

ITEM #7

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 17, 2007

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center

1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

4:30 – 6:30 pm

Terence Hinson called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

Committee Members present:

Terence Hinson	Jerry Conger
Jess Van Dyke	Tom O'Steen
Anita Davis	Kevin McGorty
Dianna Norwood	Gregg Patterson
Steve Amnett	Kathy Archibald (telephonically)

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Dave Bright	Randy Matheny
Phil Maher	Gary Phillips
Margie Quillman	Bill Little
Ed Ringe	Angela Richardson
Doug Martin	Paco de la Fuente
Paul Hiers	

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications. Dave Bright introduced Debra Schiro as the new Blueprint attorney.

Information Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Capital Circle NW Completion and Ribbon Cutting

This item was informational only.

Item #3: Capital Circle NW/SW Access Classification

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update

This item was informational only.

Item #5: Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel

This item was informational only.

Item #6: Regional Stormwater Pond: Park Concept (CCNW)

This item was informational only.

Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Marketing Plan Update

Gil Ziffer from ZifferStansberry Public Relations shared the task outline of the fundraising-marketing campaign they were working on. The effort is being funded by the Knight Foundation. He stated that their target "kick-off" date was September 10, 2007 with a special event planned for the park area. They were developing a program that would elicit support from virtually every person in the community; even the lone boy/girl scout that wanted to participate should have the opportunity to do so and feel that they were a part of creating the park. Terence Hinson questioned who the Co-Chairs would be. Mr. Ziffer stated that at that time it appeared that it would be Representative Lorraine Ausley, Mayor John Marks and someone, not yet determined, from the business community.

Item #8: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Workshop

This item was informational only.

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail Supplemental Service Approval

This item was informational only.

Consent Items

Item #10: CAC Minutes: March 15, 2007

Jerry Conger moved to approve the March minutes; seconded by Dianna Norwood. The item passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #11: CAC Report to the Community

Dave Bright briefly updated the CAC of the history of the Report to the Community and requested that they begin thinking of the process and what they might want for the next report

with a target date of late 2007 or early 2008 for publication. Kathy Archibald suggested that the CAC create a one page informational report for publication in the newspaper on an annual basis, with a more elaborate report/open house/field tour/etc. every five years because of the time involved in getting projects underway as well as creating and producing the report.

Dianna Norwood questioned if the five year mark would be in 2008? Ms. Archibald stated that in her opinion any date could be chosen but she wouldn't do anything before next year. Kevin McGorty stated his support of that idea but felt it should be tied into the Capital Cascade Trail marketing and public fundraising efforts that would be happening in 2008. It showed a benchmark of what had been accomplished and would lend credibility and potentially promote public investment into the amenities.

Ms. Norwood questioned the budget for such a production but stated that if less was spent in the other years... Mr. Maher explained the fiscal year schedule and stated that there was the potential for additional funding available on many of the road projects. Staff would be better informed of that line item closer to that time and could possibly augment it if necessary. Ms. Archibald stated that the minimal budget should be requested most years with a larger budget every five years.

Tom O'Steen stated that it was an opportunity to emphasize green space acquisitions because the roadway projects were the most obvious. Mr. Maher stated that in reviewing the numbers, once Capital Cascade Trail (\$190M) kicked off, total greenway project expenditures would be comparable to the roadway projects.

Kathy Archibald suggested that a policy be adopted for the annual report so that it wasn't a recurring agenda item each year. She then **moved that every five years staff/CAC coordinate and produce a significant community outreach (to include publications, open houses) to highlight all of the Blueprint projects that had been accomplished up to that point. On the interim years, a minimal budget would be spent to update the public annually as to what had been done. It was seconded by Dianna Norwood.**

Dave Bright clarified that the five year major update would be in Fiscal Year 2009 with the one page, informal report to be released earlier, possibly as an advertisement or insert to the Democrat. There was some discussion regarding text only versus photographs and the difference that made to costs. Ms. Archibald reiterated that was why she suggested the five year promotion rather than annually. Mr. O'Steen requested that staff bring a more definitive time table for both the one and five year projects. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Item #12: Revision to the Blueprint 2000 Real Estate Policy, Section 107.06A.1

Randy Matheny stated that in ongoing property acquisitions staff had found that two appraisals were required, per policy, for anything over \$400,000. Some of the parcels that Blueprint was looking to acquire were appraising in the \$800,000 to \$1M range. That policy was not in agreement with the authorization for Mr. Davis per the Intergovernmental Management Committee. The item was to make the Real Estate Policy incumbent and in accordance with his approval authority of \$750,000 and potentially, saves some money for Blueprint. Mr. Maher

stated that it was similar to FDOT policy, however, they required a second appraisal when parcels were above \$1M.

Dianna Norwood questioned if there was a significant difference between commercial and residential appraisals. Mr. Matheny stated that it varied depending on complexity of the appraisal itself.

Jerry Conger questioned how the appraisal firms were selected. Mr. Matheny stated that Blueprint had been using one of the GEC Team partners, Wiegel-Veasey. The appraisals for the remainder of the parcels however, on Capital Circle NW/SW would be going out for bid to local appraisers. Furthermore, local appraisers had been utilized in the past for some acquisitions (Delta, Copeland, etc). Mr. Maher stated that the local firms that had been used were approved by either or both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve staff recommendation to change the threshold amount required to obtain a second appraisal report for properties with initial estimates of value that exceed \$750,000 and permit it to be an option and not a mandatory requirement.

Kevin McGorty moved to approve staff recommendation; it was seconded by Anita Davis. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #13: FY 2006 Performance Audit

Phil Maher stated that the audit was completed by Kaye Kendrick of Kendrick Enterprises. The outcome was that Blueprint was generally following the intent of the program. Kaye Kendrick briefly discussed the process of the audit and the results. She stated that overall there were no significant problems with the Blueprint program, however, the audit tried to point out areas for potential problems to the overall success of Blueprint; as well as opportunities.

Kevin McGorty stated that he was disturbed by the adversarial relationship between the City, County and Blueprint 2000. He stated that the role of the TCC was advisory and quasi-regulatory, however, it seemed to him that Blueprint staff should respect the expertise of the members of that committee and vice-versa. He felt that it was necessary to emphasize it because he was sorry to see it listed in the audit. He stated that he had received complaints in the past from members of the TCC who were, in his opinion, trying to give their best professional judgment and felt intimidated.

Mr. Maher stated that there were two specific issues that related to the "adversarial relationship;" one being long term maintenance issue, which was quite difficult for both parties. There would be significant maintenance issues regarding some of the Blueprint projects and Blueprint staff was tasked with the "fun part" of designing and building while other Agencies would be responsible for maintaining it. Blueprint staff had been working to break the surface of that issue he stated.

The second issue, Mr. Maher continued, was the design-build issue. It was risky in the eyes of many people and Agencies. However, with the projects and schedules that Blueprint was tasked with and the time and costs included, the design-build process was necessary. It was partially a matter of historically different processes among the Agencies.

Mr. McGorty stated that he was not trying to be critical of any party in his statement. He respected the legitimate debates that exist between the Agencies because they were healthy in the end. Tom O'Steen stated that he had observed the level of integration between Blueprint staff, consultants and City/County regulatory agencies on numerous projects and that there was an extraordinary amount of time and effort dedicated to complicated projects. Furthermore, one of the major points for the creation of Blueprint was those types of interactions did not bode well under the existing local government framework. Another group of people needed to be in charge of ensuring that projects were completed in a new, different way. Therefore, that, in and of itself, created conflict or anxiety however, he felt that Blueprint staff had gone to great efforts to overcome those issues. Mr. McGorty stated that he respected that, however, Blueprint was finite. The City and County workforce was not. The projects would be public projects after Blueprint expired.

Jerry Conger stated that a person that was uninformed about the complicated process might view the comment of "Blueprint takes too many risks and moves too fast" as a serious deficiency. He felt it needed explanation of resolutions or processes for resolution. Ms. Kendrick stated that it was not written as a "fact" and they would change the wording if they felt it read that way. They were trying to point out, she clarified, the two sides of the issue. Mr. Conger stated that people that were involved understood that, however, his concern was the public perception. He suggested they elaborate on it and list if and/or how it was resolved.

Gregg Patterson stated that he read it as a "cultural difference" between the Agencies. From the business community perspective he appreciated that Blueprint was more nimble, less bureaucratic, etc. However the "deficient practices of a design firm" bothered him; he did not recall that. Mr. Maher clarified that it was not a consultant firm hired by Blueprint but a sub-consultant firm hired by one of the contractors. Several members of the committee requested that it, and the other areas mentioned, be clarified in the audit. However, they also stressed that Ms. Kendrick should report her findings honestly.

Mr. Maher noted that the comments would be incorporated into the IA agenda.

Item #14: Capital Circle SE Design Update (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)

Gary Phillips stated that the 60% design plans had been essentially completed and the consultant was working to complete 100% right of way (ROW) maps within the next few months. However, the project would stop at that point due to a lack of funding for ROW and construction. He briefly explained the typical section and noted that it included three lanes eastbound and four-lanes in the west bound direction, with the auxiliary lane to accommodate a continuous right turn movement. That put the estimated costs (for seven lanes) at \$28.3M for right of way and construction.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff developed an interim solution of four-lanes which would provide sufficient capacity through 2030 and it would reduce the estimated cost to \$12M. The footprint would remain the same with construction occurring from the "outside in" leaving a 72-foot median. At some point in the future the roadway could be widened to the inside.

Mr. Phillips explained that the interim solution was a viable option because the E2 to the east project would acquire ROW through a large portion of the E3 project area. Furthermore, an easement from the US Forest Service provided ROW for the majority of the remainder of the project area between Woodville and Crawfordville. With the roadway transitioning into the four-lane intersection at Crawfordville which was built by FDOT in 2004.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff hoped to receive TRIP funding from FDOT to accomplish the four lane option. They would need to work toward finding funding to use for the match but they should know in the fall if that would be possible. Phil Maher stated that it was intriguing because there were no ROW issues, secondly if TRIP funding were available, Blueprint would only need \$6M to match; third, there were several DRI's in that area that would hopefully produce mitigation dollars that could be used for the match. He reminded the CAC that FDOT was partnering with agencies that had projects that were construction ready. Blueprint was trying to posture itself to act if any funds became available.

Kevin McGorty stated that the EECC's initial thinking was to secure enough ROW for light rail or future transit. He questioned if the ROW capacity was sufficient for other modes of transportation. Mr. Phillips confirmed that it was.

Tom O'Steen questioned the expected timeframe for seven-lanes. Mr. Phillips stated that was associated with the \$28M price tag and there was simply no funding available for that. However, they would have 100% ROW maps and could acquire ROW anytime in the future that funding became available. He stated that the capacity analyses staff reviewed indicated that the roadway would meet traffic needs for 20 years with the intersections would give about 10 years before improvements were necessary.

Harry Reed stated that the CRTPA reiterated Mr. Maher's comments about FDOT funding for projects that were construction ready. Furthermore he stated that the next long-range plan would be coming up in 2010 but he hoped to take a different approach than in previous plans. The CRTPA wanted to create a mobility plan that moved away from individual modes and toward increasing mobility in the corridors.

Dave Bright stated that in the early 1990's the Planning Department conducted a multi-modal conceptual plan/feasibility study and at that time the land density was not enough to support anything more than dedicated bus lanes on Tennessee and Pensacola Streets. Tallahassee would need to move in a direction of much higher density if any of the options were to work. While there had been some infill the land uses and density levels were not sufficient to support the infrastructure of even light/mono rail or anything at that time. However, he continued, gas prices could change that outlook. Tom O'Steen stated that part of Legislative reform would need to be that density increases could not occur without land use changes as well. Yet they could not

promote land use with higher density without some demonstration that there would be infrastructure in place to support it.

Item #15: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study: Guidance for Evaluation Criteria

Paul Hiers introduced Steve Godfrey, Project Manager for Kimley-Horn, for updates on the project concept charrettes and to give an overview of the proposed evaluation criteria. Mr. Godfrey stated that the community had been quite involved since October 2006 through an extensive public involvement effort. He stated that three corridors were identified during the public involvement process. He briefly discussed the ones that would move forward in the PD&E study.

Mr. Godfrey discussed the 13 categories of the evaluation criteria (listed in the agenda) as well as the study topics that would be addressed in the PD&E study. He described the ranking process for the Evaluation Matrix and offered an example for the committee. The results of the matrix would give Kimley Horn staff an indicator of how the alternatives stack up against each other.

Kevin McGorty complimented Kimley-Horn staff and questioned how many people were in attendance at the concept charrettes. Margie Quillman stated that there were 75 at the Thursday meeting and 45 on Saturday; not including staff, etc. Mr. McGorty further questioned how the residents and stake holders felt regarding the existing alignment. He stated that in reviewing the data of previous forums, for example the forums on February 6 and 24, 2007, two out of 43 and nine out of 73 people (respectively) felt the existing alignment should be used. He questioned what type of consensus the IA would receive regarding the feeling on the existing alignment.

Mr. Godfrey stated that he was unsure if those numbers were truly indicative of the consensus. There were obstacles to using any of the alignments and all would be documented in the process. He further stated that, of the people that had been involved in the process at least, understood the factual basis and were not driven by their emotions. The process, Mr. Godfrey stated, would allow Kimley-Horn staff to collect the actual facts relative to all alignments, the impacts (environmental and residential), the availability or lack of land, etc. Additionally, once the facts were clearly identified there would be a community survey distributed for the general citizen to share their input.

Mr. McGorty stated that he appreciated the efforts however he was trying to gauge what the citizens felt regarding that particular major issue. He was concerned that because of the levels of minutia people could lose sight of what the CAC, Kimley-Horn and Blueprint were asking them to form an opinion about. Mr. Godfrey stated that, right or wrong, he had personally avoided scenarios where someone could stand up to say, "I want the existing alignment." He stated that was not a decision people needed to make at this juncture. The general public needed to see the facts of each potential alignment that the PD&E study would highlight and to be as unbiased as possible to make an informed decision. The citizens would have the opportunity to express those opinions at the Alternatives Meeting, where the evaluation of each alternative would be up for discussion in workshop forum style.

Jerry Conger questioned how and when the weighing would be assigned to each criterion. Mr. Godfrey stated that the details of that system were still being determined, but that they would have it to present to the IA for their decision; but stated that it would possibly be based on a point budget. Dave Bright stated that it would be an agenda item for the August 23, 2007 CAC meeting, if it was ready.

Gregg Patterson requested clarification regarding Airport access. Mr. Godfrey stated that in the 20-year horizon, with the new alignment in place and the existing roadway dedicated to Airport access, he indicated there would be sufficient capacity on both roadways.

Kathy Archibald questioned, regarding the weighting of the evaluation criterion and a new alignment versus the existing alignment, if there was a way to evaluate how that impacted traffic. Mr. Godfrey stated that ultimately Kimley-Horn would assign values to each criterion but behind each would be a description of the reasoning for that number. He further stated that they would calculate the economic impact of the alternatives in the PD&E study. Ms. Archibald questioned if there would be any recommendations made regarding future land use submitted along with the recommended alignment. Mr. Godfrey stated that the project was not about recommending changes to the Comprehensive Plan. However, the dynamics were such, with the amount of publicly owned land and the Airport itself, that they would work with Tallahassee/Leon County Planning Department and others; and while they could not force changes the Comp Plan, they could review what seemed the most logical based on the various alternatives. The secondary effect of land use changes as a result of changes to the infrastructure would be included.

Dianna Norwood reminded everyone that in 11 years, when funding finally became available for construction, that the area would look nothing like it did currently. That was due to the new Master Plan for FSU, Senate Bill 360, and the pressure with student housing / intramural fields. She questioned if she understood Mr. Godfrey correctly, in that they had already eliminated corridors that citizens had drawn. Mr. Godfrey stated that they had not eliminated them but based on the aeriels and house-counts, etc it was likely. Mr. Godfrey briefly discussed the corridors and how/why they were chosen for further study. He further stated that the lines indicated on the maps presented did not mean that was precisely where the roadway would be placed. During the engineering analysis and environmental review it could be adjusted. Saving special information that comes from those analyses, the proposed alternatives were the alternatives that would be studied in the PD&E.

Jess Van Dyke encouraged Kimley-Horn staff to investigate the relative quality of the wetlands in their research. In recent evaluations, Mr. Van Dyke stated, the quality of the wetlands within that area was questionable (referring to the Delta property). Also it would allow staff to potentially move the roadway further away from the lake.

Kevin McGorty stated that CCSW was the one project that the EECC felt could symbolize the holistic spirit of Blueprint. They felt very strongly about going beyond the normal State and Federal standards of road construction to ensure the protection of pristine water bodies in that area. Without prejudicing the outcome, and realizing that the CAC was only participating in an advisory capacity, they were fixated on the project and the enhancement of improvements while protecting natural resources.

Mr. Godfrey stated that as nice as it would be to not be in a position to re-construct anything the project would not be driven by what had previously been committed to construction (CCNW/SW). The project was committed to finding the right solution. If what was previously committed to construction needed to be modified in the future, so be it. Dianna Norwood stated that she was thrilled to hear that but if it had already been constructed the damage had already been done.

Terence Hinson requested clarification regarding the community survey. Mr. Godfrey stated that would be a newspaper distributed survey that could potentially have a "savings bond prize" associated with it to motivate people to participate. It would not be a perfect, scientific survey but would be indicative of the opinions of the people in the larger community not just the residents of the study area. Mr. Hinson suggested linking to it from the various websites (City, County, and Blueprint).

Tom O'Steen moved to forward the list of the evaluation criteria on to the Intergovernmental Agency for consideration; Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Public Hearings – 5:30

Item #16: Proposed FY 2008 Blueprint 2000 Operating Budget

There were no speakers present for the advertised Public Hearing on this item.

Phil Maher briefly explained the changes to the proposed budget. **Kathy Archibald moved to approve the 2008 Operating Budget; Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Item #17: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2008 – FY 2012 Blueprint Capital Budget

There were no speakers present for the advertised Public Hearing on this item.

Phil Maher briefly explained the connection between and the changes to the Master Plan / Capital Budget. **Kathy Archibald moved to approve the revised Master Plan / Capital Budget; Gregg Patterson seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Item #18: Fred George Basin Acquisition Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1

There were no speakers present for the advertised Public Hearing on this item.

Dave Bright reminded the CAC of the action previously taken by them regarding the Fred George Basin and questioned if there were any changes to their position. Kathy Archibald questioned what actions the TCC had taken on the item. Mr. Bright stated that the IA had not

accepted the previous comments/action by the TCC choosing an option closer to what the CAC recommended. Mr. Bright noted that the IA's action did not include the TCC's language that the "funds could come from the County's water quality funds without review by the consultant". The IA voted to move \$2.77M from the Lake Jackson Basin budget item to the Fred George project. Those funds were to be used to acquire the subject properties. **Jess Van Dyke moved to approve staff recommendation; Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Item #19: Mahan Drive Update – FDOT Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1

There were no speakers present for the advertised Public Hearing on this item.

Phil Maher stated that the IA had reserved \$10 million for Mahan Drive with instructions that Blueprint was not to begin the supermajority vote process until FDOT indicated they would fund the remainder of the project. During the Legislative Session the possibility of additional FDOT funds was discussed, but DOT needed a firm commitment from Blueprint that the \$10M was committed to the Mahan project. Mr. Maher stated that staff's intention was to begin the process of moving Mahan Drive from a Tier 2 to a Tier 1 project; with the caveat of only when funding became available. It was necessary to position it in that manner due to the meeting schedule of the IA. Harry Reed spoke in support of the process and stated that he had similar discussion with the FDOT District 3 Secretary regarding positioning the project to be utilized only in the event of the funding from FDOT; due to FDOT's preference for funding projects that were construction ready.

Kevin McGorty stated that the CAC had previously gone on record as not supporting reserving \$10 Million for Mahan, however, the IA respectfully disagreed. He was looking for tighter language or more assurance of complete funding of the balance by FDOT. Dave Bright read from the agenda, "...would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and officially commit the \$10 million reserved for Mahan Drive to the project only to be used if FDOT provided the balance needed for construction." Tom O'Steen questioned if staff needed to add, "without repayment." Mr. Maher stated that was not what the IA approved; they put the money in reserve.

Kathy Archibald requested clarification that Mahan Drive was not a Blueprint designed roadway but was in fact a FDOT designed road. Bill Little confirmed that it was an FDOT roadway and the design is not being done by Blueprint. Gregg Patterson stated that he was concerned that they were setting a precedent with their actions. He also questioned the deficit for funding all of the Blueprint projects. Mr. Maher stated that it was approximately a \$150 to \$200 million shortfall in funds. He reminded the committee that all Blueprint projects were in some form of production. The ones that were not fully funded, CCSE (Woodville to Crawfordville) however staff had a "plan" for funding options, and CCSW. However, Mr. Maher stated, CCSW was the "big unknown" for Blueprint.

Mr. Maher offered a new perspective for the committee; Blueprint had the opportunity to invest \$10M for a \$30M return. Mr. Reed stated that Mahan Drive was the number one project on a major priorities list for the region. Additionally it was part of the SIS system and therefore had a

better opportunity of being funded. Mr. McGorty stated that he felt the IA was committed to Mahan Drive and to the \$10M; he was looking for, however, assurance that the original Tier 1 projects received ample funding and were carried through to completion.

Dianna Norwood requested staff elaborate on the differences between a FDOT and Blueprint designed roadway. Mr. Reed stated that there would not be anything lacking from the roadway however the footprint would not be as wide. Mr. Little stated that the width of the right of way would be the main difference and a significant number of trees would come down but that was unavoidable.

Gregg Patterson asked if there was language that staff could incorporate in the agenda item for the IA that explained that the CAC was making an exception to support the action due to extraordinary circumstances rather than it appearing that they reneged on their previous vote. Jerry Conger asked Mr. McGorty for suggestions on how to "tighten" the language. Furthermore, if the CAC made changes to the motion, would any of the process need to be repeated? Ms. Norwood suggested that possibly it could revert to a Tier 2 project if FDOT funding was not forthcoming. The committee agreed wholeheartedly.

Dave Bright stated that he had not heard of that caveat and that per the By-Laws, the staff recommendation was to begin the process of moving the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1. He further stated that the intent was to commit the \$10M so that when FDOT had resources available there would not be a four month delay on the part of Blueprint. Mr. Maher stated that in the briefing to the TCC he stated that the move from Tier 2 to Tier 1 was contingent upon funding from FDOT. **Mr. McGorty stated that he liked the caveat of "if (the project) was not fully funded it moved back to a Tier 2 project."**

Kathy Archibald offered a bit of historical information. She stated that as a member of the sub-committee that made the recommendations for which projects should be classified as Tier 1 or 2 that the only reason Mahan Drive was relegated to Tier 2 at that time was because the City representative stated that they had the funds to put forth for Mahan. Subsequently that situation changed however it was originally represented as there being other funding sources available for Mahan Drive and it did not need to be considered as a Tier 1 project.

Gregg Patterson moved to add the language that Kevin McGorty previously discussed.

Tom O'Steen stated that he was less concerned with moving it to a Tier 1 project. He felt that hopefully securing 75% of the construction cost with only a 25% commitment was a "good deal." His concern was more in the aesthetics of the roadway. He stated that he understood that the reason for the reduction in right of way was to preserve as many of the oak trees as possible.

Mr. Little stated that every effort was being made to preserve as many trees as possible however it was necessary for a significant number to be removed. Mr. O'Steen stated that he understood that however he would feel much more comfortable with Blueprint's money being leveraged if there was an opportunity to enhance the roadway to make it more "Blueprint compatible" either through landscape or stormwater design, etc. Mr. McGorty stated that his goal was to limit funding to \$10M and to not leave it at a Tier 1 project.

Ed Ringe stated that The LPA Group was working closely with Leon County to enhance the trails and ponds along the corridor. He stated that they were making all efforts to utilize existing stormwater facilities or to install linear ponds in areas where they did not have enough capacity. The pond at Buck Lake Road, for example, would be a joint-use pond for the roadway and development.

Mr. McGorty stated that he felt the existing language for Option 1 was acceptable but would add the following: "if the financial commitment was not made by FDOT the project would revert to Tier 2."

Harry Reed stated that he anticipated with the design completion due in March 2008 (in the midst of the Legislative session) Blueprint wanted to be in the position to say, "...give us the money. We'll let the contract in July and have it under construction before the end of 2008." That, he stated was the key to the whole process and why staff option was phrased the way it was.

Tom O'Steen seconded the motion. The motion passed 8 to 1 with Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting vote.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were no public speakers present.

Items From Members Of The Committee

No items to be discussed.

Adjourn

Gregg Patterson moved to adjourn the meeting; everyone seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.