

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 8, 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 4:29 pm. He stated that due to concerns with quorum issues the meeting would end at 6:30. There were no objections stated by the Committee.

Committee Members present:

Michael Sheridan	Bob Henderson
Jerry Conger	Gregg Patterson
Dianna Norwood	Anita Davis
Jess Van Dyke	Kevin McGorty

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Mark Llewellyn
Dave Bright	Jack Diestelhorst
Phil Maher	Shuli Leonard
Ed Ringe	Paco de la Fuente
Jim Shepherd	Linda Jamison
Shelonda Gay	Delmas Barber
Angela Richardson	Donald Downey

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Dave Bright stated that a new item for the election of the CAC Chair had been added. He further stated that new graphics for CCSW as well as the Matrix had been added. Furthermore, the order of the discussion items had been changed and was noted on the modified agenda. Mr. Bright also stated that due to the “heavy” items regarding CCSW and Capital Cascade Trail discussion of other agenda items would be limited as previously requested by the Committee. Information items would therefore stand alone, as presented with only moderate discussion. There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Phil Maher stated that in the recent Federal Transportation Bill \$16.1 million was earmarked for Blueprint’s Capital Circle NW and SW projects. He explained that the Appropriation Bill had dollars allocated to three line items:

1. \$8 million for Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest
2. \$1.1 million for Capital Circle Northwest to the Airport
3. \$7 million for Capital Circle Northwest

He reminded the Committee that CCNW/SW was fully funded in the sense that dollars had previously been allocated to it although they had not been appropriated yet. He explained that it essentially meant that an additional \$9.1 million would have to be reallocated to other projects. He further stated that Item #13 would discuss that in greater detail.

Mr. Maher stated that in addition to Federal funding, Blueprint had applied for a Florida Highway Beautification Grant in the amount of \$300,000 for landscaping on CCSE. As well as an FDEP Office of Greenways and Trails Grant for the purchase of the 214-acre Atkinson properties located west of CCNW and extending from West Tennessee Street to Northwest Passage.

Jim Davis added that the Florida Community Trust (FCT) Grant draft scores had been released. Blueprint had submitted two applications to FCT one for 24-acres in Segment 4 of Capital Cascade Trail in the amount of \$980,000.00. That project was the number one rated project in the state of Florida! The second application was for the 160 acre Booth property acquisition in the Headwaters of the St. Marks River. He further stated that on or around October 15, 2005 FDOT would release their draft work program, which would include SIS funding. Blueprint could have as much as \$32 million in that program and staff was diligently chasing it.

Dianna Norwood asked where in Segment 4 the 24-acres were? Dave Bright stated that the parcels that made up the 24-acres were all near the intersection of Orange Avenue and Springhill/Lake Bradford Road.

Item #2: Atkinson Property-OGT Grant Application (Blueprint Map 2A)

Dave Bright reiterated what Mr. Maher stated earlier and identified the property on Blueprint Map 2A. Bob Henderson asked who would manage the property if Blueprint were successful in acquiring it. Dave Bright stated it was located outside the City limits therefore it would potentially be the County. He further stated that County Commissioner Sauls was quite interested in it. However, because it was adjacent to the City limits it was possible that it could be annexed.

Item #3: Blueprint In-House Attorney

Jim Davis stated that he felt the agenda item was self-explanatory; there was a potential cost avoidance by hiring in-house council.

Item #4: Capital Circle NW (I-10 to US 90) Bid Letting Update (Blueprint Map 2A)

Bill Little stated that the project was successfully let to bid. It was awarded to M. Inc of Tallahassee for \$25.462 million and 825 days for completion. The groundbreaking ceremony would be held on October 24, 2005. Bonnie Pfuntner stated that a reminder would be mailed to the Committee.

Item #5: Capital Circle Southeast Design Consultant Selection (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway, Blueprint Map 4)

Doug Martin stated that the project was successfully advertised and URS was selected. Michael Sheridan asked where they were headquartered. Mr. Martin stated Tampa. Jim Davis stated that they had a local office located at Summit East. Jerry Conger asked for clarification of the evaluation scores. Mr. Davis explained the consultant selection process. He stated that each

proposal was reviewed and evaluated by a technical committee based upon the criteria established in the solicitation. The individual members of the selection committee graded each firm; the members' scores were averaged to determine the final score.

Item #6: Capital Circle Southeast-Potential Design Build (Tram Road to Woodville Highway, Blueprint Map 4)

Jim Davis stated that a contract had already been awarded to DRMP for the design of that segment of CCSE. However, there was approximately \$14 million in Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funding that was available to organizations that had a regional outlook. The CRTPA met that criterion. In a conversation with Mr. Davis, Ed Prescott stated that if Blueprint had a project ready for construction by the end of the 2006 fiscal year, June 30, 2006, they would be "very eligible" for the remaining TRIP dollars.

Mr. Davis stated that in order for Blueprint to be eligible there had to be a design partially complete and nearly ready for construction; Design Build would qualify. The Woodville to Tram project had a completed PD&E, and had a design firm on board. The \$16 million that became available as a result of the Federal SAFETEA Bill and with the possibility \$14 million from TRIP it was a "good fit for this \$30 million project.

Staff was therefore proposing a Design Build contract on Capital Circle from Woodville Highway to Tram Road assuming they received TRIP funds. The current contract had been structured so that if Blueprint was unsuccessful in obtaining the \$14 million they could continue with a standard design.

Blueprint had negotiated with DRMP early on in the process. Basically, DRMP would be stopped at 60% design if Blueprint received the money and the project would be bid out for 100% design and the construction. If the funding did not come through DRMP would continue to 100% design. The contract was structured with Letters of Authorization (LOA). The first LOA only went to 60% and staff would issue a subsequent LOA to continue to 100% if necessary.

Anita Davis asked if, in light of the multiple projects having recently been out for bid, was Blueprint adhering to the Minority Business practices. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint's standard for MBE participation was 15.5%, which they met, and that it was tracked on a monthly basis in the Production Report. He further stated that Blueprint's goal was 21% participation for construction.

Mr. Sheridan commended staff for pursuing the multiple leveraging options. He further stated that the CAC was "very happy" with the job Blueprint staff was doing.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

Item #7: Minutes of CAC Meeting: July 7, 2005

Michael Sheridan requested a motion to approved the July 7, 2005 CAC minutes. **Jerry Conger moved to approve the minutes. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item #8: Harbinwood Estates Stormwater Enhancement Project

Michael Sheridan stated that, if he understood correctly, that item was simply a confirmation vote. Dave Bright stated that the CAC approved the Harbinwood Estates Stormwater Enhancement Project at the July 7, 2005 meeting. However, the meeting had not been properly noticed staff was bringing it back to the CAC to ensure legality. He further stated that there had been no changes to the project and the TCC had reviewed it in the meantime and was in concurrence. **Greg Patterson motioned to approve the project. Anita Davis seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.**

Jerry Conger stated that he may have misread the agenda item but thought the CAC would have taken action on Item #6.* Mr. Bright explained that the agenda items were written for the IA. Therefore, while the item may have a recommended action listed it was not necessarily for the CAC or TCC. Mr. Sheridan stated that he felt, as citizen appointees, they certainly had the right to approve or disapprove any item that was to be taken forward to the IA. Historically, the Committee had added emphasis and enthusiasm to such items, but could go the other way as well. Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Conger if he would like the Committee to reconsider Item #6. Mr. Conger stated, no, it was fine.

Item #9: Appointments to the CAC

Dave Bright stated that at that time there were five CAC positions that required action; two were due to resignations and three due to expiration in November. He stated that the EECC had recommended that Charles Pattison and Kevin McGorty be re-nominated. The Better Transportation Coalition and Ability First both recommended Paul Martell. However, he continued, it was his understanding that the Better Transportation Coalition did not exist as it once had therefore the recommendation actually came from Ability First. The Economic Development Council recommended Kathy Archibald.

The final position was the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Commission appointment. Mr. Bright asked Dianna Norwood if elections had been held for that group yet. Ms. Norwood stated that elections had been held for the Chair and Vice-Chair. Mr. Bright stated he understood that was the delay in their nomination and hoped they would have their recommendation within two weeks. Michael Sheridan asked Ms. Norwood if she thought that action would be taken in time to have a representative from the Planning Commission at the November CAC meeting. Ms. Norwood stated, yes, and stated that she would email Maribel Nicholson-Choice for confirmation. Mr. Bright stated that he thought Ms. Norwood would still be a valid member, through November, if they did not have any appointment.

Bob Henderson moved to approve the recommendations as stated by Mr. Bright. Gregg Patterson seconded the motion. Mr. Sheridan stated he would be delighted to have Kathy Archibald re-join the CAC. Various members of the Committee and Blueprint staff expressed their agreement. Kevin McGorty stated he was surprised but thrilled to hear that Ms. Archibald would be joining the Committee again. Jerry Conger asked to amend to motion to include the expression of the Committee's enthusiasm at the nominations and recommendation. Mr. Henderson agreed to the amendment. **The motion passed unanimously.**

IV. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

(No item number): Election of CAC Chairman

Kevin McGorty stated that he felt it would behoove the Committee to thank Bill Smith for doing an excellent job Chairman. He stated that he understood Mr. Smith's resignation was due to his extremely busy schedule. **Mr. McGorty moved to nominate Michael Sheridan for the Chair and Jess Van Dyke for the Vice-Chair. Bob Henderson seconded the motion.** Mr. McGorty further stated that Mr. Sheridan had served as Chair when Mr. Smith was unable to attend, and had done a wonderful job of effectively and efficiently running the meetings. Mr. McGorty continued, Mr. Van Dyke was a member of the EECC, always attended the CAC meetings, and had always been there. For continuity purposes, he felt, it would work well, if Mr. Van Dyke were willing to serve.

Michael Sheridan called for other nominees or discussion of the motion. Then stated that if elected he would serve the remainder of the term, through December 31, 2005. He also clarified that at the November 17, 2005 meeting the Committee would be electing officers for 2006. Jess Van Dyke stated that his attendance to date might have been excellent, however, he would be unable to attend the November 17, 2005 meeting. Dianna Norwood asked if Bill Smith had been the only Chair or if there were others. Jim Davis stated that Kathy Archibald had been the Chair of the CAC for several terms prior to Mr. Smith.

There were no additional nominations offered. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Sheridan stated the both he and Mr. Van Dyke were delighted by the unanimous election. Also, he requested Mr. Davis draft letters, for both of their signatures, to Mr. Smith and Ms. Moran thanking them for their excellent service to Blueprint.

Item #14: FY 2004 Performance Audit

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint was pleased with the outcome of the audit and especially proud of their efforts with leveraging and public involvement. Mr. Maher requested the Committee to select a sub-committee of CAC members to prepare an annual report based on the Performance Audit. Michael Sheridan asked if that would include and evaluation of management. Mr. Maher stated that the performance audit was basically a management review. Bob Henderson stated he thought the Financial Audit required an annual report. Mr. Maher stated that the requirement was actually the Financial Audit but everyone "*expected*" a management report. Therefore the Performance Audit would be the basis of it.

Michael Sheridan recommended that Gregg Patterson head the sub-committee because it was the type of work he did professionally and was extremely competent in that area. He further recommended the sub-committee have two additional members with one of them being Charles Pattison. Mr. Patterson stated that, like everyone, his schedule was quite full therefore he would like to have a better understanding of the scope of the report before committing to the project.

Mr. Maher stated that the Performance Audit had already outlined everything that was needed in the report. He suggested Mr. Patterson basically highlight and summarize the items of the audit for the report. It should also be something that could be published in the Tallahassee Democrat.

Jim Davis reminded the Committee that they had requested to have a report published in the Democrat at a past meeting. He felt that if the report came from the CAC it would be more credible than from the staff. The basis for the report was in the Performance and Financial Audits. Mr. Davis stated that he thought the sub-committee could coalesce the data into something that was suitable for publication. It should only require a couple hours work.

Mr. Patterson agreed that would be acceptable. Mr. Sheridan stated that Charles Pattison plus one additional volunteer would work with Mr. Patterson. Dianna Norwood volunteered. Mr. Sheridan thanked her.

Bob Henderson asked if it was normal for the Performance Audit to be released nine months after the end of the fiscal year. Phil Maher stated that it should not have been so late but MGT of America wanted to see the CAFR (the annual financial statements). The CAFR required Board approval before it was final. The soonest date after the end of the fiscal year to do that was the January 31, 2005 IA meeting. He further stated that the Performance Audit should have been completed in February or March of 2005 however.

Mr. Henderson stated the reason he raised the question was that time healed old wounds. If they (the CAC) received the report late they might have forgotten if there were any issues. He quickly clarified that he did not have any issues with Blueprint but was merely stating a point. Mr. Maher stated that staff agreed with Mr. Henderson and had spoken to MGT of America. Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Maher if he felt it appropriate for the sub-committee to create time frames for the audit. Mr. Maher agreed.

Jerry Conger requested clarification on the following quote from the executive summary: "...The interviews conducted confirm the diversity of views that exist among key people responsible for monitoring, administering, and implementing the Blueprint program." He asked if there was a message in there somewhere. Dave Bright stated that the citizens and commissioners often held strong, varying views of the topics Blueprint addressed. Phil Maher stated that he read it as a positive, meaning that the Committee members were not simply "yes men;" that they (TCC, CAC, and IA) truly discussed each item. Mr. Davis agreed.

Mr. Conger further stated that later on it stated, "...Both the TCC and CAC have provided valuable input into the Blueprint program. Only minor changes are suggested for these two advisory groups. Improved coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organization staff is recommended." He asked if that was a recommendation for the CAC as a committee to improve their coordination and what minor changes were they suggesting for the committee. Phil Maher stated that he thought some of the language might have been carried over from the previous year's report. In the previous report the CAC had requested the inclusion of someone from the education community as well as someone from FDOT. Blueprint had made the effort to include those two positions.

Jim Davis stated that staff had made drastic efforts to improve the relationship with the CRTPA (former MPO). He further stated that staff had just recently attended a very productive meeting with their Executive Director. There was also the continued search for a permanent Executive Director for the CRTPA, which to date had been unsuccessful. However, he felt that once that position was filled there would be more opportunities for cooperation with Blueprint. Mr. Davis

further stated that Dave Bright was a member of the Technical Committee for CRTPA so Blueprint did have some input and did monitor what went on.

Mr. Conger asked if they were routinely invited to or if they attended Blueprint meetings. Mr. Davis stated that they held a seat on the TCC and were at the meeting the previous day. Mr. Conger asked specifically about the CAC. Mr. Davis stated that because they were staff they were more suited to the TCC. Dave Bright stated that they had attended public meetings for Capital Cascade Trail and CCNW/SW.

Michael Sheridan asked what the recommended action was. Phil Maher stated that the recommended action was for the Committee to appoint the sub-committee (Chair, Gregg Patterson, Dianna Norwood, and Charles Pattison) to use the Performance Audit as a basis for an annual report that would be suitable for a newspaper article. **Bob Henderson moved to appoint the sub-committee as explained by Mr. Maher. Anita Davis seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Item #13: Priority Guidance for Additional Funding

Jim Davis stated that he had previously explained the allocation of \$16 million in Federal transportation funds, and furthermore there was the potential to gain additional, significant funding in the next month. All of which was above and beyond the sales tax revenue. Consequently Blueprint staff needed guidance as to where funds released by receipt of the "new" money should be allocated.

Staff outlined several options in the agenda item, included explanations for each and recommended an action for the CAC to consider. Mr. Davis stated that staff's priority one recommendation for any new money was to leverage it. He further stated that the potential Design-Build of Capital Circle from Woodville Highway to Tram Road was the perfect example. \$16 million in new money could be turned into a \$30 million project by getting an additional \$14 million from the TRIP program. Staff also proposed, because of the money follows production strategy, the PD&E for this section had been completed, the project was let to design, and staff was in the position to go to Design-Build very quickly when money becomes available. FDOT and the Legislature like to say, "I'll give you the money; show me what you are going to do with it. And I'm not talking about studying anything. I want to see, next year, where you have turned some dirt with the money." Projects at the construction stage are far more apt to getting additional money.

Partially because of that reason, staff was proposing the second priority for new money be to complete the PD&E for the remaining sections of Capital Circle, in order to have production ready, or near production ready projects. Furthermore it would provide Right-of-Way (ROW) maps. Not only would staff know where the route would be but also as opportunities arose to acquire properties from willing sellers via land bank funds, Blueprint would be able to pursue them. Mr. Davis reminded the Committee that the greatest expense of any project was ROW.

Mr. Davis stated that the third priority indicated by staff was the acceleration of the Stormwater and Greenway funding. He reminded the Committee that on Capital Circle Northwest there was \$22 million allocated for Stormwater retrofit and Greenway Trails construction. The Board decided to re-allocate that money for construction of Capital Circle SW from Blountstown

Highway to Orange Avenue. When Mr. Maher recently revised the Master Plan he was able to refund the Greenways component, but not until the out years, 2016-2017. If, however, additional funding was available staff felt the priority should be on advancing the Greenway projects. Mr. Davis clarified that staff was not adding any money it was simply a cash flow issue.

Mr. Davis stated that many of the priorities were subject to how much funding was *actually* received. He reiterated that what staff was suggesting was any additional funding received should not be allocated to any specific project but added to the land bank. The land bank afforded staff the flexibility and opportunity to acquire ROW when it became available. Even though there might not have been money in the Capital Budget for that specific project.

Michael Sheridan stated that it was obviously an extremely important policy question therefore he suggested Committee members address questions or comments to Mr. Davis. Kevin McGorty stated that he had not had the opportunity to critically review that particular agenda item. He asked Mr. Davis to clarify if the listing of staff's recommendations were in priority order. Mr. Davis replied that they were. Mr. McGorty stated that his concern was "locking the money" into any one area without more thought.

Dianna Norwood stated that she did not see funding for the proposed park amenities for Capital Cascade Trail listed in the options. She stated that staff "dropped" Segment 1 from Capital Cascade Trail. Mr. Davis stated that Segment 1 was fully funded in the out years of the current Master Plan, but Ms. Norwood was correct that Segment 1 did not make it into the final list of staff recommendations. He continued that with that agenda item staff was requesting guidance from the Board, however, proposed and final allocation would always be presented to the CAC.

Mr. Maher stated that it was important to remember that the item was not to appropriate funds. Bob Henderson stated that it seemed to him staff was searching for a way to prioritize, to be comfortable with in their own minds, the decisions before they were presented to the CAC or IA. Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Henderson was exactly correct. Kevin McGorty stated he wanted to ensure that the CAC was kept in the loop and had the opportunity to make a recommendation(s) to the IA. Mr. Davis stated that the CAC would always have an opportunity to review funding strategies and proposals before any dollars were committed anywhere.

Gregg Patterson stated that as he understood it Blueprint staff would use the CAC's input as a guide, in each instance, to recommend allocation. Mr. Davis stated that was correct and reiterated that it was situation dependent because the Master Plan would be updated annually and many of the situations would be addressed through that process. Mr. Patterson asked if the Committee should implement a dollar threshold and timeframe in which they should be informed. Mr. Davis stated that he would rather they not because they were required to see everything through the Master Plan process. He further stated that the IA would not take action on the Master Plan without comments from the CAC

Dianna Norwood stated that she did not remember being asked or shown where the \$16 million was to be placed. Mr. Davis stated that staff recommended the \$16 million released go toward the Design-Build of Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Tram Road (agenda item #6). Ms. Norwood stated that it was staff's recommendation, but that the Committee had not voted. Mr. Davis thought for a moment, then stated that she was correct. After reviewing that

(informational) agenda item (#6) he stated that the Committee did not specifically approve the recommendation, as far as advancing the CCSE segment with the \$16 million back, but clearly that was what the agenda item was intended to address.

Michael Sheridan stated that, in specific response to Ms. Norwood, Jerry Conger had asked the question about approval of that item (Agenda Item #6). He further stated that, as he understood it, the items listed as informational or discussion would be moved forward to the IA, however the CAC had the right to pull an item for discussion and comment, and approval or disapproval. Mr. Davis stated that he felt it was his error and that the Committee did in fact need to vote on Agenda Item #6. Mr. Sheridan agreed and suggested the Committee continue with the immediate agenda item and then readdress Item #6.

Mr. Sheridan stated that, in the most simplistic terms the Committee was setting policy for the new money, that would prioritize using it to acquire additional leveraged money and secondarily, or possibly at the same level, used for land banking. Dianna Norwood stated that the land banking was the fourth item on the priority list. Mr. Davis confirmed that. She stated that the second priority would be the PD&E studies, followed by the Greenways and Stormwater for CCNW and then land banking. Phil Maher offered an example scenario of how items or projects could move within that prioritization. Jim Davis added that land banking was basically, in that case, a blanket term for any remaining money.

Jess Van Dyke moved to approve Option 1 of staff recommendation. Bob Henderson seconded the motion.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Guidance for the staff for the tentative allocation of new funds as follows:

1. Priority for all money is to leverage, i.e. TRIP and any grant program where a match is required.
2. Conduct EPD&E study for remaining segments, Capital Circle from Orange Ave to Crawfordville Road
3. Accelerate full funding for the stormwater and greenways for Capital Circle Northwest. (Currently an opportunity exists to acquire 214 acres, the Atkinson property, not to exceed \$6.5M. A FDEP Office of Greenways and Trails grant has been submitted to offset this amount. This is consistent with a leveraging opportunity.)
4. Enhance land bank funds to allow for early opportunity ROW purchases from willing sellers

Gregg Patterson stated his only concern was, especially given the example of what had happened within that meeting and not to imply that he did not trust staff, the possibility of abuse with only a small amount of manipulation. Michael Sheridan and Jim Davis both agreed that anything could potentially be abused. Mr. Davis further apologized to the Committee and stated he thought it would be "cleaner" if they actually voted on leveraging the \$16 million against TRIP funds.

Kevin McGorty stated that he did not take issue with that, however he did have a policy issue that he would personally feel more comfortable, on a case-by-case basis, to be a part of the decision of future funding. He also asked if that particular item was on the IA agenda. Mr.

Davis stated yes it was, as without direction from the IA, he did not know how to reprogram the \$16 million. Mr. McGorty stated that he understood that, however, he questioned if the CAC could support the leveraging without implementing a policy that would allocate future funding. Phil Maher stated that if the CAC approved Option 1, for staff to spend any additional dollars they would return to the CAC when they were asking for the appropriation.

Kevin McGorty stated that due to the aggressive leveraging of funds, he felt they would need to give due consideration to where to allocate the money. He did not want to lock them into a policy. He wanted staff to have and exhibit creativity for the best leveraging of funds. Anita Davis stated that she wants to ensure that the leveraged dollars would be appropriated to the correct place and in the correct order. She wanted to ensure that what she voted on was what was necessary.

Bob Henderson stated that it might help Committee members to focus on the title and statement of issue listed on the agenda item. **It was "guidance" to staff and did not usurp the responsibility of the requirement to follow the appropriations process or to have CAC review and/or debate the issues of specific projects.** It simply provided outside boundaries for staff to work within. Mr. Sheridan asked if Mr. Henderson was offering that as a modification to the motion. Mr. Henderson stated that no, he was reading the agenda item and explaining how and why he felt comfortable with it.

Gregg Patterson stated that what might be said instead of setting policy, it could be a general rule that the CAC liked the outlined priority but realized it was subject to change. He did not understand why the Committee was "setting it in stone." Mr. Sheridan stated that his proposal was to not adopt staff recommendation as formal policy but to give the staff informal guidance that those were the priorities the CAC would like followed. Mr. Patterson agreed. Mr. Sheridan asked how Mr. Davis would feel about it. Mr. Davis stated that he did not personally take issue with it, but his concern was how to move that forward to the IA.

Mr. Sheridan stated that he thought there were several issues on the table (1) the approval of item #6, leveraging the \$16 million against TRIP funds. Mr. Davis stated that if approved he would move the \$16 million leveraging request forward to the IA which would handle the immediate need. Mr. Sheridan stated that the CAC, as a consensus, would tell staff without a formal approved motion that they approve the general guidance but would wait for proposals to come back. He asked Mr. Davis if that would compromise what staff needed to present to the IA relative to item #6. Mr. Davis stated he did not think so.

Mr. Davis stated that part of the problem staff has had with the Master Plan was that there were 12 elected officials, 12 CAC members and often the guidance received conflicted with the other. He reiterated that everything had to go back to the CAC. All staff was discussing was allocating the money, if they received it, in the Master Plan. The actual appropriation, approval and budgeting of the money would all have to be approved by the IA. The CAC would see everything, they had to see everything before the IA could act on any item. The CAC always had the right and opportunity to approve or disapprove any item.

Michael Sheridan stated that there was a motion on the floor to accept the recommended option. He further stated that, if the motion were approved, Bob Henderson's reiteration of the statement

of issue be included with the motion. **The motion passed 6 to 1; Kevin McGorty was the dissenting vote.**

Item #6: Capital Circle Southeast-Potential Design Build - RECONSIDERATION

Michael Sheridan returned to Item #6 for reconsideration. **Bob Henderson moved to approve staff recommendation, Option 1. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Pursue a Design-Build Contract this Fiscal Year for the Tram to Woodville segment of Capital Circle Southeast. Initiate contract activity to:

- a. Select a CEI firm for the Tram to Woodville segment.
- b. Initiate the procurement process for a Design-Build Team.
- c. Authorize a stipend not to exceed \$25,000 for the Design Build Short listed firms, with payment to all three firms if the Design-Build is terminated.
- d. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award the above listed contracts.
- e. Commit the funding released from CCNW/SW due to the \$16M in Federal funding to this project as required.
- f. Direct the CRTPA to take all necessary actions to enhance the probability of qualifying for TRIP funding for this project.

Item #12: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design (Blueprint Map 3)

Dave Bright stated that the CAC had reviewed the Capital Cascade Trail project several times throughout the year but staff would provide a brief update. Staff would also give the IA a project status that would identify issues that had been resolved and the ones that remained on the table, request action from the IA that would allow the project to move into design of Segment 2 and continue to resolve some of the unresolved issues (primarily with Segment 3 and Segment 0).

The highlights of the discussion were the bike lanes in Segment 1, Concept E for Segment 2 with placeholders only for the amenities, Concept A for Segment 3, and Concept 4 for Segment 4. Mr. Bright reminded the Committee that the sequence of construction would be segments 2, 4, 3, 1. He stated that one of the TCC issues was that the IA selected a preferred concept for each segment, which Blueprint staff had not expected and did not request, without specific City or County staff input. He also briefly discussed Segment 0/Leon High School.

Bob Henderson asked of what value would such a small holding pond be at Leon High. Mr. Bright stated that it would not solve any major flooding issues down stream however it would slow the initial surge and allow for some initial sediment deposit. Mr. Davis stated that the pond would be a LHS project and would store approximately 10 acre-feet. Mr. Bright stated that the TCC sub-committee had addressed several of those issues over the summer. He also noted that in Segment 1 the box culvert that was proposed to be used for storage had been eliminated. There was, however, still one culvert there for conveyance and one for underground utilities.

Mr. Bright stated that one of the issues for the TCC was the culvert and stream velocities through Segment 1 and in front of the FDOT building. The concern was in regards to providing proper

habitat for fauna and flora. The flora would assist with cleaning the water as it moved along the channel. Another issue was the peak water stage in Cascade Park proper. In the southwest corner, near Monroe Street the water would stage up dramatically; approximately one foot per seven minutes at peak or four to five feet out every seven minutes. Mr. Bright stated that early on in the process staff decided not to add any capacity for flow underneath Monroe Street, partially so as not to disrupt traffic and partially because something would immediately need to be done downstream to accommodate it. That did raise some flags at the TCC, and staff's resolution was to review that issue early in the next phase, Segment 2 design, to determine what might be done either on interim basis or the final design.

Mr. Bright stated that staff was proposing to get Segment 2 designed and would propose to the IA to accept the preferred concept that was accepted in January 2005. It was planned to use the early part of the next phase to look in more detail at the volume LHS could store, look at more of the peak water stage in Cascade Park and on how to add additional capacity under Monroe Street and resulting downstream requirements. It probably would not change the rate of rise but it would change the amount of total rise. Also considerable amounts of work remained in regard to Railroad Square and FAMU Way coordination. He also mentioned there was the possibility of some off-line, upstream storage by building a pond on the very southern edge of Myers Park, which would slow down the peak flooding.

Mr. Bright further stated that staff intended to propose to the IA a three-phase program for Capital Cascade Trail. He stated that there were several permitting issues involved and staff was working with Federal, State and local agencies to resolve them. The issues mostly revolved around on-line or off-line ponds and severance of jurisdiction.

Bob Henderson asked for clarification on how the water would get from the possible pond at Myers Park to Cascade Park. Mark Llewellyn stated it would be conveyed through a culvert under the railroad track. Dianna Norwood asked if Mr. Bright was referring to Smoky Hollow. Mr. Bright stated the parcel was at the extreme southern end of Smoky Hollow.

Dave Bright stated that the current contract with Genesis did allow Blueprint to extend it into Phase 2. Staff had requested Mr. Llewellyn provide a proposed design team for review. The team included everyone from signals and lighting to stormwater and park design. He also stated that the TCC was concerned, based on history in that area, and staff would include additional karst analysis in Segment 3 and Segment 4. The same would apply to additional Cultural Resources Analysis in Segments 3 and 4.

Due to a malfunction with the dictation equipment the remainder of the meeting was not recorded. The minutes that follow were generated from staff notes.

Michael Sheridan reminded the Committee of the time constraints of the meeting and reiterated the possibility of losing the quorum if it ran long. He asked them to limit their comments because of it. **Gregg Patterson moved to approve staff recommended Option 1. Bob Henderson seconded the motion.**

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1:

1. Reaffirm the January 31, 2005, IA recommendation for the preferred concept for Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2.
2. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and execute a contract with Genesis Group for design services for Phase 2 Segment 2, at a cost not to exceed \$2,000,000 (including contingency); it is acknowledged that additional funding will be required and requested in order to address all scope items. The design team will include a nationally recognized park design firm. The Blueprint Director will approve the design team. The proposed design team is shown in Attachment 6. The Contract will be divided into the following three separate authorizations
 - A. Expanded Master Plan Activities
 - a. Increased geotechnical and historic/cultural resource investigations of Segments 3 and 4
 - b. Prepare FEMA letter of map revision
 - c. Develop permit level plans for all CCT segments
 - d. Design of SWMF at Leon High School
 - B. Segment 2 Technical Design
 - a. Design Survey
 - b. Geotechnical Investigations
 - c. Final Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis
 - d. Park Programming: Trails and recreational facilities, public areas, stream morphology
 - e. Construction Plan and documents
 - f. Permitting
 - e. Public Information Program
 - C. Myers Park SWMF Conceptual Design (with option for Final Design)
 - a. Preliminary Design Survey
 - b. Preliminary Geotechnical Analysis
 - c. Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis
 - d. Conceptual Design and Feasibility
 - e. Right-of-Way Map
 - f. Public Information Program
3. The Technical Coordinating Committee will be required to comment on the Scope of Services.

Kevin McGorty stated that Segment 2 support with the public and the Master Plan was a plaza concept with a natural sloping field. He advocated for open design options until the remediation was complete. Mr. McGorty stated he was concerned that the project would be locked into a flat field design for Cascades Park. Mr. McGorty further stated he supported staffs proposal to extend Genesis' contract through Phase 2 of the project but he felt more emphasis should be placed with landscape design. He suggested Genesis to manage the project but hire a nationally ranked landscape firm to complete the actual park design. Jim Davis asked if Mr. McGorty was suggesting the field have more slope. Mr. McGorty confirmed that was his request.

Mark Llewellyn stated that the park program needs were an early scope task as far as what its uses would be, the intensity of use and potential themes. Bob Henderson stated that he understood but felt that was simply the phraseology of the plan. Mr. McGorty stated that

ultimately the size of the stormwater pond would determine the remaining space and its potential use. He also reminded the committee and staff that the IA's 11 to 1 vote was against the ball field but was not necessarily for a flat field. **A motion was made to increase the slope or grade at the proposed Centennial Field Plaza in Segment 2, consistent with the EECC vision. The vote passed unanimously.**

Item #10: Capital Circle SW Corridor Study/PD&E Alternatives (SR 20 to Springhill Road, Blueprint Map 2B)

Michael Sheridan briefly summarized the agenda item and introduced Jim Shepherd for the presentation. Dianna Norwood stated she thought they had requested/decided to invite speakers to the meeting. It was noted that Bill Smith and Jim Davis were to have discussed that between the meetings but with Mr. Smith's resignation from the Committee it did not occur. Mr. Davis apologized and stated that all communication (letters and emails) from the various groups and citizens were attached to the agenda item. Furthermore, several of the CAC members were present at the 4th public meeting.

Mr. Shepherd shared several graphics with the Committee and briefly discussed each. He spent considerable time discussing the revised map for CCSW, which identified all three corridors and the proposed individual routes. In regards to the evaluation matrix, Mr. Shepherd stated that it was not 100% accurate but was consistent throughout. Jess Van Dyke stated that Corridor 2, the routes through the forest were a waste of time and money to consider. They were not reasonable and should be eliminated. Mr. Van Dyke also suggested staff modify the map to indicate the 200-yard buffer from homes that had been discussed for Segment 4A in Corridor 3. Furthermore, he strongly encouraged staff to not eliminate 4A so early in the process. He stated that Corridor 3 should be broadened to include the Jackson Bluff Town Homes/Delta Industrial Park area because they had not been constructed yet. It would also alleviate some of the concerns regarding disturbance of neighborhoods or Cascade Lake.

Michael Sheridan agreed with Mr. Van Dyke that Corridor 2 was an unreasonable option. Kevin McGorty stated that he preferred Corridor 3 and would like to see staff reevaluate 4A because it encompassed the spirit and intent of the EECC and BP2K. He also reiterated that some of the property in that area was largely undeveloped. He further stated that Corridor 2 was in complete contradiction to the philosophy, principles and intent of BP2K. **Mr. McGorty then moved to remove Corridor 2 from further consideration. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion.** Chairman Sheridan passed the gavel to Mr. Van Dyke. Mr. Sheridan stated that Corridor 2 would be an environmental disaster and that the corridor should not be studied further. The gavel was returned to Chairman Sheridan. Bob Henderson echoed those comments and added that he did not agree with the degradation of the natural environment west of Capital Circle to protect the Chain of Lakes. **The motion passed 6 to 1 with Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting vote.**

Mr. Henderson further stated that Corridor 3 should be expanded to include 4A stating that the "white area" (Delta Industrial Park) needed to be rehabilitated. **Jess Van Dyke moved to extend the northern boundary of Corridor 3 200-yards from occupied dwellings. Dianna Norwood seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Kevin McGorty moved to only study the amended Corridor 3 in the PD&E. Dianna Norwood seconded the motion. There was some discussion between Jim Shepherd, Dianna Norwood and Michael Sheridan regarding that recommendation. Mr. Shepherd stated that he personally did not have issue with it but was certain that FDOT would. Jim Davis stated that he was certain that FDOT would strongly encourage Blueprint to study the existing alignment, Corridor 1. Bob Henderson asked what the approximate cost of studying Corridor 1 would be. Mr. Davis replied that it would be approximately \$250,000. Mr. Henderson asked if it would not be prudent to save that money. Mr. Davis replied that by eliminating the existing alignment from the PD&E study Blueprint could potentially lose Federal funding. Jerry Conger spoke out in favor of studying Corridor 1 in the PD&E.

Dianna Norwood reminded the Committee that the original Blueprint report for this segment stated that it was a "realignment of CCSW." Additional Corridor 1 discussions included access to the Airport, and the Apalachicola National Forest and 4F property near the CCSW/Orange Avenue intersection. Kevin McGorty stated that BP2K was citizen driven and the recommendation was based on nine-years of study to realign CCSW, therefore, strongly recommended Corridor 3. **Mr. McGorty repeated his motion to recommend Corridor 3 and expanding it to the north to Segment 4A for the PD&E study.** Gregg Patterson asked if it also included the 200-yards from occupied dwellings provision. The group replied, yes. Jerry Conger asked if the motion excluded Corridor 1. Mr. McGorty stated that the motion only included Corridor 3. **The vote passed 6 to 1 with Jerry Conger casting the dissenting vote.**

Jim Davis asked if the CAC intended to eliminate Corridor 1 from the PD&E study. **Kevin McGorty moved to eliminate Corridor 1 from the PD&E study. Dianna Norwood seconded the motion. It passed 6 to 1 with Jerry Conger casting the dissenting vote.**

Item #11: Capital Circle NW/SW E-PD&E: Typical Section, Recommended Alignment Approval, and Extended Design Limits Approval (Blueprint Map 2A & 2B)

Michael Sheridan read the statement of issue from the agenda item: "The purpose of this agenda item is to approve the typical sections and recommended alignment, and to provide final approval to design from Blountstown Highway (SR 20) to Orange Avenue (SR 371). There was virtually no discussion of the item. Jim Davis stated that the votes the Committee had taken on item #10 did not affect item #11 because the IA had directed staff to design the roadway to Orange Avenue. **Jess Van Dyke moved to approve staff recommended Option 1. Jerry Conger seconded the motion. It passed 6 to 1 with Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting vote.**

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1:

1. Approve the typical sections.
2. Approve the staff recommendation (Combination Alignment #2).
3. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to:
 - a. Approve the outstanding issues listed in Section 4.
 - b. Execute a supplemental agreement to the existing contract with H.W. Lochner, Inc. for the continuation of the design to Orange Avenue (refer to Section 5).

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were none.

VI. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were none.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Gregg Patterson moved to adjourn the meeting. Bob Henderson seconded the motion. It passed 6 to 1 with Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:32 pm.