Blueprint approximately \$4 million in loss of buying power, furthermore, sheer persistence was what brought that to fruition. Mr. Sheridan expressed his approval and called for questions or comments from the committee.

Jess Van Dyke asked if there was hope for Timberlane Ravines in the future. David Bright stated he had recently received an email from Craig Diamond stating there were three parcels involved with the project, and the problem was being caused by the large Middlebrooks parcel and the owners' desire not to sell. The owners of the two other parcels had reached an agreed upon price and the transaction should consummate a portion of the track. The City would resubmit the FT application in 2006 to request reimbursement from the FCT and possibly pursue the Middlebrooks parcel at a later time. Mr. Bright further stated regarding the Patty Sink parcel, the owner was not interested in selling the sink parcel itself but was interested in a conservation easement for it plus three additional parcels adjacent to Patty Sink. That would provide a larger conservation area than Blueprint originally anticipated; Kevin Pope was assisting with data compilation. This project may be completed through the Agreement between Blueprint and the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Mr. Bright also stated that Mr. Barden owned land in Jefferson County that the Water Management District might possibly be interested in obtaining to further preserve the basin.

Mr. Davis mentioned Capital Circle Northwest and the appropriation of \$10 million in the House version of the Transportation Bill.

Charles Pattison requested visual aids to assist with future leveraging updates given its importance to the program. Furthermore, he felt it would provide positive "press" for the general public to see that each dollar was being matched a number of times. Mr. Davis agreed that was a good recommendation and stated staff would consider it further. However, there were times that Blueprint received money but was unable to close the sale, the Timberlane Ravine and Patty Sink parcels were examples, where staff obtained matching funds but the owners eventually decided not to sell. Mr. Maher suggested reporting only on what was actually finalized. Mr. Davis agreed that was certainly possible. Mr. Bright also suggested the possibility of listing what was unconsummated on an annual basis.

Gregg Patterson mentioned one last leveraging point, and asked if anyone present was familiar with an amendment to the spending bill to change or "tighten up" deductions and tax benefits from conservation easements, which would have a tendency for persons to be less inclined to engage in them. No one present was familiar, however, Mr. Bright asked him to follow up with any information he obtained in the future. Mr. Sheridan asked staff to inquire with Congressman Allen Boyd's office. Mr. Maher stated that Kevin McGorty was "on top of that." Mr. Sheridan further asked if it was indeed happening to request Congressman Boyd to champion our position.

An observer of the meeting stated there was a Red Hills Alert regarding that issue on the Tall Timbers website (www.talltimbers.org). Mr. Sheridan suggested that Congressman Boyd might want to know just how important an impact that would be to the Blueprint program.

Sidebar: Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Davis how the monthly GEC and Engineering reports fit into the agenda. Mr. Davis clarified they were merely supplemental information updates for the courtesy of the members. Mr. Davis further stated staff could keep CAC members informed of future progress report meetings. Mr. Sheridan stated he would like to attend if his schedule permitted. Jerry Oshesky stated he would include CAC members on the meeting distribution list.

Mr. Sheridan, while the committee was off topic anyway, requested Mr. Maher to update the committee of the progress of the annual Blueprint Performance Audit. Mr. Maher stated it was on going and should hopefully be completed by the end of March 2005. Mr. Sheridan stated he understood that all interviews were complete. Mr. Davis stated Mr. Sheridan had more current information that staff did and it would more that likely remain that way until the final report was released. Dianna Norwood asked if it would be printed in the Democrat and if there was a publication date set. Mr. Maher stated the Audit would be in draft form until the IMC reviewed it and the IA approved it at the May 2005 meeting. The CAC was charged with reviewing the financial and performance audits. That would be completed at the CAC meeting prior to presentation to the IA.

Item #2 1000 Friends of Florida Better Community Award

Jerry Oshesky stated that Blueprint 2000 staff had applied for a "Better Community" award with the 1000 Friends of Florida. This Item was informational only. Additionally, staff recently applied for and received a national recognition award for the Blueprint2000.org website. Applying for awards is something Blueprint occasionally pursues to assist in positive recognition of the program. Mr. Bright stated that environmental preservation, multi-modal roadway design, enhanced stormwater, livable community issues, etc. were examples of the improvement of quality of life in Tallahassee as a result of Blueprint projects. Mr. Pattison, who is affiliated with 1000 Friends of Florida, stated that the Blueprint program received a similar award under the EECC. Mr. Davis stated that Santa Rosa County has requested Blueprint make a presentation to their community in May 2005 regarding the possibility of establishing a similar program there. Several members discussed the advantage of the holistic approach, combined environmental and transportation issues, versus unilateral attempts at one or the other.

Item #3 Capital Circle SE Design Consultant Selection (Tram Road to Woodville Highway, Blueprint Map 4)

Phil Maher stated eleven firms responded to the Request for Qualification (RFQ) for Capital Circle Southeast, however, one of the eleven was found not to meet the minimum qualification requirements. Of the ten firms which remained, five were short-listed and would receive the project scope and advance to oral interviews. The firms were Dyer, Riddle, Mills & Precourt, Inc., EC Driver & Associates, Inc., Kisinger Campo & Associates Corp., Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Inc., and URS Corporation Southern.

Item #4 Capital Circle NW/SW E-PD&E (US 90 to Orange Avenue, Blueprint Map 2A)

Jim Shepherd stated while there was overlap between the projects listed in items #4 and #5 he would attempt to explain them as clearly as possible. Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest, US

90 to Orange Avenue) Expanded Project Development & Environment (EPD&E) study also included design from just south of Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway. He further stated there were two major deadlines associated with the project, firstly, May 10, 2006 at which time the project consultant, H.W. Lochner, would have completed the EPD&E study, prepared approximately 60% design plans, prepared right-of-way maps and submitted all necessary permits. The second deadline would occur on May 10, 2007, at which time all permits would be obtained and any revisions to the right-of-way maps would be made based on negotiations with property owners. Mr. Shepherd explained the May 2006 date was the more important of the two because at that time staff could move to a design-build, or authorize Lochner to complete the design of the project. Currently, however, the design did not extend beyond Blountstown Highway. Mr. Maher stated the IA clearly directed staff to extend it down to Orange Avenue and that staff would be looking for funding to accomplish that.

Lochner has prepared a typical section package, access management plan and conceptual drawings for the project. These items would most likely be presented to the CAC at the May 2005 meeting. Staff had held four Project Advisory Group meetings and anticipated conducting the Alternatives Public Meeting in the summer of 2005. Mr. Davis stated staff was at the issue of meandering versus straight sidewalks, 230' versus 180' of right-of-way, etc which need to be answered but could hold up the typical section; those would be political decisions.

Jess Van Dyke asked about land acquisition near the cypress swamps. Mr. Davis stated the Board instructed staff to use the previously programmed stormwater retrofit and greenway money to construct Capital Circle SW to Orange Avenue. Mr. Van Dyke stated he thought that was mainly from the stormwater funding but also, apparently, included acquisition of greenspace as well. Mr. Davis stated it would take it all for construction. Mr. Bright interjected that staff was looking at 61 acres (Gibby property) they would like to purchase but how that would be financed was unclear. He further stated there were approximately 300 acres in the area which Blueprint "had their eye on" however there was not funding for it in the near future. Mr. Davis stated there was some money set aside and it could possibly still be purchased.

Mr. Van Dyke stated the reason he continued to mention the cypress swamps was that currently they could legally be cut to make cypress mulch. He was concerned about the stormwater attenuation and to protect the cypress resource that is vulnerable. Mr. Davis agreed he was correct. Ms. Norwood requested Mr. Bright indicate on the map the location of the Gibby property; he did stating it was southwest of Tennessee Street and Capital Circle Northwest. Additionally, at least half of the 61 acres was included in the 100-year flood plain. The owners are not on friendly terms with the City or County; staff was allowing things to settle down before attempting to negotiate a sale. Ms. Norwood asked what the property would be used for. Mr. Bright stated mainly floodplain and preservation in its natural state, and maybe a trail.

Sidebar: Mr. Davis stated there was a 215-acre tract northwest of Tennessee Street and Capital Circle Northwest (Atkinson property), which abuts a state park, and near some land the Seminole Boosters owns. Blueprint had the land appraised, it was in the urban services area and expensive, above \$25,000 per acre. If the \$10 million for Capital Circle in the House Transportation bill came to fruition, one of the things Mr. Davis would like to do was put it into that area. The bridging of Gum Swamp was the biggest wild card of the group; \$12 million was budgeted for a long bridge (worst case scenario) through that area. If a short bridge or some

structure that would facilitate the cross flow of the swamp and fauna were allowed, then as much as \$10 million could become available again for acquisition of the parcels mentioned earlier.

Charles Patterson asked to be reminded of the "turn-dirt" and completion dates. Mr. Davis stated the I-10 to US 90-segment contract would be let to construction in June 2005 and should turn-dirt late in 2005. Mr. Shepherd reiterated the deadlines he mentioned earlier are for the remainder of the project south of US 90 and clarified "*if it went to design build*" on the 2007 date. Mr. Davis emphasized that design-build was used when "it fit the project" but it may not have been appropriate for every segment of the project. Ms. Norwood asked for clarification of the term "design-build." Mr. Davis explained it was where Blueprint contracted with one firm to design and build the roadway, for example, Capital Circle Southeast is a design build project. M, Inc and C.W. Roberts in a joint venture would design and build that segment of Capital Circle. The design and building phases are completed sequentially thereby saving time and money by reducing conflicts between designers and contractors. Ms. Norwood asked if there were any negatives to the design-build approach. Mr. Davis stated there were generally fewer firms who submitted proposals and usually they were larger firms; meaning more money was required upfront. Typically the right-of-way (ROW) must be acquired and in ownership prior to releasing a project to design-build. The risk in that would be if there were one parcel, which was difficult to obtain, it could potentially delay the entire project.

Proceeding in that way was beneficial to Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest because of the Expanded PD&E. Typically ROW maps would not be obtained until the design phase, however, because of the EPD&E the maps could be obtained earlier. That would further the Blueprint goal of concurrency (completing the study, knowing where the alignment would be, begin acquisition of the right-of-way while the contractor completed the design). Mr. Davis estimated turning dirt on the US 90 to Blountstown segment in late 2007 or early 2008 and the construction would take approximately 24 months to complete.

Mr. Sheridan stated he had been looking for a place to introduce a comment made by a "to be unnamed elected official." Given that the issue of the "meandering of the sidewalk", issues over how much to spend and how wide the right-of-way should be...were there any circumstances which could be considered to eliminate the bike lanes along the sides of the road and to move them to the trail (walking/meandering). He did not need a response during the meeting but the official would like staff to research requirements and possibilities. The justification for the request was in the Official's opinion having the lane adjacent to the highway was dangerous and therefore would decrease the number of persons who would feel comfortable using it. If however the bike facility was incorporated into the sidewalk/trail area, the users could potentially increase with citizen perception of increased personal security. Mr. Pattison stated he would support the removal of the afore mentioned bike lanes.

Mr. Davis stated that staff would comply with the research request but cautioned that the roadway must meet the specification of FDOT roads and community desires. The elimination of one or any of those specifications may require an exception from the FDOT. They can be obtained but were usually difficult to come by.

Mr. Bright reminded the committee there were several existing parks and town-home developments being built along that segment of Capital Circle and the bike lanes, trail, and

sidewalks would be useful to the residents. Casie Moran stated in her opinion persons utilizing bicycles as transportation would prefer to keep the bike lane on the roadway. Mr. Pattison respectively disagreed and restated the reasoning given by the afore mentioned official. Mr. Bright agreed with Ms. Moran. Mr. Davis stated that based on information staff has received from the bicycle community, Ms. Moran was absolutely correct. The "dedicated cyclist" would indeed prefer to have the four-foot bike lane included at the edge of the highway. He also briefly mentioned the engineering advantages to having bike lanes adjacent to the highway but agreed to investigate the request further.

Item #5: Capital Circle SW Corridor Study (SR 20 to Springhill Road, Blueprint Map 2B)

Jim Shepherd stated the limits of the Capital Circle SW project were State Road 20 to Springhill Road. Blueprint staff had developed and conducted preliminary analysis on ten alternative alignments. The goal of the corridor study was to reduce the number of alternatives to three or four alignments which then would proceed through the entire EPD&E study process. The EECC/Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report recommended an alternative alignment (realignment) for CCSW in the limits defined above. The intended purpose of the proposed realignment was to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that flowed into the chain of lakes to provide easier, more direct access to Innovation Park and to provide additional economic development potential to the adjacent area.

To date Blueprint has held two Public Meetings and two Citizen Advisory Group meetings to allow the public to review the alignments, identify and discuss pertinent issues, and assist staff in reducing the number of alignments, determine cost and preliminary impacts. Following the completion of all public meetings staff would present their preferred recommendations to the IA. Mr. Shepherd discussed the study area, the ten alternatives and the maps, which were attached to the agenda.

Regarding Alternative 10 (west and south of the Airport), Ms. Norwood asked if Geddie Road versus Aenon Church Road was chosen in relation to I-10. Mr. Shepherd stated there were several reasons, mainly however, it was due to the headwaters of the chain of lakes crossing just south of Aenon Church Road. The impacts which would occur at Geddie Road (near Roberts Sand Company) were fewer than at Aenon Church Road. Ms. Norwood further stated if it were moved closer to Aenon Church Road the majority of impacts would be to Crowder-owned property, the landfill in particular, and would bring motorists closer in on US 90, splitting the difference between 90 and I-10. Mr. Shepherd stated the other issue which staff reviewed was to continue to use the existing route as best we could. The intent of the project and alternative 10 was to get to I-10 as quickly as possible. Given that the roadway would traverse the National Forest, staff felt aligning the roadway with the utility easement would have the least impact on the area. Ms. Norwood stated she had met with the Airport to determine their position on the realignment of CCSW and they stated the runway was the dividing line between City and Talquin Utilities; given that information, was Mr. Shepherd aware of who owned the easement in question? Mr. Shepherd noted that point in the process that level of investigation had not been preformed; all he was stating was if Alternative 10 was chosen, the utility easement had an existing impact on the forest and Blueprint would choose to build adjacent to that easement. Mr. Conger asked what the footprint of the impacted area would be. Mr. Shepherd stated that the drawings indicated a 300' footprint however the ultimate design would conform to the 230' right-of-way like the remainder of Blueprint's Capital Circle projects.

Mr. Shepherd further explained that was staff's first pass at the evaluation matrix to review the strength of each alternative, the number of possible relocations (both residential and commercial), 4F-land impacts (Federal Highway category regarding impacts to parks, recreational areas, cemeteries, etc.) Off the top of his head he thought the two sites involved in #10 were the National Forest and State Park.), and public institutional impacts as well as wetland and flood plain impacts. The alignments shown were not optimized options, however, when the project goes to the PD&E study there were many things the engineers could do in an attempt to reduce the impacts. The only two caveats to that analysis were the cemetery near the airport and remaining lands south of the power line. He further stated that additional environmental categories would be added. Mr. Maher reminded the committee that the cost estimates shown were in present day dollars and did not reflect future increases (or decreases) in costs.

Mr. Conger stated he attended the second public hearing regarding CCSW and commended staff on a fantastic job. He realized, however, that the project would be the most controversial issue the CAC and the Blueprint staff and Board would deal with. There were several groups (environmentalists, affordable housing supporters, national forest supporters, the Airport, etc) that each wanted something different for the same area. He wondered if at the next public hearing would the four staff recommendations be presented? Mr. Shepherd stated the game plan for the next public hearing was under development. The reason staff completed the corridor analysis was to narrow down the alternatives to save Blueprint money in the PD&E Study. If a consultant were chosen to review all 10 alternatives the cost would be significantly higher. By narrowing down the scope of the alternatives they were saving Blueprint money. Mr. Conger asked if the four staff recommendations would be shared with the CAC. Mr. Shepherd stated they had hoped to present the recommendations to the IA in May 2005, however that agenda was full so it would either wait until the September 2005 IA or a special meeting might be called. Mr. Davis interjected if obvious, straightforward information came out of the analyses then it would move forward to the May IA. It did not appear that would be the case and more discussion with the various groups would be required.

Mr. Conger stated for the last public meeting there was a significant amount of difficulty some people had in finding the location of the second meeting and it only amplified their fears on the project. Was there any way to make the location clearer to persons in the future? Mr. Shepherd explained there were directional signs at the meeting however the flimsy stands were basically worthless after several uses. He agreed with Mr. Conger that the three signs posted at the meeting held at Lively were not sufficient and staff was not familiar enough with the facility; the third meeting would be held at Tallahassee Community College again.

Jess Van Dyke stated that when he was a member of the EECC, the group favored an alternative away from the current Capital Circle alignment due to proximity of the chain of lakes and impacts of the runoff. If the current alignment was maintained and the roadway was significantly widened it would dramatically impact the chain of lakes. Additionally, realigning CCSW would add economic development potential by providing an intersection near Innovation Park as well as a more direct (straight) route; basically Alternative 6. The idea of approximately 100 residential relocations did not appeal to him however the satellite imagery presented appeared to show "holes" between the neighborhoods. He felt that Alternative 6 would provide

the most direct route, have the least environmental impact and lowest cost. Ms. Norwood asked to have Alternative 6 displayed on the screen for review by the committee. Mr. Sheridan asked if that review was necessary at that meeting. She stated she just wanted to see it. Mr. Van Dyke stated he just wanted to point it out to the committee because they knew it would be controversial. He further stated he had personally been on the receiving end of "eminent domain" and it was daunting, "a blunt sword that should not be used without reason." Mr. Sheridan explained they had been lectured on it, in fact, told to avoid it at all cost. A committee member corrected Mr. Van Dyke, the EECC concept fit with Alternative 7 not 6; Mr. Van Dyke agreed.

Ms. Norwood pointed out that the area of the map labeled 4A were proposed for intramural fields belonging to FSU that would be built long before CCSW construction. Mr. Sheridan was reminded of a recent conversation with T. K. Wetherell and felt it would be in Blueprint's best interest to have a high profile level of discussion, on a continual basis with FSU. Mr. Davis explained that staff was in ongoing dialogue with FSU. Mr. Van Dyke stated if it was intramural fields versus homes, wetlands and lakes... Mr. Sheridan expressed the basics of Mr. Wetherell's comments were that the City of Tallahassee was "trapping us, we have no place to go...we are the economic driver in this community even more so than state government and we need a place to expand." Mr. Sheridan speculated that Mr. Wetherell was developing a new doctrine of what he would and would not want in the community. It would be prudent to continue discussions with FSU. Mr. Davis stated he felt Blueprint staff had met specifically with them to discuss what they wanted to do. The Blueprint Board would review the information and determine which alternative was the best compromise for the community. Furthermore he reminded everyone present there were no construction dollars in the master plan at this time and frankly he did not have a good strategy to fund it. The reason for proceeding was to reserve the corridor preservation. He also agreed that CCSW would be the most controversial project Blueprint undertook.

Mr. Sheridan stated, if no other committee members had comments there was one citizen request to speak.

** Carolyn Kindell of the Florida Natural Areas Inventory introduced herself and stated the purpose of her organization: FNAI is a group which tracks rare plant and animals in the state and maintains a large database of their findings. One of their main functions was to assist the State in determining where to purchase conservation land. Another important function they provided was to assist local, state and federal conservation land managers with information on how to manage rare species in native eco-systems. She was there to express their concern on Alternative 10. It was undesirable because it promoted urban sprawl by segmenting what was a very high quality natural eco-system, that is federal conservation land. That alternative would fragment an extremely important landscape. Ms. Norwood asked what animal species resided in that area. Ms. Kindell stated they had tracked 80 rare plants in the total forest. In the vicinity of Alignment 10 there were records for 17 rare plants and animals, mostly animals; two of them being federally listed, the red-cockaded woodpecker and the indigo snake. There were seven state listed animals (snakes, birds, frogs and salamanders) and three state listed plants. Marcus Beard, District Ranger for the Apalachicola National Forest, drafted a letter to "committee members and concerned citizens" (see attachment). Mr. Shepherd stated it was hand-delivered to him at one of the public meetings. Ms. Kindell clarified she was not speaking on behalf of the

National Forest, simply sharing the letter for the committee's information only. She continued that the main issue was the impact of fragmentation of an extremely important ecological system. The matrix used to calculate cost did not consider the fragmentation issue. The land east of Alignment 10 was all sand hills; she was not certain of the exact acreage, but those lands would be cut off from the rest of the forest. Longleaf pine eco-systems cannot function unless they are control-burned, that cannot be managed through treatment with herbicides, that area would become un-burnable. It would not only fragment the landscape, threaten the lives of federally protected species, the indigo snake, but would also change forever the character of the sand hills because they would not be able to be burned.

Ms. Norwood asked if other alternatives were reviewed or if the Florida Natural Areas Inventory focused only on Alternative 10. Ms. Kindell stated only Alternative 10 was reviewed by her organization, however, they would be glad to run analyses for the other 9 alternatives. In summary Ms. Kindell reiterated the severe fragmentation impacts with the long-leaf pine eco-system. It created a high-speed/traffic roadway through a natural system that would have tremendous impact to herpetofauna in the area. The route also significantly impacted the area north of the roadway and the public enjoyment of it. The Apalachicola National Forest was an incredible bio-diversity resource; additionally it was not only a local issue but a global issue as well. Long-leaf pine sand hills were a globally imperiled community; (approximately) only 2% of the original community of the southeast coastal plain remained and the Apalachicola National Forest was at the heart of that 2%. The study by The Nature Conservancy and national group of heritage groups, released in 2000, identified 5 biological hot spots in the United States; the Florida panhandle was one of the five. Mr. Sheridan thanked her for her time and stated he felt she had made an impact on everyone present. He also asked her to provide additional information regarding her organization. She stated they were actually an adjunct office of FSU.

Consent Items

Item #6: CAC Meeting Minutes: January 13, 2005

Jess Van Dyke motioned to approve the January 13, 2005 minutes; Jerry Conger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7: CAC Meeting Minutes: January 19, 2005

Jess Van Dyke motioned to approve the January 19, 2005 minutes; Jerry Conger seconded the motion. Dianna Norwood apologized if it sounded as if she was criticizing the EECC, she was actually expressing her concern that current Blueprint staff stated "if it was not originally one of the EECC's concepts then they could not be creative now." (page 7, paragraph 3, lines 3-5) Mr. Davis clarified that she was criticizing Blueprint staff not the EECC, she replied, "Yes". With that changed noted and no further corrections, the motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion/Action

Item #8: Capital Cascade Trail Update

Mr. Bright reminded the committee of the considerable discussions at the January 2005 meetings of the CAC and TCC regarding the Capital Cascade Trail alternatives. The TCC in particular

could not recommend moving ahead with the staff-recommended alternatives due to, in their opinion, lack of technical data on the effectiveness of the alternatives. Staff chose to present the Capital Cascade item as information only to the IA on January 31, 2005. The IA however, took the following action:

1. Segment 1 (Franklin Boulevard): Recommended the 4-lane roadway concept with underground box culvert conveyance. The IA indicated that they wanted additional study completed by the City and the County to investigate additional off site storage capacity (Leon High School), and indicated the issues of the TCC related to stormwater velocities, box culverts used for storage, etc. needed to be addressed.
2. Segment 2 (Cascade Park): Recommended Concept E, with as flat and green as field as possible in the lower segment (versus the amphitheater); noted some concerns with putting the holding pond on the site of the contamination and requested staff review that issue. (Staff noted that the pond is to be lined and EPA may have a say in the issue.)
3. Segment 3 (FAMU Way/Gaines Street) and Segment 4 (Gamble Street south to the Munson Slough): Passed staff recommendation (Concept A and Concept C, respectively.)
4. Project Phasing: the IA passed a motion to move Segment 4 construction into Tier 1. They also accepted a construction sequence of Segment 2, 4, 3, 1. (Note: Franklin Boulevard is last.) "Capital Circle NW/SW, I-10 to the Airport, is to be funded before Segment 1 of the Capital Cascades Trail."

Additional discussion came from the TCC (City and County technical staff) meetings and subsequent stormwater and growth management sub committee meetings which resulted in the nine-page correspondence from Mark Llewellyn of the Genesis Group (which was attached to the Agenda Item). Mr. Davis interjected that agreement was nearly impossible based on the "stormwater history" between the City and County. Blueprint, he continued, was in an untenable position between the two entities. The goal of Blueprint staff was to identify the areas where consensus could not be reached, present them to the Board and compel the IA to make a decision. He further stated that was the only realistic expectation of an outcome. This issue would only be resolved if the joint water resource board became a functioning entity; Blueprint was merely it's precursor.

Based on Mr. Davis comments, Mr. Sheridan stated the CAC should act in a "worst case scenario" format meaning they would have to take the leadership role and force the issue in the IA. Charles Pattison stated the true power of the CAC was in the "court of public opinion." He understood the frustration of staff but refused to accept a "worst case scenario." He felt the CAC in the "court of public opinion" could demonstrate the negative impacts the City and County's indecision has, and would continue to have on similar projects, to sway the actions and opinions of the IA.

Given that situation, Mr. Pattison asked if there was potential for the City and County not coordinating, was there anything which affected the CAC's ability to recommend what should happen in Segment 4 (reference to Agenda Item #9) Mr. Davis stated the only thing the CAC would be asked to do in Item #9 was to comment on moving construction of Segment 4 from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint program. It had nothing to do with engineering or technical issues. Mr. Pattison asked if that was not what the committee did in January. Mr. Sheridan interjected that the CAC had recommended this, however, the IA acted on it and now a super-

majority vote of the IA was required to implement the change. Mr. Davis stated that to complete the change from Tier 2 to Tier 1, two public hearings were required, and recommendations and comments from the CAC and TCC. Technically the CAC had already made their recommendation, however, in reference to Agenda Item #9, it would formalize the CAC's position.

Mr. Pattison stated he had recently received a copy, from Nancy Miller, of the discussion between Growth Management, Stormwater and "somebody else." It was a large document, approximately two inches thick; that gave the impression, under the guise of urban development and affordable housing, of how the City could streamline permitting efforts and lower costs. All of which would affect stormwater, TMDL's, etc. In his opinion the discussions had not considered how that arena would affect Blueprint projects. Mr. Davis stated all the variables, which could affect Blueprint were huge. The TMDL issues alone, if activated in fullness, would bankrupt the entire project. His goal was, if the issue moved at typical City and County rates, to have Capital Cascades Trail completed before anything was enacted; even if it was ten years in the future. Blueprint's job was to deal with issues of the present; identify points of conflict and resolve them. There were several issues in the community which impacted Blueprint and many times Blueprint has been suggested to undertake certain functions of the community which far exceeded the charter of Blueprint. For example the economic development of downtown, like the River City Company of Chattanooga. One of the Commissioners promoted the idea of Blueprint managing all buildings, stormwater policy and mitigation, etc. These were all wonderful ideas however, while Blueprint was flattered to be considered, it just was not possible at that time based on staff and funding issues. Mr. Pattison stated he understood, and felt there should at the very least be a cursory overview and assessment, possibly comment as well, that there would be implications for Blueprint 2000. Furthermore it did not appear to be a part of the equations at that point.

Mr. Sheridan suggested having the CAC Chairman send a letter to various officials, stating the impact several items in said proposal would have on Blueprint 2000. Moreover, Blueprint 2000 had some priorities and request them not make decisions without consideration, consultation and integration of the Blueprint philosophy. Mr. Davis stated he would like to hold the CAC in reserve, so to speak. If in the future staff felt they had exhausted all available avenues the CAC could be brought in at that time. He felt comfortable that at least two people, Michael Wright and Vince Long, of the City and County respectively, were extremely cognizant of Blueprint efforts. Mr. Davis reminded the committee of the TCC and the charge of the TCC was to stay abreast of current events. He agreed that Mr. Pattison was right and assured the committee that Blueprint would investigate the issue in greater detail but until actual ramifications were known and the proposal was more developed, he would prefer not to comment. Mr. Sheridan interjected that he did not feel the necessity to "put them on notice." Mr. Davis stated he was correct. Mr. Pattison asked for a follow up, relative to Blueprint, of the aforementioned issues at the May 2005 CAC meeting. Mr. Davis agreed.

Jerry Conger stated he felt uncomfortable in attempting to reach a decision on what the TCC was or was not doing or any ongoing quarrels between the City and County. He did not feel prepared to assist with technical issues, political or philosophical yes, but not technical. Mr. Davis stated some of the issues would be policy. Mr. Conger stated that it would be important for staff observation and clarification. Mr. Davis agreed wholeheartedly.

Jess Van Dyke stated besides "watching the till," which he felt was the most important charge of the CAC, the second most important was "trying to find the truth" in the arguments between the City and County. He felt the committee was capable of doing just that and that it would be a wonderful advancement for the community. Mr. Davis stated the issue with Capital Cascade Trail could serve as a wonderful example of differences and force the City and County to make joint plans and decisions for the future. Mr. Sheridan stated the CAC was not appointed to be "watchdogs," however, to the extent that their activities affect Blueprint it was under their purview.

Mr. Sheridan asked if there was further discussion of the update and noted the full January 31, 2005 IA minutes were attached to the agenda for review. Mr. Bright thanked Ms. Norwood for the suggestion of duplexing the agenda and remarked on how much paper was saved. She commented on how interesting the IA minutes were to read.

Sidebar: Mr. Davis mentioned a recent meeting he had with Leon County Superintendent of Schools, Bill Montford, in which Mr. Montford agreed to review the possibilities of a stormwater pond at Leon High School. He further stated that Genesis was in the process of developing preliminary sketches of how it could possibly look or what would need to be constructed. Several options were discussed some being (A) elevating the existing parking lot and installing a pond underneath, (B) excavate the site, back fill with a course aggregate and pave over it; the water would be stored between the aggregate, (C) a dry pond on the existing field the dimensions of a soccer field, contiguous to the baseball field, that could be used for recreation when dry.

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail: Addition of the Construction of Segment 4 into Tier 1 of the Blueprint program

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Davis to provide the motion which the CAC would vote to approve. He continued that as he understood it the vote was not to change anything already approved by the committee but simply to formalize the decision, trigger the public hearings and to provide for the super-majority vote as required to move the recommendation to Tier 1.. Dave Bright referred to section 9 of the Interlocal Agreement (Amendment, Deletion or Additions to Projects) to clarify why this issue was before the CAC again. Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Bright and Mr. Davis discussed possibilities of language for the motion until Ms. Norwood asked if it could simply state, "The CAC recommends moving construction of Segment 4 Capital Cascades Trail from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint program?" Mr. Davis stated she was exactly right. Charles Pattison agreed to second the motion with one clarification. Had the IA seen the comments of the January CAC meetings? Mr. Bright stated they were included with the January 31, 2005 agenda. He requested to have reference made to those comments in the motion. Mr. Sheridan clarified that Ms. Norwood's motion included the comments of the January 13th and 19th meetings of the CAC. She agreed; Mr. Pattison seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Mr. Davis wanted everyone aware that the proposed Segment 4 concept could change based on engineering and geotechnical data that has yet to be collected and analyzed. He further clarified that the committees voted on the concept to construct Segment 4, moving it from Tier 2 to Tier 1 with no other details. Mr. Bright mentioned that Commissioner Lightsey did in fact anticipate changes based on the forthcoming data. Ms. Norwood stated that she agreed.

Mr. Patterson asked for clarification regarding Segment 1. Mr. Bright stated that Segment 1 was still a Tier 1 project however it was moved to fourth of the four sections. The suggested construction sequence was Segment 2, 4, 3, 1. Mr. Davis stated that the IA had effectively reallocated the money in the Blueprint master plan for Segment 1 to build Segment 4. Therefore Segment 1 construction was likely unfunded with the current sales tax revenue.

V. Citizens to be Heard

There were no additional Citizens to be heard.

VI. Items From Members of the Committee

Mr. Davis updated the CAC on the Action 2010 Committee meeting he recently attended. There were two significant issues which came out of it, one being concurrency. If a property owner was willing to donate right-of-way, the donation action could be made an incentive by providing concurrency to the property owner. The same idea was discussed regarding wetland mitigation or wetland banking, in particular, how it could be used to help fund Segment 4 of Capital Cascade Trail. (Example: If a developer, somewhere in town, said he did not want 15 acres of \$30,000 an acre property used for a holding pond on his property, but was willing to donate an equivalent amount to Blueprint 2000 for the water quality and stormwater ponds south of town in return for not having to do that on site.) The 2010 committee felt it was a practice that could be implemented in the community. Additionally, there was some concern regarding the divergence of money for stormwater retrofit for Capital Circle Northwest down to Capital Circle construction from Orange to Blountstown.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business Casie Moran moved that they adjourn. Jess Van Dyke seconded it. The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 pm.