

**Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes**  
Friday, April 28, 2006  
Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center  
1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109  
12:30 pm

Chairman, Michael Sheridan called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm.

**Committee Members present:**

Jerry Conger	Michael Sheridan
Jess Van Dyke	Charles Pattison
Bob Henderson	Kevin McGorty
Terence Hinson	Gregg Patterson

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

Jim Davis	Randy Matheny
Dave Bright	Shelonda Gay
Phil Maher	Joan Brown
Jerry Oshesky	Brandie Miklus
Bill Little	Vince Long
Bonnie Pfuntner	Tony Park
Doug Martin	Nancy Miller

**Agenda Modifications**

There were no modifications made to the agenda. Dave Bright introduced several new employees including Randy Matheny, Brandie Miklus, and Joan Brown.

**Consent Items**

**Item #1: Transportation Regional Incentive Program Resolution**

Phil Maher presented Consent Item #1. Mr. Maher informed the committee that Blueprint 2000 received a Joint Participation Agreement from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in relation to a Transportation Regional Incentive Program grant in the amount of \$4,337,500 for Capital Circle SE from Tram Road to Woodville Highway. Mr. Maher explained that the Agreement requires a resolution by the Board delegating signature authority to the Chairman or his designee to execute the Agreement. **Jess Van Dyke moved to pass the Consent Agenda to approve the proposed Transportation Regional Incentive Program Resolution; Bob Henderson seconded the motion. No discussion; motion carried unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion

**Item #2: IA Item: Mahan Drive: Reconsideration of a Previous Vote**

Jim Davis noted to the Committee that Item #2 is the main reason for the special meeting and thanked the Committee for prioritizing their schedules on such short notice. Mr. Davis asked if any of the committee members planned to leave the meeting early, as Charles Pattison stated he must do, to please keep in mind the necessity of a quorum for any action taken on this item.

Before Mr. Davis continued, Michael Sheridan shared with the Committee information on the Blueprint 2000 retreat at San Luis Mission Park. Mr. Sheridan thought the retreat was very progressive and had an impressive attendance. Mr. Sheridan also shared that the retreat was well represented by City and County staff, as well as management. The retreat group prioritized and voted on six items considered as important issues for the future, with regional transportation being the highest rated future concern. Overall, Mr. Sheridan felt the retreat was very constructive.

Jim Davis resumed his presentation of Agenda Item #2 with background information on the item. Mr. Davis stated that at the February 2006 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting, Blueprint 2000 presented to the Board an agenda item that was previously approved by the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC). The item allocated within the Master Plan approximately \$42,000,000 in additional funds. Mr. Davis referenced the table within the agenda packet titled "Allocation of Additional Funds". Mr. Davis reminded the committee members that they have seen this table once before. Continuing, he stated that the table was developed based upon guidance received from the Board that stated how to distribute any new money by four priorities. Blueprint conveyed that it would like to add a fifth priority to make sure that in light of the recent construction cost increases that all of the existing projects were solvent, this being reflected on the table under "Cost Estimate Adjustments". During the course of discussion at the IA meeting in February, Commissioner Grippa made a motion to allocate some of this money to Mahan Drive. Specifically, his first motion was to move \$2.5 million from the Atkinson property, which is Priority 3, and move it to Mahan Drive for construction.

Charles Pattison asked what the Mahan project is and could Mr. Davis expand on that for the committee. Mr. Davis explained that the Mahan project is a widening of Mahan from Dempsey Mayo Road out to Walden Road, just short of the Interstate, taking it from the existing 2-lanes to 4-lanes. Bob Henderson asked what the relationship of the Mahan project is to the Fallschase DRI. Mr. Davis deferred Mr. Henderson's question to Tony Park, County Public Works Director. Mr. Park stated that there is no relationship. Continuing, Mr. Davis stated that the Mahan project development has been ongoing for years; the County has advanced funded some of the project; the right-of-way is already available (200 feet of right-of-way in-hand); and three of the four required stormwater ponds have already been constructed. Mr. Davis also noted that the project has to be converted from the original design, which was done in metric units, to English units. Mr. Davis stated that the bottom line is that the project would take the 4-lanes that exist east of Capital Circle and run it out to I-10 and then transition back to 2-lanes on the east side of I-10. Jess Van Dyke inquired as to the length of the project. Mr. Davis deferred to Tony Park who stated that it is 4.7 miles. Mr. Davis stated that the current estimate for the

construction is \$28.5 million. Mr. Henderson asked if it was correct to say that "additional money", as it relates to the table, is money received other than sales tax money. Mr. Davis stated this was correct. Mr. Henderson further questioned whether the \$46 million is the total of what has been received so far. Mr. Davis explained that the \$46 million is not the total because a few additional grants have been received for various properties, increasing this amount. The \$46 million is the total that was released last year from previously funded projects. To further explain, Mr. Davis gave the example of the \$27 million allocated in the Master Plan for right-of-way of for Capital Circle NW/SW. Blueprint received from the State under the SIS system, \$42.1 million for right-of-way for Capital Circle NW/SW. This money would have to be spent on right-of-way for this segment only, thereby only releasing the \$27 million that was already in the Master Plan, not the full \$42 million received. Mr. Davis stated that the bottom line is that Blueprint had about \$42 million which was reallocated to various projects.

Mr. Davis stated that during the course of discussion at the referenced February IA meeting, Commissioner Grippa made an initial motion to move some of the money from the Atkinson property to Mahan Drive. Commissioner Grippa subsequently changed his motion again to include some money for the Gaines Street project. Mr. Davis pointed out that Gaines Street and Mahan Drive are both listed projects in the Blueprint program but as of now they are Tier II projects and since Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4 has been moved to Tier I, Gaines Street and Mahan are the two highest project in Tier II. Mr. Davis stated that Commissioner Grippa's subsequent motion included \$2.5 million for Mahan and money for Gaines Street (FAMU Way). The vote was called and the substitute motion failed. Mr. Davis stated that Commissioner Thael said a motion would have to be made to initiate the supermajority vote proceeding which are required to move a Tier II project to Tier I. Motion was made and voted on; motion failed. The Board denied starting the supermajority process.

Kevin McGorty inquired as to the reason the vote failed and what some of the comments made during the discussion were. Jim Davis declined to comment. Michael Sheridan offered his opinion on what happened at the meeting and stated that the environment of the meeting basically deteriorated into political cat-calling. He stated that people had come to the meeting with their own political agenda, thus clouding the real issues at hand.

Jim Davis stated that Commissioner Bob Rackleff and Commissioner Cliff Thael commented that the reason they did not vote for this issue is because the original motion involved taking \$2.5 million from the Atkinson property (greenway property) and put it on a road project. Mr. Davis stressed that the main issue to be considered by the CAC at this time is whether or not the IA should reconsider the vote that failed; the vote that stated to not initiate the supermajority vote proceedings to move Mahan Drive and Gaines Street up to Tier I. Bob Henderson stated that this seemed to deal with a procedural matter and stated he would prefer to deal with the substantive matter - whether or not the CAC is in support of Mahan and Gaines Street being moved to Tier I. Mr. Davis concurred with Mr. Henderson; however, he could not answer, at this time, many of the funding questions regarding Mahan. Mr. Davis further stated that the funding questions would definitely be addressed before this item goes to the IA for the supermajority vote. Mr. Davis stated once again that the bottom line is whether or not the CAC supports triggering the supermajority vote.

Jim Davis recapped by stating that at the February IA meeting, the motion to start the supermajority vote process for Mahan Drive and Gaines Street failed. Mr. Davis stated that the reallocation of additional funds presented in the CAC's agenda item, which the CAC previously concurred with, did pass. Subsequent to the meeting in February, the County Commission was presented and discussed an agenda item on March 14<sup>th</sup>. The agenda item basically stated that instead of reallocating the \$42 million as the IA had passed, the County recommended to reallocate \$38.5 million to the following projects: \$28.5 million to Mahan; \$5 million to Gaines Street (FAMU Way); and \$5 million to the Atkinson property. This approach provided certain benefits to the County by freeing \$16.5 million of County funds to use on Buck Lake Road and Tharpe Street.

Gregg Patterson inquired as to whether the \$16.5 was the portion of the County's discretionary share of Blueprint dollars. The question was deferred to Tony Park who stated that the \$8 million and the \$8.5 million budgeted for Buck Lake and Tharpe Street were funds from the 1989 sales tax. This was set in the County's 5-year program as advance funding to the Department of Transportation. Jess Van Dyke asked the question of how the \$2.5 million at the IA meeting went to \$28.5 million at the County Commission meeting. Mr. Van Dyke said this reminded him of the Killlearn Lakes sewer situation and is curious of what this would do to green projects that are part of Blueprint 2000. Vince Long, Assistant County Administrator, stated that this is a reprioritization on part of the IA and several County and City Commissioners made it very clear that priorities change and it is no surprise that Welaunee and Fallschase have probably added to the urgency of this project.

Kevin McGorty inquired whether the Atkinson project is still a viable project; he assumed it was a dead project. Jim Davis stated that it is not necessarily dead. K2 Urban Corp. has a contract with the Atkinson family that must be closed on in the near future. Mr. Davis stated that in his opinion, it is not financially viable without some outside investment, via grants and other things for the greenways and trails portion, etc. With some investment for those areas it could then become a viable operation for them. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint still had an OGT (Office of Greenways and Trails) grant for this parcel, but have not negotiated a revised amount based on the K2 Urban plan; Blueprint may eventually have some OGT money to contribute to this project. Mr. Davis continued to say that it is still a viable option from the standpoint that Blueprint has partnered with K2 Urban Corp. to get the greenways and trails portion through there without owning the whole 214 acres. As to whether the parcel could come back on the market, Mr. Davis stated that it is a possibility, not a strong possibility, and would happen only because K2 Urban Corp., for whatever reason, could not make it financially viable. In summary, Mr. Davis stated he did not have a clear definitive answer but did not think it was a dead project as far as Blueprint's involvement.

Dave Bright stated that a draft plan had been drawn up in architectural form showing the trail connecting from Tennessee Street all the way up into Lake Talquin State Forest with connections also to Northwest Passage. Mr. Bright also stated that trail needs had been accommodated by K2, and the wetlands would have to be set aside per Leon County environmental management laws. Mr. Bright stated that we probably are going to protect a lot through K2 Urban Corp's development that we would have protected anyway.

Kevin McGorty stated that the reason he raised the question is because of the concern of the linkage of roadway projects with greenway and stormwater projects complimenting roadway projects. Mr. McGorty stated that he has before seen the taking of money out of the environmental projects and making it a higher priority strictly for the road project. The consensus was the Atkinson property was a jewel in the Capital Circle planning and would fulfill one of the clear commitments of Blueprint 2000 of this gray and green linkage for \$6 million. Mr. McGorty stated the reason for him bringing this up is because the CAC is being asked today to not only procedurally go with the supermajority process but dedicate a tremendous amount of money for two road projects; when in the past there has been a raid of environmental money in making this linkage. Mr. McGorty stressed that this is not what was sought when the Blueprint program went to the voters.

Terence Hinson inquired as to what would happen to the funds if the CAC chooses to not support triggering the supermajority vote. Jim Davis stated that as of today, the only allocation of the additional funds is what was passed at the February IA meeting, as reflected on the "Allocation of Additional Funds" sheet in the CAC agenda packet.

Michael Sheridan inquired that if the CAC were to make the recommendation that the supermajority process should go forward would the core issue then be the movement of the Tier II projects to Tier I? Jim Davis stated that Mr. Sheridan is correct in that statement. Mr. Sheridan also inquired that if the CAC were to recommend to not proceed with the supermajority process, could the IA proceed regardless? Mr. Davis stated that this is also correct. For clarification, Mr. Davis stated that there are certain steps that must be taken before the issue of supermajority vote could be presented to the IA. He stated that at the February meeting there was a motion made to initiate the process to get to the supermajority vote; this motion failed. Staff has been told to not start the process. The County Commission has come back unanimously and said to the Chairman of the IA that they would like to reconsider the vote so they could have staff initiate the supermajority vote process. Michael Sheridan reiterated that the substance of what the CAC will be voting on today consist of making a recommendation on its position in regard to the project itself.

Kevin McGorty agreed with Mr. Sheridan and stated that the CAC shouldn't get caught up in the supermajority matter and concentrate more on the substantive issue of the two road projects at hand and whether the CAC supports moving them from Tier II to Tier I projects. Mr. McGorty also stated that he has financial questions on the impact of moving these projects. Bob Henderson also relayed concerns about the financial implications in regards to monies that may or may not be reimbursed. Mr. Henderson also inquired as to whether or not this meeting was untimely in that the financial questions could not be answered fully at this time. Jim Davis concurred with Mr. Henderson that yes, this meeting is untimely from that aspect, but not from the standpoint that staff wanted to consult with the CAC to formulate a recommendation and advise the IA before its special meeting on May 2, 2006, to reconsider the failed vote. Mr. Henderson inquired whether the CAC will have an opportunity to reconsider this issue if it goes to supermajority vote. Mr. Davis stated yes, that when staff submits the applicable agenda item to the IA for their supermajority vote, the CAC will also have the opportunity to review the agenda prior to the meeting date. Dave Bright added that before the issue can go back to the Board, two public hearings and a recommendation from the CAC and the Technical

Coordinating Committee (TCC) must take place so the CAC will definitely have the opportunity to visit this issue again.

Jess Van Dyke asked when it will be known definitively about FDOT's future funding of the projects. Jim Davis did not know at the present time. For clarification, Mr. Davis stated that at a second County Commission meeting on March 28, 2006, the Commission unanimously stated that Mahan Drive should be added to the Strategic Intermodel System (SIS). The presumption at this meeting was that Mahan's construction would ultimately be paid for by SIS funds. At the meeting, direction was given to staff to meet with FDOT and come back to the Board. A meeting was held with the Secretary of Transportation and other FDOT staff in which FDOT clearly said they supported putting Mahan Drive on the SIS; were flexible with the design; and committed to fund, at some level, the construction of Mahan Drive via SIS. A date certain of the funding was unknown – FDOT mentioned 2012 with the possibility of earlier funding, depending upon monies available. Mr. Davis reiterated that the basic presumption of the County Commission is that this is not a raid on Blueprint but more of an advanced funding by Blueprint for Mahan construction with a repayment by FDOT in some point in time and at some level to be determined. Mr. Davis once again stated that he could not answer the question of how much specifically FDOT would commit to funding but stressed that FDOT committed to a partnership.

Jess Van Dyke suggested that maybe the CAC should recommend that there shouldn't be a supermajority vote taken until some sort of commitment is given on the amount of funding FDOT is willing to provide. Jim Davis stated that the IA would not pass a supermajority vote without knowing the precise financial implications.

Terence Hinson inquired as to the status of the current Tier I projects. Jim Davis stated that with the exception of Capital Circle Southwest, every Tier I project was active and under contract. Southwest is expected to be under contract within 90 days. Mr. Davis also stated that Blueprint is \$150 million short of fully funding the Tier I projects. Jerry Conger inquired whether moving the two Tier II projects at issue to Tier I would impact any of the current Tier I projects as far as prioritization or funding. Mr. Davis referred to the "Allocation of Additional Funds - Impacts to Adopted Reallocation" attachment in the agenda packet which sets out the worst case scenario of impacted funds. Previously approved projects in the master plan will not be impacted.

Gregg Patterson expressed that he felt it was premature to move forward at this time with a vote. **Charles Pattison moved to not shift Mahan Drive and Gaines Street from Tier II projects to Tier I projects.** Mr. Patterson asked to include an amendment stating that **the CAC supports and agrees that the Mahan Drive corridor expansion is a high priority for the community and should seek ways to fund it, however, recommend not moving it to a Tier I project at this time.** Mr. Pattison stated that the funding issues must be resolved before moving forward. **Jerry Conger seconded the motion with amendment.** Michael Sheridan called for discussion. Jess Van Dyke stated he would be in opposition to starting the supermajority process until more is known about the FDOT funding issues. Kevin McGorty suggested a substitute amendment to the motion that covered the two topics which the CAC had been asked to discuss. **Kevin McGorty moved a substitute motion to not support the moving of the Gaines Street and Mahan Drive projects from Tier II to Tier I and to not support the beginning the supermajority vote process by the IA.** Jess Van Dyke seconded the substitute motion. **Charles Pattison accepted the substitute motion and withdrew his original motion.**

Mr. McGorty also stated that he had a few points that would clarify the reasoning for the motion that should in some way be relayed to the IA along with the CAC's recommendation. The points being: (1) if the Blueprint funds were just advance funding with a guarantee of recouping its funding of the projects in a timely manner, the projects would be reconsidered and moved into Tier I; (2) the Tier I projects are already at a deficit funding of approximately \$150 million and prematurely moving Tier II projects to Tier I will exacerbate the funding deficit; and (3) Mahan Drive is an important project community-wide and it should be suggested to the IA that they move the project forward within the larger process and make it a priority rather than going through Blueprint. Michael Sheridan delegated a committee, with CAC members' consent, to formulate and incorporate the clarification points mentioned by Mr. McGorty within the CAC's recommendation to the IA. Kevin McGorty volunteered to draft the clarification language with the assistance of another CAC member.

Terence Hinson asked for clarification on the reasoning behind the IA wanting to elevate the two projects to Tier I projects. In reference to Mahan Drive, Jim Davis stated that the reasoning for elevating this project is traffic safety and the fact that this is a project that could be constructed for the community in an expeditious manner. He noted that the right-of-way is paid for, the stormwater is mostly built and the design will be completed in June 2007. Michael Sheridan asked for comments, if any, from Vince Long, Assistant County Administrator. Mr. Long concurred with Mr. Davis and added that the issue at hand for the CAC is whether to speed this process up or not – move Mahan Drive and Gaines Street to Tier I projects or not. He conveyed that he felt the CAC was accomplishing what had been asked of them to do.

**Jerry Conger moved to call the question; Gregg Patterson seconded. The motion to call the question passed unanimously.**

Michael Sheridan restated that final wording would include the reasoning behind the motion. This task will be delegated to Kevin McGorty, with assistance from Gregg Patterson. Jim Davis asked for clarification on the motion. It was restated: **to not support the moving of the Gaines Street and Mahan Drive projects from Tier II to Tier I and to not support the beginning the supermajority vote process by the IA.**

Kevin McGorty agreed with the motion on the floor and stated he would have no problem in adding "at this point in time". **Jess Van Dyke seconded. The motion passed unanimously.** Gregg Patterson stated he would not be able to assist Mr. McGorty with the additional wording due to time constraints; Jerry Conger volunteered to take Mr. Patterson's place in helping Mr. McGorty with the additional wording. *(A copy of the wording formulated by the committee is attached hereto and incorporated into the record.)*

#### Citizens To Be Heard

There were no public speakers present.

Adjourn

Bob Henderson moved to adjourn the meeting; Gregg Patterson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

*Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Agenda Item*

*Item Title: Mahan Drive: Reconsideration of a Previous Vote*

*Meeting Date: May 2, 2006*

**Action by CAC:** At a special meeting of the CAC on April 28, 2006, the CAC unanimously passed the following:

The CAC unanimously acknowledges the importance of Mahan and Gaines Street projects and supports these enhancements, however at this time, the Committee does not support the movement of these projects from Tier II to Tier I with any accompanying reallocation of previously approved Blueprint funds. Furthermore, at this time the Committee does not support the initiation of any activities leading to a supermajority vote on this issue. We do however, believe that should Blueprint only be an advance funding source with timely and guaranteed reimbursement by FDOT or other sources that the movement of these projects from Tier II to Tier I should be reconsidered.

The Committee strongly encourages the CRTPA, City, County and FDOT in partnership with each other to provide the timely and necessary funding for the Mahan corridor rather than increasing the current Blueprint program shortfall of above \$150M.

The Committee urges the Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors to maintain the integrity of the Blueprint program and assurances made to the voters by continuing the focus on the current Tier I projects thru their fruition.