

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, April 3, 2008
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members present:

Tom O’Steen	Jerry Conger
Jess Van Dyke	Kevin McGorty
Nancy Miller	Kathy Archibald (telephonically)
Hugh Brown	Scott Balog
Wilson Barnes	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Dave Bright	Gary Phillips
Jim Davis	Latesa Turner
Phil Maher	Margie Quillman
Dave Snyder	Angela Richardson
Jim Shepherd	Paco de la Fuente
Andrew Orr	Ray Youmans
Echo Gates	Harry Reed
James Bailey	Nathan Bailey

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications for this meeting. Although, Dave Bright introduced new staff members David Snyder, GEC Program Manager and Ray Youmans, Right-of-Way Manager, and intern Andrew Orr.

Sales Tax and Master Plan Workshop

Jim Davis stated that the projected decline in sales tax revenue was worse than expected. Therefore staff would be taking a revised Master Plan to the Board at the June 2, 2008 Intergovernmental Agency meeting that reflected anticipated reductions in revenue. He solicited input from the Committee and clarified that staff was not making any recommendations as to which projects would have decreased funding or be eliminated all together. However, Blueprint was faced with a \$100 million reduction to the total budget.

Phil Maher explained that Blueprint’s sales tax revenue came two months in arrears. Therefore the agency had only just received the January 2008 allocation which was approximately 2% below last year’s level. There was an 8% decrease in December 2007 which was extraordinary; when and or if that leveled off remained to be seen.

Mr. Maher stated that he had met with the Legislative staff economist shortly after the conclusion of the state's Revenue Estimating Conference. He distributed a copy of the executive summary of that conference and offered a brief overview of their perspective for the next five years. The conference offered a base line, however, he did not think that Blueprint would follow the same trends as the state.

Blueprint staff would be meeting with their Finance Committee and financial advisors on Monday, April 7, 2008. The purpose of which was to come to a consensus on growth rates for Blueprint to use in the Master Plan and for the Capital Budget. He reminded the Committee that things were subject to change in one to two years.

He stated that Blueprint based the original Master Plan on a 4.5% growth rate in tax receipts. At the last Finance Committee meeting they evaluated the Master Plan with 0.5 % growth for two years before returning to 4.5%, and a second scenario with 1.5% growth rate for two years before returning to 4.5%. Presently, however, staff felt even that was extremely optimistic. Mr. Maher could not estimate what Blueprint would use until staff met with the Finance Committee. He suspected however that there would be no growth in the current year and only minimal growth in the next. Whether Blueprint returned to the 4.5% growth the following year (2010) would be questionable. He used the 0.5% growth estimate for the analysis before them; it also provided the \$73M reduction in tax receipts listed.

Mr. Maher stated he received an e-mail from Lamar Taylor who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Taylor felt that the Committee should be focusing on two things. First identifying and quantifying the current financial and legal commitments of the organization that cannot be scaled back without threat of legal action. Second identifying and prioritizing from the remaining projects, those projects which could be scaled back or cut if funding dries up.

Mr. Maher reviewed the Master Plan by year: Beginning in 2006 there was a \$350,000 reduction; that was reflective of the County Water Quality allocation. The Master Plan was modified to show the allocation in the same fiscal year as indicated in County documents (2006 to 2007). Staff worked from an approved \$109M budget in 2007, but only \$44M was actually invoiced. The difference was carried forward to the 2008 budget.

Also, Mr. Maher reviewed the Master Plan by project: There were no changes made to the \$50M allocated for Water Quality for the City and County, nor to the Sensitive Lands projects. There should have been \$10M in the Land bank, however, at the beginning of 2008 the IA authorized staff to transfer \$2.6M to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 for an early implementation of the design; with the understanding that the design dollars, in the out years, would be moved to the Landbank. It was a net loss, for the short term at least. Mr. Maher stated that he did not make any further cuts to the Landbank because it allowed Blueprint to acquire land early (ROW or Sensitive Lands). Secondly, the land bank was a contingency.

Capital Circle NW (I-10 to 90) is complete with the exception of additional stormwater retrofit in the out years. The \$9M proposed for that was eliminated. The \$2M for Greenways in 2008 remained untouched. For Capital Circle NW/SW (90 to Orange) again, the stormwater retrofit, in the out years, was reduced by approximately \$3.3M and moved out by one year. However Blueprint had acquired between \$6M and \$7M in stormwater and mitigation property along the

corridor. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had \$42M in State SIS funds and \$8M in Federal funds that they were using to acquire ROW. Blueprint received that funding based on commitments to both entities that the project would be built. Therefore, "let's not do that segment anymore" was not an option from staff's perspective.

Mr. Maher continued, Capital Circle SE E1 (Connie to Tram) was under contract and nearing completion. CCSE E2 (Woodville to Tram) was currently under contract and under construction. The 60% design had been completed for CCSE E3 (Woodville to Crawfordville); construction on E3 was never funded. On Capital Circle SW W1 (Crawfordville to Orange) the \$27M allocated for design and ROW had been eliminated.

Mr. Davis noted that W1 was partially funded at best to begin with. Depending on the alignment construction could be around \$200M; Blueprint had only \$27M allocated. Kathy Archibald clarified that staff would complete the PD&E and determine the future alignment but they were not moving forward with ROW acquisitions or design. Mr. Davis concurred and stated Blueprint would be able to protect the identified alignment and ROW based upon City Ordinances until the money became available.

Capital Cascade Trail General and Segment 1 would be completely unfunded under the new scenario. It would have been the last segment of Capital Cascade Trail to be completed at approximately \$43M. The \$9.7M listed in program management for General/Segment 1 was actually the Program Management allocation for all segments of Capital Cascade Trail. Mr. Maher reiterated that under the proposed 0.5% growth scenario Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 would be eliminated.

Kevin McGorty questioned how eliminating Segment 1 would affect the total stormwater engineering concept. Mr. Davis explained that each segment had been identified, from a concept standpoint, to function independently. Segment 2 would make some improvements to the stormwater issues but it would not eliminate the flooding on Franklin Boulevard. Segment 2 had been designed to accommodate the storm water from Segment 1 however; that remained unchanged. Nevertheless, due to the restraints of the ditch and the dip in the road on Franklin, that area would continue to flood. Even the \$5M proposed for interim improvements was no longer available under this scenario.

However, if Segment 3 and Segment 4 could be implemented to store the water in those areas the impact to the whole stormwater system would be greatly enhanced. Water would be captured, attenuated, and treated. Also staging of the water in the park itself could be controlled as well. Until Segment 1 was completed though, the amount of water entering the park would remain unchanged from today. The overall drainage structure would be improved but not to the optimum.

Jerry Conger noted that the public perception that would be generated by eliminating Segment 1 might not be the type of recognition Blueprint wanted. Mr. Davis agreed but also stated that the IA determined that Segment 1 would be the last segment to be addressed. Construction was not programmed until 2016. Mr. Maher stated that the \$43M included design; a decision could be to eliminate another segment or project. The scenario was at the point where someone would be required to make difficult choices and decisions. All of the projects were viable but the cuts had

to come from somewhere. Segment 3 and Segment 4 were moved out a few years under the 0.5% growth scenario. By doing so however, inflation caused the cost estimates to increase.

Mr. Maher stated that when staff returned with the Master Plan in May/June 2008 it could be less than the \$549M; if, coming out of the Finance Committee meeting on April 7, 2008, the numbers were less (worse) than the 0.5% growth for the next two years and 4.5% there on out, what was left of the Master Plan would be negatively impacted.

Regarding Segment 3 and Segment 4, Mr. Davis stated that staff was in the preliminary phase of designing them. Once they reached 60% design the impacts could be evaluated and the decision made as to which segment would be carried to 100% design, Segment 3 or Segment 4. Based upon that decision one segment would move forward but not both.

Mr. Davis requested that the Committee propose a prioritization of the projects to be reduced or for elimination. Kathy Archibald stated she was more concerned with how they would be re-prioritized once revenues increased. Mr. Maher noted Blueprint's success with grants, and stated they would continue to target those that were applicable. Also, FDEP had a revolving loan program that Blueprint could borrow money for stormwater projects. It would be less costly than selling bonds. However, Mr. Davis stated, the state was experiencing their own economic shortfalls. In fact, there was currently a bill before the Legislature that would take \$3.3 Billion from the Transportation Trust Fund over five years. The current five-year Work Program was \$1.4 Billion short. Furthermore, he stated, that he would not be surprised if TRIP, SIB loans, and additional SIS funding were significantly reduced.

Kathy Archibald agreed that times were tough and recommended that staff focus on completing as much of Capital Cascade Trail as they could. Having the designs in place so that they were ready when the funding became available was, she felt, appropriate. However, eliminating Segment 1 of Capital Cascade Trail was not to her liking either. She commended staff for making the best of a bad situation however.

Tom O'Steen questioned what would happen if rather than the anticipated 0.5% growth there was zero or even negative. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint would have their financial advisors run a cash flow proforma of the revenue consensus. The projects would be readjusted to balance the bottom line which might mean moving them out or eliminating them. As it stood the next projects to be eliminated would be construction of another segment of Capital Cascade Trail or some of the environmental or Sensitive Lands projects.

Mr. Maher stated that under the current cash scenario, funding was available to finance the cost of the projects for the next couple years. Beyond that it would cause staff to increase the next bond sale in order to fund the remainder of the projects. Blueprint sold \$75M in bonds in September 2007 and anticipated returning for a third bond sale in 2010 and another smaller one after that. He did not see any reason to readjust the current year budget. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint's priority was to complete the projects they had begun as well as, to protect the Water Quality money and the Land Bank.

Kevin McGorty questioned the reduction to funding in projects when \$10M was still allocated for the Mahan project. Mr. Maher stated that the State was to sign the development order soon

for the Capital Circle Office Center DRI. The development order was contingent upon Mahan Drive being completed within three years. Under that the State has made a commitment to fund FDOT \$26M, along with Blueprint's \$10M, over the next three years to build Mahan. Reallocating that \$10M would result in the loss of the \$26M match.

Mr. McGorty stated that he was extremely concerned with the elimination of Segment 1 of the Capital Cascade Trail. He did not agree with shifting funds from C2, C3 or C4 to fund C1. The only reason C1 was delayed was because they were struggling to reach consensus on flooding, design, the roadway, and what Leon High School might contribute. He commended Mr. Maher for his talent in trimming the budget as he did and requested that the CAC, at a minimum, be strongly in favor of the restoration of those funds when funding became available.

Mr. Maher concurred and stated that it could be the time to take a hard look at some of the environmental projects. Money had been allocated for the Lafayette flood plain, for example, for several years, yet there had been no identifiable parcels to acquire. That could be an interim solution for flooding in C1. There were few road projects remaining that the funds could be transferred from. Mr. McGorty stated that what remained should be balanced. He did not want to say at the end, that the balance was tipped for roads with only fragments of environmental projects being completed. That was, in his opinion, what Capital Cascade Trail represented. Mr. Maher agreed and stated that Capital Cascade Trail was an environmental project.

Nancy Miller disagreed and stated that it was environmental opposition that caused the IA to change the priority on Franklin Boulevard. Mr. McGorty stated that he did not have any solutions but wanted to bring the subject to everyone's attention. Mr. Davis stated that using 0.5% as the base line for projected growth there remained approximately \$140M in Capital Cascade Trail Segments 2 through 4. If the CAC offered guidance of reallocating funds from non-defined specific projects (Headwaters of the St. Marks, Lack Jackson Basin, Lafayette Floodplain) to the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1, because they recognized it to be a greater priority than stormwater retrofit on CCNW/SW; staff could clearly do that.

Ms. Archibald stated she would be more inclined to re-appropriate the nebulous greenway and stormwater funding from CCNW/SW to CCT Segment 1 than to move Sensitive Land funding. Mr. Maher clarified that of the \$42M in NW/SW ROW included approximately \$6.5M in mitigation property. It was reflected in ROW on the Master Plan but was in actuality stormwater retrofit and was unrelated to the road itself. Mr. Davis stated that he was reticent to move all of it because there were indications that Blueprint would be short ROW dollars on NW/SW. The use of some of the stormwater retrofit allocations could pay for mitigation properties, if necessary. However, he also understood the validity of the funding being in the out years. Nonetheless, they could be re-allocated if they remained in the same years (2018-2020) and were not lost.

Nancy Miller stated that, in her opinion Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 was a road project and by re-allocating those funds it appeared that they were moving stormwater money to a road project. In reviewing a breakdown of the costs, more money would be spent on pavement than on stormwater. Segment 1 was merely conveyance anyway. Ms. Archibald agreed and noted that it was not anyone's "fault" there was a road on top of the conveyance system.

Jess Van Dyke noted that the sentiments expressed were the heart of the controversy with Segment 1. It was a flooding issue not a water quality issue nevertheless it was still stormwater. Ms. Archibald felt it was more of a public relations / public perception issue than anything. Ms. Miller stated that she understood and would support it if the other segments were built first, as they were of a higher priority. The Committee agreed.

Mr. Davis stated that the plan then would be that staff would re-appropriate the full \$11.7M currently designated for greenway and stormwater retrofit near CCNS/SW in 2018-2020 to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 in the same years. The committee concurred. Mr. Davis confirmed that doing so would have no impact on Blueprint's ability to meet the deliverables or objectives of the grants received.

Information Items

Item #2: Leveraging Update

In regards to the return of grant funding from Florida Communities Trust (FCT), which would have acquired the Myers Industrial Park, Kathy Archibald questioned if it was because it required matching funds. Mr. Davis stated that funding from FCT came with so many restrictions and conditions; Blueprint simply could not satisfy them. Mr. McGorty questioned if there would be any political fall out from Blueprint declining the grant. Mr. Bright stated that with FCT there were no problems and FCT was grateful that Blueprint did not drag the process on longer than necessary so that they could reallocate the funds.

Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update

Mr. Davis stated in regards to the Dog Park, that City Stormwater had lobbied against the Dog Park to the City Commission. It therefore did not make it beyond the City's Environmental and Energy Resources Target Issue committee.

Gary Phillips briefly discussed the amphitheater area and noted that in the worst rain event conditions, the stage area could flood. However, the Meridian Plaza was at a high enough elevation for it not to flood, even during the worst storms.

In regards to the natural fluctuation of water, Ms. Archibald questioned how much water would be stored with the construction of the park. Mr. Gary Phillips stated that it would total 82 acre-feet of storage.

Ms. Archibald also referred to the Development Standards of Environmental Management and strongly recommended the collection of samples for water quality analyses. Therefore if there were any questions later regarding the quality, there would be documentation to show that it was in fact improved with the project. Mr. Phillips stated that samples had been collected as part of the alum injection study. Ms. Archibald suggested collecting samples on a more regular basis for backup data. Along with having a warning system to vacate the park in case of the magnitude of the storm that would flood the stage. Ms. Archibald also mentioned that there was a certain public liability that went along with flooding or a storm approaching with a large amount of rainfall. Mr. Phillips stated that there were emergency call boxes throughout the park and could be used as speakers from the control area. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had talked

about the lights flashing in those situations, along with a very stern message coming out of Boca Chuba.

Scott Balog stated that Ms. Archibald brought up a good point and in regards to higher education in what has happened at Virginia Tech, in consideration to finding ways to communicate effectively to a larger audience in an emergency. Mr. Phillips stated that a police substation would be adjacent to the bathhouse. It would allow the police to be in the park on a regular basis, with a computer system to be able utilize the speaker system. They would also be able to help with the security in the park in general.

Ms. Archibald questioned the steel sheet pile walls versus the concrete wall. Would there be vegetation covering them, or was it an architectural element of itself? Dave Snyder stated that the steel sheet pile wall would have plants which would eventually cascade over the walls and cover the rustic steel sheet piling. The sheet piling was designed to retain the fill adjacent to the railroad. With the railroad setting, the park planner wanted a steel sheet system running to both ends of the Boca Chuba bridge, with cascading vegetation. The particular steel sheets would oxidize within one year and then stop, then have a rustic look.

Item #4: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park

Nancy Miller stated that she would like to use recycled plastic materials for the benches and hoped to see Blueprint continue this trend with future projects. Mr. Snyder stated that Blueprint was filing for permits and he reviewed the specs for the use of recycled plastic material.

Item #5: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update

Mr. Van Dyke stated in regards to the possible donation of fish from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation, there was a fish called the red-ear sunfish (shell cracker), which ate snails. It would be beneficial to have a large population of them, as a biological control, to protect the vegetation. He also requested to have the county post a sign stating that it would be ok to fish there; that was the caveat to getting "free" fish from FWC. Mr. Davis stated that rather than a sign allowing fishing he felt we should try to keep the County from putting up signs saying "No Fishing". The County's concern would be the human consumption of fish harvested from a pond that by design, was intended to remove impurities from runoff.

Wilson Barnes questioned if there would be an agency to periodically check the water quality for a minimal threshold for health requirements. Mr. Van Dyke stated that he did not feel there was enough analyses on all of the water bodies in the region. The fish consumption advisories were based on the quantity of meals per month. Realistically, however, he did not see how Blueprint could fund the extensive and expensive study to determine whether or not the fish from Regional Stormwater Pond 1's fish would be fit for consumption or not. There were other issues to worry about; if though Blueprint could receive free fish and keep the vegetation alive, he did not see that it would bring harm to anyone.

Mr. Van Dyke moved for the committee to state a preference to allow fishing in the pond in order to receive free red-ear sunfish. Mr. McGorty seconded the motion.

Mr. Van Dyke stated that he would like to have signage suitable that would satisfy FWC

requirements, and worried that without the signs Blueprint would not receive the fish. Mr. Davis stated that he would rather allow passive fishing than actively disallow it.

The motion passed unanimously.

Item #6: Capital Circle SE Completion and Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

This item was informational only.

Item #7: Capital Circle NW/SW Access Management Public Hearing

This item was informational only.

Consent Items

Item #8: CAC Minutes: February 7, 2008

Dave Bright noted that Lamar Taylor had provided language revising a few sentences to clarify what he stated in reference to the legal commitments that couldn't be changed in the Master Plan, and Dave noted he would revise the minutes per Lamar's comments (on page 8 and 9 of 10). **Mr. McGorty moved approval of the minutes. Mr. Van Dyke seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion

There were no presentations for the Committee.

Citizens To Be Heard

James Bailey expressed his concern with the Tanglewood properties; he stated that he and his son own approximately 23 lots; 14 of which have homes on them. He gave an extensive history of Tanglewood. The recent history included: In 2005 Blueprint selected Tanglewood as the site for flood plain and wetland mitigation. In 2007 Blueprint received authority from the Intergovernmental Agency to acquire property within Tanglewood. Throughout 2007, relocation agents and appraisers visited Tanglewood making contact, discussing acquisition with the owners and tenants. The property owners were told to expect offers by November/December 2007 and then again in January/ February 2008. In January owners met with appraisers and right-of-way agents and were told that they would be relocated. February 7, 2008, owners (the Baileys) attended the TCC and CAC meetings to find that Blueprint had found another site. Furthermore, Blueprint stated that the new site was cheaper; but he has not seen actual figures on that. He also shared photographic examples with the CAC of the repercussions of flooding in Tanglewood.

Mr. Davis stated that he concurred with Mr. Bailey and that everything stated was accurate. Tanglewood was a problematic area. It was identified by the County for Blueprint to try to acquire for mitigation. Blueprint started an evaluation process, standard procedure, looking at Tanglewood. Right-of-way estimates were done, but they had not gotten to the appraisal part in the process. They identified each mobile home site at \$75,000 and used that amount as the basis for the budget process.

Blueprint was looking at the Tanglewood site for attenuation and water quality purposes. As part of the investigation, Blueprint also investigated an alternative site on Gum Road. That site appeared to be more financially advantageous, and it provided more water quality than originally thought. Tanglewood was originally looked at for flood plain mitigation. However the alternative site was better suited for Blueprint's requirements.

Letesa Turner stated that Tanglewood was initially looked at as mitigation for a flood plain. It was believed that if Blueprint needed it to be from a flood plain mitigation perspective that additional wetland and water quality could be provided for on that site. The Board approved acquisition of the parcel off of Gum Road for potential additional flood plain mitigation, as well as storm water management. That was not the new alternative site that Mr. Bailey is alluding to. It was another parcel that Blueprint had previously received approval to acquire for a storm water pond.

Ms. Turner further stated that Blueprint received additional geotechnical information that determined that all of the flood plain mitigation requirements could be met on the site off of Gum Road, where the pond is proposed for construction. That site could not only provide storm water management for the project, but well and above and beyond, in terms of capacity, for flood plain mitigation as well. The alternative site that continued to be mentioned was something that Blueprint would continue to look at for additional wetland mitigation.

Mr. Bailey stated how amazed he was on the timing and how recently this was discovered. Ms. Turner stated Blueprint had not received the geotechnical information until December 2007. Mr. Davis stated Blueprint tried to be proactive through the entire process. The information available had changed. The bottom line was that the Tanglewood property was no longer needed for the project. Mr. Davis stated that a letter was drafted and approved by him and would be sent to the property owners and tenants. Blueprint had to follow the relocation rules provided by the Federal Government because there was federal money involved. Blueprint received \$8 million for that segment, for construction, however there was no additional money for relocation.

Mr. McGorty stated that he did not believe that the issue was in the purview of Blueprint and that staff did their due diligence. From a timing stand point, he stated that he wished that there was better communication because expectations were raised and people's lives were affected.

Jerry Conger noted that Mr. Davis stated that a letter was forthcoming that would provide the information that Mr. Bailey requested.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 p.m.