

ITEM #8

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 5, 2005

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
4:30 pm

Vice-Chairman Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:38 pm; a quorum was neither present nor achieved during the meeting.

Committee Members present:

Mike Sheridan	Gregg Patterson
Bob Henderson	Dianna Norwood
Jess Van Dyke	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Phil Maher
Dave Bright	Jerry Oshesky
Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Gregg Garrett	Angela Richardson
Mark Llewellyn	Shelonda Gay
Michael Wright	

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

There was no quorum at the time the meeting was called to order. Jim Davis briefly discussed the events of the groundbreaking ceremony for Capital Circle Southeast (CCSE) on May 3, 2005. Mr. Davis also informed the committee of two agenda modifications. The first was an amendment to the CCSE Design Build Contract. The second was the Golden Web Award for the Blueprint website.

Regarding the contract amendment, Mr. Davis stated that that Blueprint had been working with the City of Tallahassee Water Utility for many months to incorporate their work into the CCSE project. At the last minute there were changes to their schedule; Blueprint has been negotiating with COT Water Utility via a Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) which was a contract between Blueprint and the Water Utility to add the Utilities work to Blueprint's contract. The Water Utility would have a contract with Blueprint who in turn would amend the contract with M, Inc. The City Commission has appropriated \$5.3 million for the work. Blueprint would manage the contract for 3% of the total invoice price.

The alternative to the JPA was for Blueprint to complete construction and COT Water Utility return in the future to dig up valves or the force main for replacement. The 42" force main had no bypass along that segment therefore before the valves could be taken out of service to replace the force main and valves, a bypass would have to be built. Mr. Davis further stated that that it

was an ongoing process that continued to be a struggle but it was the most logical and fiscally efficient way to proceed.

Mr. Bright announced the Golden Web Award was received from the International Association of Web Masters and Designers for the Blueprint website, which was developed by the MBE consultant Uzell Advertising. Michael Sheridan asked about the application process and who suggested applying for the award. Mr. Davis stated that he suggested staff apply following several unsolicited compliments received from the community. Additionally, he reminded the committee that 80% of the time spent on approval of the previous fiscal operating budget was spent discussing a \$35,000 line item for web design and maintenance.

Shelonda Gay distributed blueprint hardhat stress relievers to the committee, souvenirs from the groundbreaking.

IV. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Agenda items were discussed out of order due to the lack of a quorum.

Item #7: Design Services for Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road

Dave Bright stated that that the original agenda item indicated recommending the award of the contract to the second ranked firm URS (from the short-listed firms in the RFP process for CCSE Woodville Highway to Tram Road, see Item #3). However, when the Woodville Highway to Tram Road segment was advertised staff did not indicate the second place firm would be awarded the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway segment, therefore we did not meet the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act requirements. Therefore, staff had amended the agenda item to initiate the RFP process for the Woodville to Crawfordville segment. (Option 2 of the original agenda item.)

Item #8 a: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study: Typical Section Guidance Regarding Policy Issues (US 90 to Orange Avenue, Blueprint map 2A)

Dave Bright stated that that the original agenda item combined 8a and 8b, however, they were separated into individual items for the benefit of the IA so they could take the issues up separately. The individual items were distributed as supplements to the agenda modification.

Item #8 b: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study: Extend Design South to Orange Avenue

See Item 8a above.

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

Dave Bright stated that that the original intention of staff was to have the IA Board, once again, endorse their preferred concept for Segment two, the Cascade area. Additionally staff would recommend the Genesis contract be extended into the design phase. Mr. Bright further stated that that Blueprint staff had postponed the request for recommendation until the September 2005 meeting due to unresolved issues regarding the technical reports as well as the City and County Stormwater staff's review. At the current time, the item was an informational update for both the CAC and the IA.

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Item #1: Leveraging Update

Michael Sheridan stated that the committee would move forward with the informational items even though a quorum had not been reached. He further stated that when or if a quorum was reached, the committee would return to the previously discussed items.

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint had entered into a contract to purchase 168 acres surrounding Copeland Sink for \$1.4 million. FCT would participate in the purchase at the level of \$660,000. Additionally, Blueprint had entered into an option contract for a conservation easement for the 132 acres adjacent to Copeland. The value would be determined at the completion of the appraisal process however it was estimated at approximately \$200-300,000; the Northwest Florida Water Management District would provide 50% of the funding through the existing agreement with Blueprint 2000.

Mr. Maher further stated that Blueprint had once again applied to FCT for grants. The first was for the Booth Property Phase II, which consisted of 160.5 acres in the Headwaters of the St Marks River. The estimated total cost was \$1.4 million with a 60% share requested from FCT. Staff also applied for a grant for Capital Cascade Segment 4, which consisted of four parcels totaling 24.8 acres. The estimated total cost was \$1,935,000 with a 50% match requested from FCT.

Furthermore, the City of Tallahassee Planning Department has applied to FCT for the Timberlane Ravine Phase II project, which consisted of two parcels near I-10 and Meridan Road. Jim Davis stated that Blueprint provided the match for the grant as part of Blueprint's Lake Jackson Tier 1 requirements.

Bob Henderson reiterated that matching funds (from grants) would be used to offset Blueprint budgeted funds but questioned the disposition of the money that was offset? In theory, if half of the funding for greenway /stormwater came from another agency the half Blueprint saved could be reallocated for road improvements. Mr. Maher stated that it could, but reminded him that the Master Plan approach required it be balanced with current resources only. Therefore any matching funds would be added as revenue. Mr. Davis stated that it was a good point that had not been addressed in the past; there were several permutations. Mr. Davis stated that due to the shortfalls in the budget the offset funds were returned to the general revenue budget of Blueprint 2000.

Mr. Davis segued into items the committee should consider for the future. Blueprint had the opportunity to receive significant funding from federal grants and appropriations, where did the committee feel it should it go. Mr. Davis explained that there was \$12.5 million in a (state) House of Representatives bill for Capital Circle Northwest, which was fully funded by Blueprint, there was also \$10 million in a Federal bill. FDOT Secretary Abreu had committed \$20 million for CCNW ROW (whether or not the 12.5 and 20 million would be combined remained to be seen), and FDOT District 3 had made Blueprint their top priority for SIS funding, \$36 million, for ROW purchases. Mr. Davis offered the committee several options in the form of questions.

Should Greenways and Stormwater be reconstituted as a priority? Should only a portion of them be reconstituted? Should un-funded segments of the Capital Circle corridor be funded with the additional funds? Mr. Davis stated that the CAC should consider those questions and try to balance the environmental issues with the fact that two segments of Capital Circle remained un-funded.

Bob Henderson stated that if stormwater and environmental funds were re-appropriated to fund CCNW those projects should be re-paid with the potential funding. He further stated that, the original concept was to balance roads, stormwater and the environment; he felt staff should continue to maintain that balance. Jess Van Dyke stated that on the EECC originally, the business community wanted 50% and the environmental community wanted the same. However, due to the enormous cost of transportation corridors the environmental groups realized that actually receiving 1/3 of the funding would be miraculous. Mr. Van Dyke further stated that he still felt that way. Mr. Henderson stated that he understood the EECC defined the vision as holistic planning and development. Mr. Van Dyke agreed. Based on that, continued Mr. Henderson, all projects should be completed rather than having a "three-legged stool with only two legs." Mr. Davis stated that that none of the projects had been diminished; some had been eliminated, for example sections of Capital Circle. However, staff was completing all the facets of holistic planning on every segment that was budgeted at that time. He further stated that the \$22 million, which was taken out of CCNW, was for retrofit and additional stormwater, above and beyond the requirements for the roadway itself. Mr. Davis further clarified that work was in the corridor but not actually part of the project. Mr. Henderson interjected with a question to Mr. Van Dyke. Did the EECC conceive of the CCNW project dealing specifically with the corridor or did they discuss the Northwest as a whole? Mr. Van Dyke stated that he was correct regarding being holistic however improvisation was sometimes necessary. Dianna Norwood stated that it was obviously a part of the project if staff was able to pull \$22 million out of the project line item. Phil Maher stated that he thought many of the questions would be made clear during the discussion of the Master Plan (agenda item # 10). Regarding the \$22 million, the motion by the Board was to move it to a road segment and replenish it when funding became available. When staff included the second SIB loan in the Master Plan and extended the projects into the outer years they were able to put the \$22 million back into those two segments in 2015. Mr. Henderson stated that he understood that to be "imaginary" money. Mr. Davis clarified it was not imaginary but subject to change. Mr. Henderson stated that he though the cost of the projects was greater than the anticipated revenue. Mike Sheridan interjected the committee had gotten ahead of themselves; the seed was planted, however, the conversation needed to be held in the context of the overall discussion of the agenda item. With that being said Mr. Sheridan steered the committee back to discussions of the leveraging update.

Mr. Sheridan questioned why the Planning Department was submitting FCT applications for the Timberlane Ravine Phase II project consisting of two parcels. Dave Bright stated that the Planning Department applied for the same parcels two years previous. The three parcels were not purchased due to one owner choosing not to sell. The Planning Department has submitted the same basic grant as before, for the two owners' parcels that were willing to negotiate. Mr. Bright further stated that both Blueprint and Planning had and would continue to coordinate and submit FCT grants each year. If one of the Planning Department's applications were on a Blueprint map then Blueprint would match funds. Mr. Bright also stated that Blueprint could have applied for the grant for Timberlane Ravines. Mr. Davis stated that there was yet another,

subtler, issue as well. Through FCT, Cities or Counties could only apply for \$6.5 million each in grants per year. Blueprint grants were considered as part of the City and County's portions rather than individually. Mr. Sheridan stated that it was a good report and thanked staff.

Item #2 Headwaters of the St Marks: Property Acquisition

Dave Bright stated that Item #2 was repetitive of the information Mr. Maher shared regarding the leveraging update. Mr. Bright further stated that staff had reached an agreement on the Copeland Sink parcel and the Lex Thompson Conservation Easement. He estimated Blueprint was approaching 600-700 acres, which they owned or had easements on but an additional 7,000-8,000 remained in the area that staff would like to acquire. The majority of the remaining acreage would most likely be obtained through conservation easements than pure acquisitions. Staff was unsuccessful in purchasing the Barden/Patty Sink parcel; the owners chose not to sell. Staff may attempt to arrange a conservation easement for his entire property rather than the original 115 acres. Additionally, Mr. Bright stated that, the Northwest Florida Water Management District might be interested in land Mr. Bardin owned in Jefferson County.

Mr. Davis stated that expectations should be tempered. The Sensitive Lands Working Group came up with approximately 9,000 acres as priority 1-4 projects. He further stated that Blueprint was at approximately 20% of that with roughly 750 contiguous acres and the promise of another 2,000 from St. Joe Company. Dianna Norwood questioned who would manage the 750 acres, long term. Mr. Davis stated that it would depend on who took the title; if it were a fee simple title and outside the City Limits, it would go to the County who would maintain it. If it were a conservation easement acquired in partnership with NFWMD, they would take title to the conservation easement. Mr. Davis further stated that Blueprint had no maintenance responsibilities or cost involved, merely the task of acquiring the property. Ray Youmans clarified the Thompson conservation easement not only prevented development, on all but one acre, but also prevented the cutting of timber. Therefore the land would remain in pristine condition. Mr. Davis stated that it was a total of 132 acres and all except 24 acres were wetlands.

Item #3 Approval of Award Contract for Design of Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Tram Road (Blueprint Map 4)

Michael Sheridan noted Item #3 was on the agenda as informational only however he felt it was an action item. Mr. Bright clarified it was intended as an action item for the IA but was included for informational purposes for the CAC. Bob Henderson noted the agenda item listed "company X" but should actually read "DRMP." Mr. Sheridan stated that the item would be passed on to the IA without a recommendation from the CAC.

Mr. Sheridan informed the committee that a quorum would not be achieved for the meeting. Mr. Davis stated that it would be fine, staff would note who was in attendance and without a quorum present, those present voted accordingly. Mr. Sheridan agreed that would be fine. Mr. Davis further stated that he preferred those present to proceed with a vote. Mr. Sheridan asked if there was a motion to approve? Bob Henderson asked, "Approve what?" Mr. Davis clarified it would be a motion to approve awarding the contract for the design of CCSE from Woodville Highway to Tram Road to DRMP. **Mr. Henderson motioned to approve DRMP; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously 5-0.**

Item #4 Capital Circle SW Corridor Study (SR20 to Springhill Road, Blueprint map 2B)

Jim Shepherd noted the information shared at the March 18, 2005 CAC meeting had not changed significantly. Staff continued to narrow the ten alternatives to three or four to enter the PD&E study. The most noteworthy change was the item would not be presented to the IA at the May 16, 2005 meeting due to the extraordinary amount of information already included with that agenda. It would be presented to the IA at the September 19, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Shepherd further stated that he and Mr. Davis had met with the National Forest Service regarding Alternative 10. Additionally, Mr. Shepherd received an email letter from the Sierra Club. Mr. Sheridan questioned the gist or content of the letter. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was basically their support of the segment 4A, their desire to have Black Swamp be reviewed by the Sensitive Lands Working Group, and if 4A were not approved they also would support the Orange Avenue alignment.

Bob Henderson asked if the letter did not include opposition to Alternative 10. Mr. Shepherd did not recall. Dianna Norwood asked for a copy of the letter. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was not signed but he would gladly provide copies. Mr. Henderson stated that he was privy to a discussion of representatives of the Audubon Society and the Sierra Club in which both groups agreed Alternative 10 was not an option they could support. Additionally, the Audubon Society was in opposition of segment 4A. Mr. Sheridan reminded the committee that was the number one recommendation of the Sierra Club. Mr. Shepherd clarified the bulleted items of the Sierra Club letter were not ranked however it was inferred by the order the items were listed.

Mr. Sheridan stated that the CAC would meet again prior to the IA in September 2005. He reminded the committee of the presentation by the Florida Natural Areas Inventory, at the March 18, 2005 CAC meeting, in opposition to Alternative 10. Dianna Norwood also reminded the committee that FNAI only studied the impacts of Alternative 10 but not the other nine alternatives. She further stated that there was no data to compare it to and the committee/staff could do worse damage by selecting another alternative. Mr. Sheridan stated that all 10 alternatives remained on the table. Mr. Davis stated that that staff would present their recommended alternatives to the CAC at the September 8, 2005 meeting and to the IA at the September 19, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Davis stated that staff had reviewed Alternative 10, met with the district ranger and others and they were emphatic that Alternative 10 was not a viable alternative. The rangers, unofficially, stated that if Alternative 10 were pursued they were certain all the environmental groups would challenge that decision and have the case tied up in the legal system for many years. Mr. Davis further stated that staff's original recommendation was to eliminate 4A and 10. At the last public meeting, however, there was considerable support for Alternative 10. Mr. Davis stated that he agreed to review that alternative again; he had begun that process and had not found any information to date that would make it a more viable alternative. Jess Van Dyke questioned where support for Alternative 10 stemmed from. Mr. Davis replied mainly from residents of the chain of lakes and that Dianna Norwood's husband was "leading the charge." Ms. Norwood clarified it was not Alternative 10 as drawn by Blueprint staff.

Bob Henderson verified staff's goal of narrowing the alternatives to approximately four to proceed to the PD&E phase. He further asked for clarification of why 2A&B were under

consideration as viable choices. Mr. Shepherd stated that 2A&B, via Springhill Road, were in conjunction with the airport gateway. Mr. Henderson stated that he still did not understand because in his opinion it was "out of the way." Mr. Shepherd further stated that part two of the answer was the entire area surrounding the 2A&B alignments would be studied during the PD&E phase and be evaluated for possibilities; the roadway would not necessarily be as shown on the current map. Mr. Henderson reiterated that staff's recommendation was to study the whole area whether segment 2A/B or 3A/B were chosen. Mr. Shepherd agreed. Mr. Davis stated that staff was not 100% comfortable with any one alignment through that area and preferred the consultant to review it as a "zone" to find the best route through there. Mr. Sheridan stated that staff would narrow the list to 3-4; the CAC would discuss those options and could request another option be considered. Mr. Sheridan further stated that he felt the committee would be better served to discuss the details at a time when a more representative group was present.

Dianna Norwood completed the discussion by stating that at the previous Airport Gateway Committee meeting they had selected Springhill Road as the corridor to downtown Tallahassee. Dave Bright stated that it was not necessarily related to the Capital Circle realignment but beautification of an existing alignment from the airport to Innovation Park, the universities and downtown. Mr. Davis stated that the Board had directed Blueprint to consider Springhill Road as part of the CCSW alignment study. Bob Henderson questioned if anyone had reviewed the possibility of heading southwest once one was south of Munson Slough. Mr. Bright stated that it had been discussed. Mr. Sheridan asked for clarification of CAC's recommended action at their next meeting; should they choose one alternative or agree on three to four alignments. Mr. Davis stated that they would be asked to endorse staff recommendation or provide other guidance that should move forward to the IA. Mr. Davis further stated that staff's tentative recommendation included the current alignment, Orange Avenue and the "zone" (2 A/B & 3A/B area). Mr. Sheridan asked if there was anything that would prevent the CAC from only recommending one alternative. Mr. Davis stated that they could recommend anything they chose.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

Item #5: Minutes of CAC Meeting: March 18, 2005

Tabled for the July 14, 2005 meeting due to no quorum being present.

Item #6: City/County Watershed Protection Plan Interlocal Agreement

Dave Bright stated that, as information only, at the previous CAC meeting, Charles Pattison mentioned having seen information of the City and County joining forces on a watershed protection program. Mr. Bright contacted both John Buss and Theresa Heiker; however, they were not yet prepared to speak on that committee. Mr. Bright further stated that he had included the Interlocal Agreement that had been signed by both entities, which was related to the creation and operation of the Watershed Protection Plan.

Mr. Sheridan clarified that it was not a consent item. Mr. Bright agreed it was misplaced; it should have been listed with informational items or as an agenda modification.

Item #7: Design Services for Capital Circle Southeast from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road **CONTINUED**

Dave Bright stated that the revised item was included with the agenda modifications. Jim Davis stated that the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA) stated that one must competitively award each contract. Mr. Davis further stated that staff had desired to award the second place firm (URS) from the RFP for CCSE Connie Road to Tram Road since the scope of services were so similar however the CCNA would not allow that. A short form RFP with short time frames would be prepared with the caveat that firms which submitted proposals for Connie to Tram it would not be necessary to resubmit, they would be considered with the second RFP as well. Mr. Bright stated that with recent legislative initiatives there might be as much as \$9.5 billion for infrastructure over the next ten years. Utilizing the "money follows production" philosophy Blueprint would like to be ready if/when the funding became available. Mr. Bright continued by informing the committee that the PD&E had been completed, the majority of the ROW would be acquired, potentially, in advance and by having the plans available, the segue to construction would move rapidly.

Jim Davis stated that there was an initiative, by Governor Bush, moving through the Legislature for an additional \$0.04 sales tax on gasoline, which had the potential to generate \$9.5 billion in revenue over the next ten years. That revenue had already been designated for infrastructure as related to road projects. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had an adopted policy of "money follows production," meaning the project which was ready for construction held a higher likelihood of receiving funding than one which was merely in the design phase or earlier. Mr. Davis further stated that staff's intent was to facilitate that policy and he felt Blueprint was in the position to do so. In the past there had been mention of concern of the plans becoming "old" and would possibly have to be redone however, with the potential of the additional revenue, Blueprint's chances of receiving the funds, if they were production ready, was sufficient to where they would be willing to take the risk. Mr. Davis clarified that he was not proposing Leon County would impose a tax increase merely that there was the *potential* for \$9.5 billion to be in the system which would free up FDOT budgets as well as other coffers. Blueprint was moving into a situation where they could capitalize on that.

Dianna Norwood stated that she did not think projects within Leon County would benefit from the additional revenue unless they participated in the tax. Mr. Davis stated that he was not convinced of that because no other county in the State of Florida could compete with what Leon County taxpayers continued to contribute to State road infrastructure. The \$0.01 sales tax generated more money than the proposed \$0.04 gasoline tax. Bob Henderson stated that as example the state could impose the taxes to help the infrastructure and refund Leon County. The initiative was worded so the counties, without going back to the voters, could impose up to a \$0.04 gasoline tax. Mr. Davis offered an example of what he hoped might happen and further stated that he felt there was potential for the sales tax to generate other organizations similar to Blueprint 2000. He also added the FDOT District 3 Secretary as well as the Chairman of the Transportation Commission, at the District 3 Design Conference, specifically commented that Blueprint 2000 was the "wave of the future" for building infrastructure and partnerships.

Mr. Davis noted a change in attitude toward Blueprint from FDOT because of the fact that staff was moving forward much quicker than FDOT thought could happen. Mr. Davis further acknowledged, the afore mentioned strategy was a risk but he felt the potential for benefit was greater. Furthermore, FDOT Secretary Jose Abreu pledged his commitment to completing CCSE so it could be used as a model for the State of Florida.

Bob Henderson questioned where the Woodville to Tram segment of CCSE fell in the sequence of priority if the money was available. Mr. Davis stated that there was not a good sequence due to the many variables, one being the ADT. He also explained that the reasons that it was a good project. The transition from six-lanes down to two-lanes that would happen west of Woodville Highway was approximately 4,000 feet long. The transition from the four-lane intersection, with turn lanes, at Crawfordville Highway to the east was approximately 1,000 feet in length. Given those facts only a few thousand feet would need to be widened to achieve a four-lane roadway. Mr. Davis stated that there was 103 acres (the Flea Market tract), which Blueprint was already in negotiations with the Forestry Service on. Blueprint would have the ROW in hand (potentially) and have a limited project. Those two factors would make the project fairly inexpensive and, consequently, that much more appealing to outside funding sources. Mr. Davis stated that the "lowest piece" as far as ADT was concerned would be CCSW followed by Crawfordville Highway to Springhill Road. Projects on the east side of Capital Circle, as Mr. Davis recalled, received a higher priority.

Mr. Henderson stated that he would argue in favor of moving ahead with it because, with the description Mr. Davis provided, it would be obvious to the community that the corridor improvements of Capital Circle were vital. Furthermore, Mr. Henderson stated that if the funding could not be found anywhere else there was no reason Leon County could not pay for it. Mr. Henderson explained the argument that he would present. Blueprint 2000 was not about how to spend \$750 million, the issue was necessary community improvements. Whether the money came from A, B, or C was not the point, in his opinion.

Dianna Norwood requested clarification on the number of lanes in Mr. Davis' discussion. Mr. Davis stated that the Woodville to Crawfordville segment was scheduled to be six lanes however four-lanes would be an interim fix, if all the funding was not available at one time. Additionally, he felt there was a good chance to improve the road to at least a four-lane scenario for very little money.

At that time Michael Sheridan stated that the committee was faced with two choices: end the discussion or recess because it was time for the public hearing. There were no responses to Mr. Sheridan's call for remaining comments. Mr. Henderson questioned if a motion was necessary. Mr. Davis stated that yes. **Mr. Henderson motioned to approve moving forward with staff recommendation for design services for CCSE Woodville to Crawfordville; Dianna Norwood seconded the motion. Mr. Sheridan reminded the committee the vote would be non-binding. The motion passed unanimously by the members present.**

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Item #12: Blueprint 2000 FY 2006 Operating and Capital Budget

Michael Sheridan informed the committee that items 10 and 11 would be discussed as part of the public hearing. He also stated that that attachment 2 of item 11 was incomplete, however an amended attachment had been distributed. The source of funds projection had been updated on the amended version. Mr. Sheridan stated that protocol was to move to approve then discuss the

item but without a quorum it would not be binding. Jim Davis recommended proceeding as if it were a binding action. Mr. Davis further suggested, since there were no speakers for the hearing, to allow Phil Maher to discuss items 10 and 11 then the CAC could take the appropriate action. Phil Maher stated that, if the committee approved, he would discuss the Operating Budget then move to the Master Plan and then Capital Budget.

Item #11 Blueprint 2000 FY 2006 Operating Budget

Phil Maher stated that the Operating budget was relatively straightforward with Blueprint staff requesting a 6% increase in operating expenses. That would exclude, however, payment for bonds and SIB loans. Mr. Maher listed a few highlights of the proposed budget: In personnel services an increase of \$21,997 to Salary Enhancement. That would include a 5% merit raise as well as a \$500 bonus for each employee. An increase to Temp Wages for a full time Administrative Assistant, a summer intern and a half-time staff at 540 hours. Mr. Maher stated that the remainder of the projected salary costs was estimated by the City per position for insurance, pension and health benefits.

Mr. Sheridan questioned the consistency of the 5% merit increase and \$500 bonus with other City or County offices. Bob Henderson added the State as well. Mr. Maher stated that he understood the legislature had recently passed a 3.6% raise, the City was contemplating a 4.5% raise but he was unsure of the County. Mr. Davis stated that the County normally approved a 5% raise for employees. Mr. Davis further stated that Blueprint requested 5% merit increases for FY 2005 but were capped at 3.5% due to the City. Mr. Davis stated that he did not believe Blueprint, even though they follow the City personnel policies, should be tied to the maximum merit raise the City votes for itself. Mr. Sheridan questioned how Mr. Davis would argue Blueprint should receive a greater increase than other governmental entities. Mr. Davis stated that he would refer Mr. Sheridan to the Blueprint Performance Audit and Reports.

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Henderson why the Committee would include the State in their comparison. Mr. Henderson stated that the normal wage level was based on that of the community one resided in. Mr. Davis stated that he understood the genesis of the state's program in 2004 was a relatively small "across the board" increase with merit increase where applicable. Dianna Norwood stated that there were no merit increases for state employees but less than \$600 in bonuses. Mr. Sheridan asked if there were pay raise plus bonus precedent set by the City or County in recent years. Mr. Davis stated that the County had always utilized both, in fact some bonuses were quite substantial; the City also had that option. Furthermore, Blueprint gave \$300 bonuses to employees last year in addition to their merit increases. Ms. Norwood asked what the percentage increase was for the previous year. Mr. Davis stated that it was 3.5% and explained that Blueprint followed the City's evaluation criteria; an employee qualified on a percentage of the maximum allowed increase based on their evaluation score. In the case of Blueprint staff, every one received the maximum allowed increase as well as he \$300 bonus, with the exception of himself.

Mr. Sheridan stated that, if he were not the acting Chair, he would recommend the committee approve salary increases at the higher percentage of the City or County plus the \$500 bonus based on the results of the performance audit. **Gregg Patterson agreed and moved for the committee to approve as Mr. Sheridan had stated that; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion.** Mr. Patterson noted for the record the CAC did not attempt to mirror the state in how

employees were treated. **Mr. Sheridan restated that the motion for the sake of discussion; Blueprint would attempt to benchmark against the City and County, not the State, and recommend a percentage pay raise be equivalent to the higher of the City or County plus a \$500 bonus based on the performance audit.**

Bob Henderson, speaking to Jim Davis, stated that in FY 2005 the City capped the merit increases at 4.5% but would argue that cap should not apply to Blueprint therefore the motion that was on the table would be subjected to the same condition in FY 2006. Mr. Davis stated that it was in support of it. He further stated that the 5% raise for Blueprint was in anticipation of the County providing 5% to its employees therefore the motion was in complete support of the intention of the request. Mr. Davis continued that if one reviewed the performance report they would see that Blueprint saved millions of dollars for this community by moving projects along faster than ever before. That, in his opinion provided solid justification for the 5% increase plus bonus. Mr. Patterson stated that if Blueprint were a private sector organization rather than an Intergovernmental Agency, based on the performance shown by staff, they would be looking at higher bonuses and a higher rate of pay.

That being the end of discussions, Mr. Sheridan called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously by the members present.

Continuing with the discussion of the FY 2006 Operating budget, **Gregg Patterson moved to approve the budget with the prior resolution incorporated in it. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion.** Bob Henderson requested clarification of what was involved with legal services. Phil Maher stated that Blueprint was currently using the City Attorney's office for legal support and under City policy they could charge Blueprint for that time. Mr. Henderson asked if the \$60,000 to Greenburg was for retainer. Mr. Maher stated that it was a \$2,000 per month retainer; after the general policy for board meetings it would be altered to an hourly rate. In exchange for that retainer fee, Greenburg would act as general counsel in review of SIB loans and bond items, as well as property access for example. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint's legal fees would skyrocket in the near future due to the number of activities Blueprint was involved with. He further stated that Blueprint was currently paying the City Attorney's office for procurement support, ROW acquisition, the real estate policy, etc. However, staff was reviewing options for reorganization that would include in-house counsel. An example of why it was necessary, stated Mr. Davis, was with Joint Participation Agreements (JPA). It would be a conflict of interest for the City Attorney's office to represent multiple city departments under one JPA, i.e., Blueprint and the Water Utility. Blueprint would be required to seek outside counsel at approximately \$240 per hour.

Mr. Sheridan explained to Mr. Henderson that in-house counsel would most likely be cost justified in FY 2007. Mr. Henderson stated that, as he understood the item, staff was only requesting \$10,000 to replace what the City Attorney's office was charging. That would leave \$60,000, which was what Greenburg was charging anyway. Mr. Maher reminded Mr. Henderson that there were also project related activities that would be charged to legal services that were not listed on the attachment.

Dianna Norwood stated that there had been discussion in the past of Blueprint producing an annual report to the community and she did not see where funding for that had been allocated.

What seemed logical to her was in advertising but that budget would not support it. Mr. Maher stated that it could be funded out of the reproduction line item. Mr. Davis mentioned the performance audit, for example, was budgeted in the professional services line item. Ms. Norwood stated that the annual report seemed to have been a "hot topic". Mr. Davis stated that when the budget was discussed that was not a specific item that was allocated, however, it could certainly be reviewed. Mr. Maher stated that an annual report could be funded out of the reproduction line item. Mr. Henderson stated that presumably staff spent money to complete that report out of the FY05 budget. Mr. Davis asked if he was referring to the performance audit. Mr. Henderson stated that no, the one required by the statute. Mr. Davis stated that it was the performance audit; Blueprint produced both a financial and performance audit. Mr. Henderson stated that it was in the FY 2006 budget whether it was the reproduction or professional services line item. Ms. Norwood asked how the performance audit was distributed. Mr. Davis stated that there was an insert in the Democrat that publicized it however they did not highlight it. Shelonda Gay stated that for those citizens with Internet access the Blueprint website published monthly progress reports, amongst other updates, on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Sheridan called for final discussions, there were none. He reminded the committee there was a motion on the table to approve the FY 2006 operating budget (made by Mr. Patterson, 2nd by Mr. Van Dyke). Mr. Sheridan, speaking for Ms. Norwood, requested Mr. Patterson to accept an amendment to the motion to include a separate line item be considered for Public Relations (annual report to the community) and the process for disseminating information regarding Blueprint's performance. Mr. Patterson stated that it was a good point and one of the original debates when the optional sales tax was being considered. The motion passed unanimously by members present.

Item #10: Blueprint 2000 Master Plan and FY 2006 Capital Budget

Phil Maher began by stating the capital budget simply implemented the Master Plan. He further stated that the Finance Committee required the capital budget to be a balanced budget projected over fifteen years. The Master Plan, as far as a revenue source, included funding which Blueprint currently had in hand. The particular Master Plan included sales tax with an escalator approved by the Finance Committee, the payback from DOT for money Blueprint advanced, and SIS dollars committed to Blueprint by FDOT in 2008. It did not include grants since those each had a caveat that was based on a final contract. Once the final contract was complete, the grant revenue would be added to the Master Plan. Mr. Maher further stated that the Master Plan was dynamic and would continue to change each year.

Dianna Norwood stated that the committee reviewed the Master Plan, in detail, several months back and apologized for not having had time to compare that copy with the one distributed with the agenda. Were there any substantial changes? Mr. Maher stated that the Master Plan that was distributed with the agenda was based on the guidance provided by the Board at the January 31, 2005 IA meeting. Staff received the recommendations of the CAC quite clearly. The CAC's guidance supported the priorities of the original Master Plan that was articulated to the Board. However, over the last several years in trials to develop a new Master Plan, Blueprint was not receiving clear guidance from the IA. Each Commissioner expressed their individual ideas and agendas but each message conflicted with the other. Mr. Davis further stated that, after staff review, a list of questions was presented to the Board for them to vote on each. The strategy was a success whether the answers were liked or not. Mr. Maher referred the committee to the

printed agenda item for a general list of questions asked of the Board.

Mr. Maher stated that staff had asked the IA if the sensitive lands funding was available for *any* reallocation; the Board answered no. The only line item in sensitive lands that changed was the land bank; it decreased by \$600,000. Ms. Norwood asked why. Mr. Maher stated that basically to balance everything else they were required to reduce the land bank. Incidentally, the land bank provided funding for ROW acquisition and other sensitive lands issues. Gregg Patterson requested clarification on how could one take funding away yet balance the plan. Mr. Maher stated that the projects, listed further down the spreadsheet, were increased therefore the land bank was decreased to balance the bottom line budget. Ms. Norwood stated that, as she understood the previous discussion of the CAC, no money was to have been taken from the environmental projects. Mr. Maher explained that Landbank was not specifically for environmental issues but could be used for anything, including right of way. Ms. Norwood clarified the ROW was for road projects. Jim Davis stated that the Landbank allowed for current year dollars to take advantage of opportunities to purchase properties. Mr. Maher stated that it should actually be in a neither column. The suggestion was made to change the color of the Landbank line item on the Master Plan to distinguish it from the water quality and sensitive lands funds. Mr. Maher stated that it was a good idea and it needed to be highlighted.

Moving along to Capital Circle Northwest, I-10 to Highway 90 Mr. Maher stated that staff questioned if stormwater retrofit dollars could be diverted to other projects. The Board indicated that dollars currently reflected for stormwater retrofit and greenways on CCNW be reallocated to fund construction of the roadway segment from Highway 20 to Orange Avenue. Any remaining funds would return to the line item for stormwater retrofit and greenways for the I-10 to US 90 segment of CCNW. Dianna Norwood clarified that segment 2A (of Capital Circle SW) had been added to the entire category. Mr. Patterson questioned if that fell under the general category of wanting a six-lane highway from I-10 to the Airport. Mr. Maher stated that the Commissioners wanted to be able to get to the airport as quickly as possible. Mr. Maher further stated that both I-10 to Highway 90 and Highway 20 to Orange Avenue were at the same level of funding as previously listed, but had been moved further out in the timeline. Mr. Davis reminded the committee that the figures for those projects were not adjusted for inflation.

Mr. Henderson stated that it would be a "stickler" for the community and further stated that the work at Gibby Pond could be considered stormwater retrofit and greenways. Mr. Maher stated that that Gibby Pond was included in the Master Plan. Mr. Henderson asked what was missing or what was eliminated with the reallocation of funds. Mr. Davis stated that the original intent was to extend west of the roadway into the greenway and floodplains; acquire those parcels and install trails, accommodate stormwater, etc. Mr. Henderson stated that basically to acquire land from the County park behind Lowe's (northwest) south to...how far south, he asked. Mr. Bright stated that effectively to Gum Swamp, possibly further south. Mr. Henderson asked staff to estimate the acreage of that area. Mr. Davis stated that staff had not identified specific parcels ... the Gibby Pond parcel was approximately 15 acres, there was another 60-ish acres Blueprint was interested in but it had not come to fruition, also there were 215 acres, the Atkinson property (west of Capital Circle and connected to Tennessee Street and Talquin State Park), which Blueprint was extremely interested in working every angle to acquire it. Each of those properties would fit together in the area and could have been purchased, possibly, with the funds that the Board directed staff to reallocate. Mr. Davis further stated that that a portion of the expanded

PD&E for the region between West Tennessee Street and Orange Avenue would include looking for opportunities for retrofit.

Mr. Henderson stated that the \$30 million for segment 2A would include acquisition of parcels that could have been purchased under the environmental funding. Ms. Norwood stated no. Mr. Davis stated that unless it could be identified and acquired as part of the roadway. Furthermore Mr. Davis reminded the committee not to confuse stormwater requirement associated with the road with retrofit, as they were different. Mr. Henderson asked if negotiations went well for the Atkinson property would the money to purchase it come from the Landbank. Mr. Davis stated that if the funds were sufficient, yes. Dave Bright stated that Blueprint would then try to get reimbursed the next year through an FCT grant. Mr. Henderson asked if one could receive FCT funds after the fact. Mr. Maher stated that the application would actually earn 5 more points if the land had previously been acquired.

Mr. Sheridan stated that, while the topic of discussion was quite interesting, the committee was on a schedule and there was one citizen to be heard. If the committee chose to return to the discussion informally that would be fine however he was required to move the meeting forward. Mr. Sheridan asked Ms. Norwood if there were items she would recommend to Mr. Maher regarding re-formatting the Master Plan. If so, please communicate those to Mr. Maher at a later time. Mr. Sheridan asked for staff direction regarding the required action by the CAC. Mr. Maher stated that the committee should vote to accept the Capital Budget, which would implement the Master Plan, which was basically a five-year plan. Ms. Norwood asked if she was correct in thinking, if one did not agree with some of the changes to the Master Plan they should vote no. Mr. Maher stated that she was correct.

Mr. Davis stated that staff needed the committee to fully understand the entire package. Basically, there were no changes to the sensitive lands portion. The CCNW project was fully funded through three segments, I-10 to Orange Avenue. CCNE, which broke ground on at the beginning of May 2005 was fully funded. CCSE Woodville to Tram; money follows production philosophy was being implemented, however the design phase was funded. CCSE Woodville to Crawfordville was not funded; neither was Crawfordville Road to Springhill Road. On CCSW the PD&E study was funded to determine what the alternative alignment would be. Capital Cascade Trail segment one, the Board instructed staff to reallocate funding from Franklin Boulevard to segment four construction, thereby, fully funding segments two through four. Mr. Davis continued with staff recommendations in the out years of the Master Plan for the "extra money" to return to Franklin Boulevard to complete construction on segment one of Capital Cascades Trail.

Mr. Davis stated that he would ask the committee to review the priorities for accuracy. He instructed them not to be so concerned about the actual numbers because they would fluctuate from year to year but, in their opinion, had staff captured the priorities in the correct sequence? Mr. Sheridan asked if there was a motion on the floor...there was not. **Jess Van Dyke moved to approve the Capital Budget for FY 2006; Bob Henderson seconded it for discussion.** Mr. Henderson, base on his training and experience, questioned how staff could justify completing segments 2-4 of Capital Cascade Trail prior to completing segment one. Mr. Van Dyke stated that segment one did not have much stormwater improvement it was mainly to provide greenway and to prevent some flooding of Franklin Boulevard. Mr. Sheridan stated that the committee had

spent *three full meetings* discussing that subject, if Mr. Henderson would like the committee to reconsider it they could but not without a quorum. Mr. Henderson stated that he was not arguing the sequence but merely trying to understand why that particular sequence was chosen. Mr. Davis stated that there was a valid rationale for the decision and he would be happy to discuss it further with Mr. Henderson after the meeting.

Gregg Patterson requested Mr. Maher explain the difference between the 2006 column on the Master Plan (\$57 million) and the 2006 column on the five-year capital budget (\$21 million). Mr. Maher stated that in order to let a construction contract the IA had to appropriate the entire contract amount in the year of contract letting. The Master Plan was a cash flow document that indicated the full contract amounts in the years the funds were/would be appropriated. The budget sheet tracked the expenditures per year. Much of what was being spent in FY 2006 was actually appropriated in FY 2005.

Michael Sheridan stated that without a quorum the members present could make a recommendation only regarding the capital budget however it would move forward to the IA on May 16, 2005. Mr. Sheridan further stated that if the members chose to table the capital budget until the July 14, 2005 CAC meeting it would be for academic purposes only. He reminded the committee there was a motion and second on the floor. **Mr. Sheridan called for the vote; two members abstained (Patterson, Sheridan), one member voted to approve (Van Dyke), two members voted not to approve (Henderson, Norwood).** Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Davis to explain what the next step would be with, at best, a tied vote by members present. Mr. Davis stated that the capital budget would move forward to the IA on May 16, 2005 with the CAC members objections highlighted in the IA agenda item.

Mr. Sheridan recommended the capital budget proceed within the budgeting process with comment that the CAC did not have a quorum and was unable to act because of that. However, the following concerns were expressed and allow each member to express those concerns to Mr. Davis with the understanding that Mr. Davis would include those comments intact. Mr. Sheridan, with the approval of the committee, stated that he would prefer that action to a vote given the fact that without a quorum the CAC could not have a full discussion. Furthermore, he requested staff to involve the CAC in the budget discussion two meetings prior to the submission date for the IA. Ms. Norwood stated that the CAC had recently discussed, in detail, the Master Plan but with the changes the Board directed staff to implement the January 31, 2005 IA meeting created a timing issue. Ms. Norwood suggested a special meeting might have been in order. Mr. Maher stated that there was one other alternative the committee could utilize. The capital budget that would move forward to the IA was merely for review and would not be formally voted on until the September 19, 2005 IA meeting. Bob Henderson asked how the committee could move other items forward without a quorum but could waffle on the capital budget because they did not have a quorum. Gregg Patterson stated that the CAC held a specific purpose and if the committee did not agree with the IA they should not waffle but stand up for what they believed. Mr. Maher explained that the capital budget simply implemented the Master Plan. He further stated that the language needed to be crafted to state that the CAC did not agree the Master Plan reflected the appropriate priorities, and therefore recommended not to adopt it.

Mr. Davis stated that he felt the Chairman's recommendation was accurate. He further stated that staff would present the Capital Budget and Master Plan to the Board on May 16, 2005 as

required by the budget policy. Furthermore, if committee members had any objections to the Master Plan or Capital Budget they should articulate them to staff for inclusion with the IA agenda item. The Board would then have the benefit of the CAC's concerns while pondering their decision to be made in September. Mr. Davis also stated that if the members chose to discuss the Master Plan and capital budget at the July CAC meeting, they could. He stated that he would like to know what the objections were because he was shocked by their rejection. Mr. Maher stated that he felt the same.

Mr. Sheridan recommended having the Master Plan as a primary item for discussion at the July 14, 2005 CAC meeting. Additionally, he acknowledged the sloppiness of the waffling but without a quorum and with a split vote by members present he did not see a better way to proceed. Mr. Sheridan further stated that he intended no criticism to staff but without the opportunity to discuss each detail more thoroughly he voted not to approve the Capital Budget also. Ms. Norwood stated that by not taking a vote what would be reflected in the minutes was the committee had issues or reservations regarding the Master Plan, therefore... Mr. Sheridan interjected, ...and without a quorum the committee felt it inappropriate to formally vote as to whether to recommend the capital budget move forward with the concerns, which had been expressed. Ms. Norwood clarified that their individual objections would be expressed directly to staff after the meeting. Mr. Sheridan stated that the members should use the form of media they felt most appropriate to express their objections. Mr. Davis stated that staff would need those comments as quickly as possible because staff was required to distribute the agenda to the Board seven days prior to the meeting.

Greg Patterson stated that he felt members were contradicting themselves on procedure. The committee voted on multiple items, including the operating budget without a quorum but when it came to the capital budget they chose not to vote. Instead they justified it by using the lack of a quorum as an excuse, because they did not agree with the IA but felt they needed to be politically correct. Furthermore, Mr. Patterson did not want the CAC to appear...Ms. Norwood interjected that she understood Mr. Patterson to say he felt the committee should vote to reflect the actual opinions of members present. Mr. Patterson agreed. Mr. Sheridan clarified he stated that the committee did not have a quorum for a full discussion nor did the members present have unanimity of opinion therefore felt it was inappropriate to move forward. Ms. Norwood stated that she felt their vote, as unofficial as it might be, would send a stronger message.

Mr. Sheridan, again, acknowledged the sloppiness but asked if it was acceptable to the committee to move forward because there was not a better alternative available at that time. Ms. Norwood clarified he was asking them to move forward without a vote. Mr. Sheridan agreed. Mr. Henderson asked him why he felt the committee should not vote when they had voted on multiple items already. Mr. Sheridan replied because the committee did not have unanimity of opinion however if the majority of the five members present chose to vote they should. **Mr. Patterson stated that he felt the vote should reflect one yes, two no's and two abstentions.** Ms. Norwood and Mr. Van Dyke agreed. Mr. Maher clarified the committee was rejecting the Master Plan not the capital budget (which only implemented the Master Plan).

Due to another meeting commitment, Mr. Sheridan turned the Chair position over to Jess Van Dyke and reminded him the meeting had exceeded its time limit and there was one speaker to be heard. Additionally, the March 18, 2005 minutes needed to be carried over to the July 14, 2005

meeting for approval and items 8a/b and 9 remained for discussion. Mr. Sheridan also requested staff to prepare a report, for the next CAC or sooner, on responsibilities of CAC members, per the by-laws, regarding multiple missed meetings. Also please include general responsibilities of members, ethical elements, and procedures for abstention on voting. Furthermore, he requested staff prepare a presentation on "Government in the Sunshine" for newer members and a refresher for veterans.

Mr. Davis stated that all comments regarding the Master Plan should be submitted by CAC members early the next day in order for staff to meet the deadline for the IA agenda.

VI. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Mr. Jeff Phipps stated that he was excited to be in attendance and witness firsthand what the CAC did for the community. He recommended the CAC support efforts toward mitigation banking especially on stormwater. He further stated that he would be requesting the same from the County Commission. Referencing Mr. Henderson's questions regarding Capital Cascade Trail and beginning at Franklin Boulevard or Leon High School was a prime example. He further stated that the ordinances and codes could only accomplish so much. Even with the stormwater codes the community continued to overload and continued to ditch and bank the floodplains. If the Commissions implemented mitigation banking there would be fewer emergencies to "bail people out of the flood waters." He stated that he was curious to know what Blueprint was doing regarding mitigation banking and asked them to support it at the Commission level.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had investigated mitigation banking but had not formalized a plan. He further stated that the City and County had also investigated it. If either entity began a project that utilized mitigation banking Blueprint would try to cooperate with them. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was involved with many projects but what he felt was important was the mitigation itself more so than the banking. For example, Blueprint's purchase of the Headwaters of the St Marks to protect that floodplain or the plans for segment 4 of Capital Cascade Trail was the same thing. Mr. Davis further stated that all of Blueprint's corridor improvements would exceed the minimum requirements for stormwater and water quality. There was no formal banking but Blueprint was quite active in their efforts. Mr. Phipps stated that he was thinking more of encouraging the small individual landowners. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was not pursuing anything in that context.

IV. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS (CONTINUED)

Mr. Davis stated that items 8 A/B were extremely important and recommendation was necessary in order for staff to move forward.

Item #8 a: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study: Typical Section Guidance Regarding Policy Issues (US 90 to Orange Avenue, Blueprint map 2A)

(CONTINUED)

Jim Shepherd stated that the purpose of agenda item 8A was to approve the typical section for CCNW, Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. Following input from the CAC the agenda item would

move forward to the IA on May 16, 2005 with the alternatives public meeting to be held in June 2005. Staff would return to the IA in September 2005 for final approval on the typical section. It would be subject to engineering review by FDOT and finally to the CRTPA for their approval in the fall.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the proposed typical section was consistent with CCSE, and the ROW was 230' with the additional amenities such as the bike lanes, sidewalk, meandering trail, etc. Mr. Shepherd explained that CCNW/SW was dissimilar in its makeup being less residential and more commercial. He continued that staff's recommendations were listed in option 1 and summarized them for the committee; approval of the proposed typical section (subject to validation in September), a six-foot straight sidewalk and a ten-foot meandering sidewalk, four-foot bicycle lanes in each direction, and present the typical section to the public for review prior to returning to the IA for final approval. Mr. Shepherd stated that the reason why it was so important was due to the aggressiveness of the consultant's schedule.

Bob Henderson questioned how the presented typical section differed from CCSE. Mr. Davis stated that it was not significantly different. Mr. Shepherd stated that in regards to CCSE it was asked that Blueprint include a transit corridor (dedicated bus lanes for example) and it had not been requested of CCNW/SW. Mr. Shepherd (indicating images in a Power Point presentation) oriented the committee to the general area and business locations of the displayed map, south of Jackson Bluff Road. He stated that that staff had originally thought to provide a frontage road on the west side of Capital Circle to eliminate multiple driveways and median openings along the highway. All of the traffic for the businesses along the west side of the corridor would be concentrated to an intersection near the (future) Jackson Bluff town homes easement connecting to Capital Circle on the east. However, with the construction of the town homes as well as the traffic from Delta Industrial Park staff needed to tie everything to that one (signalized, future) intersection. Mr. Shepherd stated that the alternative had been presented to both the engineer and developer of Jackson Bluff town homes for feedback. Mr. Shepherd stated that both frontage roads, with the exception of where they would extend further, would be constructed within the 230' ROW. Mr. Shepherd continued through the Power Point presentation, discussing the various options for frontage road location and design. (See original agenda item 8 attachments on file at Blueprint 2000.) Mr. Shepherd further stated that Blueprint intended to present the frontage road concepts at the alternatives public meeting in June for their input and comment.

Dianna Norwood asked if any environmental issues had been reviewed given that the PD&E study had not been completed. Bob Henderson stated that much of that area (near Delta Park) was re-engineered approximately 20 years previously; not much remained that could be damaged. He further stated that the lake was originally closer to the road (CCNW) but the county back filled the area to create frontage. Mr. Shepherd stated that, from meetings with the developer's engineer, that area was quite contentious and under dispute by the City and the developer/owner. Mr. Henderson reiterated that due to the re-engineering there was not much there that could be considered environmentally sensitive. Mr. Davis interjected that Lochner validated, from an environmental perspective, that option 1, as presented, was a viable option for CCNW.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the reason Blueprint proposed all ROW come from the east side of the current alignment was that it was currently undeveloped and therefore less expensive and damaging. It was not the preferred concept but would be the best fit for the area. Mr. Shepherd stated that the concept area extended from Tennessee Street to south of Orange Avenue. Mr. Shepherd explained the PowerPoint slides as well as Right of Way fact (cost estimate projection) graphics. Mr. Davis stated that Commissioner Grippa and others had asked repeatedly why Blueprint needed to purchase the full 230-foot ROW and build certain amenities. Mr. Davis further stated the purpose of the ROW fact graphic was to answer those questions. It explained what was saved (or not) financially, however, the flexibility to include frontage roads, bus lanes, etc. Mr. Davis stated that in order for the alternative travel lanes to be effective they must be contiguous. Mr. Patterson stated that he did support staff's recommendation but if he were the opposition he could argue, "Saving \$180,000 was not much but one could buy out two flooded homes with that money." He clarified that all he intended by the comment was to make staff aware of how the matrix could be turned around and used against them.

Dianna Norwood asked if the bridge through Gum Swamp would include the sidewalk, other amenities, and a frontage road. Jim Shepherd stated that staff was very concerned about Gum Swamp and had reduced the Blueprint standard median width from 36' to 22'. Ms. Norwood asked if the concern was from a cost perspective. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff's concern was from an environmental perspective; no one wanted to see additional "fill" placed in the wetland. Mr. Shepherd further stated that John Kraynak of Leon County Growth Management was concerned that Blueprint was continuing the 10' sidewalk on one side of the Highway. Mr. Kraynak would prefer a five or six foot sidewalk through the wetland.

Bob Henderson stated that Mr. Davis' comments toward justification of ROW purchase reminded him of the Commissioner's comments back in the early 1970's. At that time the Commissioners did not understand why frontage roads were beneficial because the Highway (Capital Circle) was "so far out in the country they were concerned that people would not even use it." Mr. Henderson reminded the committee that was only 30 years ago. Jess Van Dyke stated that because no one knew what the future held was exactly the reason why an alternate transit lane was necessary. Mr. Davis stated alternate transit lanes could be included within 200' ROW; the difference between 200' and 230' was flexibility. The flexibility of a frontage road on one side with an alternative travel lane on the other, for example, would be lost. Ms. Norwood asked if any of the ROW Blueprint proposed to acquire could be used for stormwater collection. Mr. Davis stated, yes, it could certainly be used for stormwater collection. In fact in one of the typical sections included a recessed median to assist with stormwater runoff. Mr. Davis further stated that it would not only capture the stormwater but also treat it through filtration. The problem with a recessed median for capture/treatment for stormwater was the lanes would have to be fairly flat.

Jim Shepherd stated that Leon County was the permitting agency for the CCNW/SW project and Blueprint was working closely with them on stormwater as well as floodplain mitigation. Ms. Norwood clarified that the IA did approve 230' ROW for CCSE. Mr. Davis stated that was correct. Mr. Shepherd further stated that staff had included the advantages and disadvantages, as they saw them, as well as the ROW fact matrix in the revised agenda item for committee members to read. Gregg Patterson asked if staff would present the matrix to the IA. Mr. Davis stated, absolutely. Mr. Patterson stated that he was very supportive of Blueprint's position but,

from a strategic perspective, the matrix could be used against Blueprint. Mr. Davis stated the Board had asked for the information and that the matrix demonstrated there would be some cost savings to eliminate some amenities it would not be sufficient to fund another segment of the road; it was not a large impact. The Blueprint philosophy envisioned many things, Mr. Davis stated, if something would clearly provide cost savings, staff would certainly review it but what they were trying to show with the matrix was that all of the minor revisions to the Highway would not amount to enough savings to complete another segment of the road. What staff needed from the committee was an endorsement or guidance on the typical section. Mr. Davis stated that if the committee preferred a 10' meandering sidewalk or two 6' straight sidewalks they needed to express that and staff would present that to the Board. Regarding Gum Swamp, Mr. Davis stated it would be an un-typical section meaning the type of bridge would determine the type, width, and location of the sidewalks. Blueprint might cantilever the sidewalk off the side of the bridge or possibly place a barrier between the outside lane and the sidewalk; it would depend on the cost.

Jess Van Dyke called for a motion to approve the typical section submitted by Blueprint staff. Mr. Shepherd clarified that staff's recommendation was for the committee to approve all of the typical sections in the package because the frontage road typicals would fit within the 230'. Basically, he continued, staff was requesting the 230' ROW, the 10' meandering and 6' straight sidewalk, the 4' bike lanes, all of the elements of the typical section. **Greg Patterson motioned to approve the typical section; Bob Henderson seconded the motion with a friendly amendment that the committee enthusiastically supported the 230' typical section consistent with CCSE. The vote passed unanimously.**

Item #8 b: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study: Extend Design South to Orange Avenue (CONTINUED)

Jim Shepherd stated that item 8B was generated from the IA's direction at the January 31, 2005 for staff to "get to Orange Avenue as quickly as possible." The agenda item was to authorize the IA to negotiate and supplement H. W. Lochner's existing contract in order for them to design from south of Blountstown Highway/State Road 20 south to Orange Avenue. Mr. Shepherd continued that while staff did not know what the actual cost would be yet, it would only add three months time to the existing Lochner contract. The advantage of allowing Lochner to complete the design for that segment was that it would be the fastest way to get the study done to Orange Avenue. The disadvantage would be that staff had not reached a decision regarding the alignment of CCSW south of SR 20; if the IA made the decision to add segment 4A back into the mix then the work by Lochner would be premature. Mr. Shepherd further stated that staff would only authorize Lochner to begin work on items critical to the schedule.

Bob Henderson asked if the same rules would not apply in that situation as in CCSE Woodville to Tram segment. Mr. Davis stated that the CCSW Highway 20 to Orange Avenue was different. When Blueprint was originally determining the limits of the PD&E Study, FWHM mandated that Blueprint complete the PD&E all the way to Orange Avenue. Blueprint decided to do the PD&E down to Orange and build to Blountstown Highway but now they wanted to complete the design south to Orange. Mr. Shepherd stated that it was confusing but the PD&E limits extended from Tennessee Street south to Orange Avenue but the design plans, ROW maps and permits were only to be completed to Blountstown Highway. Mr. Henderson clarified that staff was requesting to extend the design plans, ROW maps and permits to Orange Avenue. Mr. Davis

and Mr. Shepherd replied that he was correct.

Jess Van Dyke called for a motion to authorize the IA to negotiate and supplement the existing contract with H.W. Lochner to prepare construction documents. Bob Henderson motioned to approve the authorization; Gregg Patterson seconded the motion. The vote was 3 to 1, with Dianna Norwood dissenting. Dianna Norwood stated she would have liked some discussion of the motion before the vote. Mr. Van Dyke apologized and re-opened the item for discussion. Ms. Norwood stated that Blueprint held public hearings on the Capital Circle SW but it appeared that staff was essentially telling the public that it was all for show. By letting construction money and continuing to Orange Avenue, staff was saying they would either use the existing route or the Orange Avenue route. Why would people show up to the public hearings if they have the impression that it's a done deal, she asked. She felt it sent a message to the public that she was not comfortable supporting. Mr. Henderson verified she said that by continuing the design to Orange Avenue would eliminate option 4A. Ms. Norwood stated that 4A would be eliminated along with an alternative that could be generated out of public involvement. Once the money was spent to build six-lanes to Orange Avenue, they were literally cementing the route to either the existing one or Orange Avenue.

Ms. Norwood stated that the issue was really about timing. Maybe, she continued, the project was at that point already, however the process had not been completed yet. She further stated that neighbors had expressed their discontent to her several times. She offered the following example... they showed up for the meetings and explained their thoughts to Blueprint but Tony Grippa had already decided that was what the south side needed. Mr. Davis stated that he understood exactly what she intended with her comments and that was exactly why Blueprint only wanted to do the contract the way it was structured because staff did not want to eliminate option 4A. Ms. Norwood agreed. Mr. Davis clarified that Mr. Shepherd merely stated that staff would only begin the process by surveying, etc prior to the September IA meeting. At that meeting, staff hoped to have a decision by the Board, regarding the alignment of CCSW. Ms. Norwood asked how much money would be spent for Lochner to complete those items critical to the schedule. Mr. Shepherd stated that Blueprint could halt Lochner's work mid-stream if that became necessary based on what they had done so far. Furthermore, there was \$100,000 contingency money left on Lochner's contract that could be spent before September 30, 2005; they could not do any more work than that. Mr. Shepherd stated that the main thrust of it was that all the engineering was dependent on the survey and in order to meet the accelerated schedule the surveyors needed to get started. Ms. Norwood stated that was not a strong enough argument for her to change her vote.

Mr. Patterson asked for someone to clarify if completing the design to Orange Avenue would eliminate most of the other alternatives. Mr. Davis stated, "no, as Dianna said it was timing." Mr. Davis stated that staff wanted to begin the preliminary work to move the segment along. Mr. Davis further stated that there was a high probability of CCSW following the current alignment to Orange Avenue based upon the preliminary work staff had completed and the item previously discussed. However the Board had not yet approved that but their guidance to staff was to "get to the airport as quickly as you can." What staff was suggesting, he continued, was rather than delay the process, begin the preliminary steps to move that segment into design and ROW acquisition. Of course it was all subject to the Board's decision at the September 19, 2005 meeting. Mr. Davis further stated that there was money at risk, however, based on Blueprint's

analysis he felt there was a high probability that staff's recommendation would be along the existing corridor down to Orange Avenue.

Ms. Norwood asked Mr. Davis to confirm that the money at risk was \$100,000. Mr. Shepherd stated that at most it would be \$100,000. Ms. Norwood stated that it was all relative when looking at the big picture, what was \$100,000. Mr. Davis stated that Ms. Norwood was exactly right and Blueprint could stop the entire process. If the Board wanted to, staff could put everything on hold pending their decision in September. Mr. Davis further stated that the agenda item did reflect a clearly articulated disadvantage associated with moving forward and that staff would present both sides to the IA at the May 16 meeting. Ms. Norwood stated that, even if she was not so intimately involved, she felt the CAC was supposed to ensure that the Blueprint process was followed. That included public hearings, citizen advisory committees, etc., yet basically what Blueprint staff was saying with the agenda item was that they intended to move forward anyway. Jess Van Dyke stated that staff's educated guess was that CCSW would keep the current alignment to Orange Avenue; they were merely trying to expedite the process. They were willing to take a \$100,000 risk.

Jim Shepherd stated that it had been intended to present the CCSW alternatives to the IA at the May 16 meeting. As the CAC was witnessing, however, with the Master Plan, Operating and Capital budgets, Capital Cascade Trail, etc. already on the May agenda staff thought it best to postpone CCSW, with all its discussion, to the September meeting. Ms. Norwood stated that she certainly understood, however she still felt the item was premature.

Jess Van Dyke stated that he was incorrect in calling for the prior vote without discussion and suggested the committee vote again from a more knowledgeable position. Mr. Davis stated that from a procedural standpoint Mr. Van Dyke was correct. Upon revote, the vote was split 2 to 2, with Norwood and Patterson dissenting.

Mr. Patterson stated that the reason he voted no was to essentially send a message that he took his position as a CAC member very seriously. He intended no offense to Blueprint staff (Ms. Norwood seconded that sentiment) however they could tell the "bully pulpit where to ..." Mr. Patterson further stated that he understood Blueprint's position and that their jobs would be at risk if everyone was not kept politically happy. However he felt it was important that when CAC votes were published they had stood up for what the CAC represented. They only had the court of public opinion on whatever the issue might be. Furthermore CAC members held an extremely important role in Blueprint 2000. As typical elected officials, Mr. Patterson continued, the IA would prefer to minimize the CAC's role, however the CAC members were charged with the responsibility, as politically incorrect as it might be, to stand up for what they was in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Van Dyke stated that it was also the duty of members to attend the meetings and without a quorum they were in trouble and the "bully pulpit" was very deep. Mr. Davis stated that Bill Smith sent his apologies he was simply unable to make it. Mr. Van Dyke requested David Bright, to the best of his ability, let the committee know ahead of time who would not be in attendance so that other committee members could "get on them a bit" because a quorum was absolutely necessary. Otherwise everyone's time was wasted. Mr. Patterson stated that a few things were accomplished but by not having a quorum, it minimized what the committee was

capable of accomplishing.

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail (Blueprint map 3)

(CONTINUED)

David Bright stated that when staff initially wrote the agenda item they intended to bring it to the IA at the May 16, 2005 meeting for a second vote to confirm segment two concept design so that staff could then request an extension of Genesis' contract. Mr. Bright stated that there remained several outstanding issues of City and County Stormwater related to the stormwater model and its results in testing the Alternatives. Therefore it would not be presented to the Board until September. Mr. Bright recommended the CAC read the agenda item and review the general concerns that were expressed by the City and County. He further stated that several of those concerns would be addressed and resolved during the design of segment two. It appeared that since it was a Blueprint project, both the City and County felt they could critique and request the proverbial "pie in the sky" because they were not funding it. The issues were related to a flash-flood situation and were nothing that could not be overcome but it would not be easy to resolve. Some of the concerns were flood flow, rate of rise, habitat, etc. Mr. Bright stated that each of those concerns were "huge" but were being discussed at more of a design level when the project was still in the concept phase.

VII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Jess Van Dyke stated, "I guess we're done." Everyone agreed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 pm.