

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 17, 2005
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 4:30 pm

Chairman Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:37 pm.

Committee Members present:

Michael Sheridan	Bob Henderson
Jerry Conger	Gregg Patterson
Dianna Norwood	Anita Davis
Terence Hinson	Kathy Archibald
Paul Martell	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Dave Bright	Paco de la Fuente
Phil Maher	Mark Thomasson
Jerry Oshesky	Danielle Jimenor
Jim Shepherd	Lionel Skinner
Gary Phillips	Angela Richardson
Shelonda Gay	

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

There were none. Dave Bright introduced new CAC member Paul Martell, representing the Better Transportation Coalition/Ability 1st, and welcomed back Kathy Archibald, representing the Economic Development Council.

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Item #1: Capital Circle SW Corridor Study/PD&E Alternatives (SR 20 to Springhill Road) (Blueprint Map 2B)

Jim Shepherd stated that based on direction given by the IA at the September 19, 2005 meeting Blueprint staff wrote a letter to FDOT, District 3 stating that the PD&E Study for CCSW would only include Corridor 3, and would such a direction cause that section of Capital Circle to lose federal funding eligibility. FDOT responded on November 3, 2005, “it is the opinion of the Department and FHWA that elimination of the existing alignment and the no-build alternative may jeopardize future eligibility for federal funding. Therefore, we respectfully request that you reconsider the elimination of these alternatives from your study.” Mr. Shepherd stated that based on their direction and their opinion, staff recommended to include Corridor 1 in the contract for the PD&E study.

Bob Henderson stated that the ‘no build’ really meant was not to do anything. Dave Bright confirmed that. He further stated that at the last meeting of the CAC, they voted to only study Corridor 3 and eliminate Corridor 1. Kathy Archibald interjected that it also included the study of alignment 4A. Jim Shepherd stated that was correct, and stated that the IA had modified it further to include the intersection of Springhill Road and Orange Avenue. Michael Sheridan reminded the committee that it also included the amendment that Jess Van Dyke and Kevin McGorty added, “...no closer to existing

homes” with the emphasis on existing.

Mr. Bright stated that Blueprint staff had met with Leon County Commissioner Cliff Thaeil on Wednesday, November 16, 2005. Commissioner Thaeil was not pleased that FDOT stated that Blueprint had to study the existing alignment and it would likely be a major discussion at the December 15, 2005 IA meeting. Dianna Norwood asked why, in regards to leveraging, when the message or direction from the IA was so clear and strong, they were obviously collecting Blueprint money (tax revenue) so when staff stated that they would be jeopardizing additional federal funding, why not simply fund CCSW with Blueprint money? Phil Maher stated that the first reason was when looking at leveraging and the funding that was available, the “big dollars” were in transportation. The second reason led somewhat into the Leveraging update (item #6).

The previous month, Mr. Maher stated, had been a banner month for Blueprint 2000. Blueprint 2000 has received \$42 million in SIS funding for Capital Circle, from US 90 to Orange Avenue, for right-of-way (ROW), which were actually state funds. However, for it to be taken to the next step, construction, which would be partially funded by the moneys received from the Federal Transportation Act (federal funds). Jim Davis and Jerry Oshesky had been diligently working with FDOT District 3 to determine what the ramification would be.

Bob Henderson asked if the statement by the FDOT suggested they were or would be inclined to build in the present location. What did they mean by stating that it had to be studied? Jerry Oshesky stated that it meant simply that, it had to be studied. He further stated that FDOT had not mandated that Blueprint build anything. According to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) a viable alternate could not be eliminated without at least looking at it first, and in their opinion, Corridor 1 had not been looked at. Bob Henderson stated that according to FDOT, Corridor 1 was a viable alternative even though the CAC said it was not. Jerry Oshesky stated that FDOT had made no opinion on whether it was a viable option or not. All they said was, it had to be looked at (studied). There was no mandate to build anything but that alternate could not be eliminated, in their opinion, without at least going through the NEPA process.

Michael Sheridan stated for the sake of clarification that if staff did not study Corridor 1 they were jeopardizing or may forfeit some federal funding. Jerry Oshesky stated that by not studying Corridor 1, it would jeopardize not only the funding but also the approval of the PD&E study by FHWA. Mr. Sheridan asked if Corridor 1 were studied and the recommendation was to eliminate it, would it create a process in which FHWA would critique it. Would Blueprint 2000 still be in the running for an alternative site with the funding? Mr. Oshesky stated that the study would include all of the criteria - direction from public officials and citizens - and even if Blueprint eliminated Corridor 1 FHWA could override that decision because it was a negotiated process. Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Oshesky if it was his opinion that the mandate was to study Corridor 1, not necessarily to build it. Mr. Oshesky stated that was not his opinion, it was exactly what FDOT and FHWA had stated. He further stated that in the meeting with Commissioner Thaeil, that was mentioned and he was not placated at all, he did not want to even study Corridor 1.

Bob Henderson stated, regarding the 400-foot barrier from subdivisions... Dave Bright interjected a clarification that the distance was 200 yards not 400 feet. Bob Henderson continued that the discussion took place with regard to moving the corridor boundary to Seminole and Mabry Manor. His concern was that it might have been recorded incorrectly, 400' through the entire corridor, which

is what he stated he understood from the current discussions. If they did that it could put them into an impossible situation on the southern half of the corridor. Dave Bright stated that the direction from the CAC and the IA was 200 yards from the neighborhoods north of the 4A alignment. It did not address the routes that went through Black Swamp.

Michael Sheridan requested that, although the September 8, 2005 minutes had not yet been approved, would someone locate the quote in them for reference. Dianna Norwood reminded Mr. Sheridan that there was a recording malfunction and that a portion of the meeting was not recorded. Jim Shepherd stated that his recollection was that the IA had approved to include segment 4A, coming no closer than 200 yards to the existing neighborhoods. He further stated that it specifically referenced "4A" and "200 yards." Michael Sheridan asked for verification of what was presented to the IA and what, exactly, they approved. Mr. Sheridan's recollection was that Jess Van Dyke stated that rather than neighborhood it was "the nearest house." Phil Maher stated that he thought it was included in the agenda item that was presented to the IA, therefore, it could be retrieved from the file to determine the exact language of what the Board voted on. Mr. Sheridan stated that he recalled the IA approving the CAC's recommendation without debate. He further stated that staff knew what was presented and he felt confident that is what the IA approved.

Bob Henderson clarified that the boundary of 4A was from CCSW to Orange Avenue, approximately where Lake Bradford Road veered off. Jim Shepherd confirmed that area. Mr. Sheridan requested to have a Blueprint staff member retrieve the September 19, 2005 IA agenda and minutes. Phil Maher stated that Shelonda Gay was doing that.

For historical background, Kathy Archibald stated that it had been known all along that Corridor 1 must be included in the study. That was always something everyone knew, back in the early days, that the existing alignment had to be part of the corridor study. Mr. Sheridan stated that he wished the CAC had had Ms. Archibald's historical perspective at the previous meeting. Furthermore, Ms. Archibald stated that it was entirely possible when requesting the PD&E, to identify specific criteria and phrase them, in terms of some of the reasons to avoid Corridor 1, to be the over-riding criteria. For example, cost was not the determining criteria but the other issues were much more important. Corridor 1 had to be given its due diligence in terms of studying it, but if all of the reasons for not wanting Corridor 1 - its proximity to the lakes, its drainage basin into the lakes, the adjacent National Forest property, very few communities have their major road pass the parking lot of the airport, it was more appropriate for that spur to become an airport access road, better for diversion of traffic - need to be included in the PD&E as parameters.

Mr. Sheridan stated that although one could not hold elected officials to "chit-chat" it seemed that the money issue was not as important as doing what was right. Kathy Archibald stated that it had never been about money in that segment. In fact, that segment was always deemed to be the most expensive segment they would encounter because of the existing conditions. Dianna Norwood stated that was basically what she was asking of Mr. Maher earlier; even though Blueprint might jeopardize federal funding, was not that the one issue (environment) where "Blueprint" money should be spent. Mr. Maher stated yes, but the issue also needs to be approached from a leveraging perspective, which was how he answered the question earlier. He stated that transportation projects allowed for the most leveraged dollars. There were two programs for leveraging funds, the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) which is intended for routing traffic to the airport, bus station, ports, etc. The other was the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) which was based on roads which had regional

significance (virtually any part of Capital Circle). Kathy Archibald stated that it could easily be argued that access to the Tallahassee Airport could be made easier by keeping the existing Capital Circle as an access road as opposed to the main highway.

Terence Hinson asked how much it would cost to study Corridor 1 in the PD&E. Jerry Oshesky stated that the additional cost to study that corridor was not significant when included with the total project fee; possibly 10-15% (\$200,000-\$250,000) more. Mr. Sheridan asked if staff stated that they would not study Corridor 1 how much money would it "put in play." Mr. Oshesky stated that he had always understood the phrase "money is not the driving force in the selection of the alternative on CCSW" to mean that for the cost of that particular segment of the roadway. However, he continued, it was important to understand that the \$42 million Blueprint received in SIS funds was for Highway 90 to Orange Avenue, in the opinion of the FHWA. If Corridor 1 was not studied all of that money could be endangered. That would affect the CCNW/SW project as well as CCSW.

Jerry Conger stated that the question before the CAC was relatively simple; did they support the study using the parameters that Ms. Archibald identified or be defiant to the bureaucrats and state "we do not care what you say, we are going to do what we want to do?" He felt that the committee should support adding Corridor 1 to the study and if the results were that Corridor 1 was the better alternative (which no one believed would be the case) then fine. If it was not, then there was justification to proceed the way the CAC and IA seem to want to go. He stated that the committee should follow staff recommendation and move to the next item on the agenda.

Michael Sheridan stated that although it was merely an informational item, it would be of value to send a signal back to the IA to what the CAC felt about CCSW. He further stated that he appreciated the staff's recommendation and felt the IA would be guided by the reaction of the CAC. **Jerry Conger moved to support staff recommendation Option 1 to include Corridor 1 in the CCSW PD&E study. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion.**

Gregg Patterson stated that he could support that only if the CAC communicated clearly their strong preference to include the wording that would meet the parameters that Ms. Archibald listed. Jim Shepherd stated that all of the information from what Blueprint staff had worked on would be forwarded to the consultant and would form the basis of how they would proceed. Michael Sheridan stated that, while not specifically worded, to have staff ... He interrupted himself and asked Mr. Conger if that he would accept that amendment to the motion. **Mr. Conger stated that the motion would be fine if amended to include what Mr. Patterson and Ms. Archibald stated so that it expanded the feeling of the committee when it was moved forward.** Mr. Sheridan suggested (procedurally) to have Dave Bright send out to the committee what some of the study criteria were. Furthermore, Mr. Sheridan stated that he would like the committee to be heavily guided by the original EECC recommendations and studies; if the CAC were comfortable with that information, that was what would be forwarded on to the IA. **Ms. Archibald, as second on the motion, agreed to the amendment as well.**

Kathy Archibald stated that as caveat to that however, the committee needed to be very careful as to how things were worded. The corridors must be studied but the committee could not state a preference; however, they could describe the conditions they were looking to be evaluated. The PD&E had to be given the discretion of being an open and honest study with the parameters that the CAC valued included. Mr. Sheridan stated that he understood Ms. Archibald's intentions but it had to

be remembered that the CAC was simply passing forward a recommendation to the IA. He further stated that, if the remainder of the CAC agreed, to delegate to Ms. Archibald, being an original drafter of the EECC, to work with Blueprint staff (Dave Bright) to develop the wording of the recommendation.

Gregg Patterson stated that the amendment satisfied him, but his concern was the appearance that the CAC was possibly considering Corridor 1 as an option. Mr. Sheridan stated that he sensed that all members of the committee shared that concern.

Bob Henderson stated that he supported the motion and the amendment to the motion. He further stated that it was all in recognition of the direction of FDOT, and he felt that issue was recognized in why the committee was suggesting to study Corridor 1. Also, he recommended that the subcommittee that would draft "this" to not merely list negatives of Corridor 1, but also the positives of Corridor 3 as well because they wanted a major Highway there to support Innovation Park and the surrounding area.

Dianna Norwood stated that she wanted to ensure that the work was actually completed and forwarded to the IA because staff did not always follow up on what the minutes stated the CAC had requested. Furthermore, she felt it was a great idea and appreciated having Ms. Archibald back with the CAC.

Michael Sheridan stated that Kathy Archibald would be a committee of one and would work with Dave Bright. The work product should be sent to himself, Jim Davis and the members of the CAC for review because it needed to be on the next IA agenda. Dianna Norwood asked if they would vote by email. Mr. Sheridan stated "no" because the CAC had previously voted on it; therefore, it would be the Chairman's prerogative. He also stated it should be phrased to the affect of "...approval of what had previously been voted on by the CAC." Jim Shepherd asked for clarification, in the IA agenda item the CAC wanted staff to state that they (the CAC) concurred with including Corridor 1 in the PD&E as well as supporting all of the items listed in the Blueprint map (environmental and economic development reasons). Kathy Archibald completed his sentence by stating ...as part of the PD&E study to be evaluated on both alignments. Phil Maher stated that it was to establish the criteria; Kathy Archibald agreed.

Michael Sheridan stated that there was another piece of information that was almost academic, however the language that the CAC approved was for Corridor 3 to be extended toward 4A but come no closer than 200 yards to existing residences. (Quoted from the September 19, 2005 IA Agenda) With the emphasis being on residences not neighborhoods. Jim Shepherd pointed out that there were residences at the intersection of Tyson Road. He further stated that staff thought, or that it was possibly an inference of what staff thought the committee voted on, that the concern was the neighborhoods, i.e. Seminole Manor as a body, Mabry Manor as a body, not a single residence on Tyson Road. Dianna Norwood agreed and stated she did not know where to suggest they locate the road if that were the case. Gregg Patterson stated his perception was of the neighborhoods also.

Kathy Archibald asked if the amended motion could clarify that. Dave Bright stated that staff wrote, verbatim, the CAC's recommendation into the IA agenda. As for knowing what the IA approved he would have to review the IA minutes to know the language of the motion the Board voted on. Bob Henderson quoting from the September 8, 2005 CAC minutes stated that, "*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.” He further stated that the whole discussion was based on moving that boundary. The original boundary already encompassed the building on Tyson Road; the discussion was about moving beyond that, he stated. Kathy Archibald stated that the intent was there, but it needed to be more specific. Bob Henderson stated that the CAC modified it to go to the IA but did not consider all of the parameters. He felt that the minutes were incorrect because they should have stated that it was the northern boundary of 4A, that was the discussion and the intent.

Michael Sheridan stated that everything, the minutes, the agenda item, and what the IA approved stated “residences.” Bob Henderson stated that was fine but “which residences” was the point. He further stated that the ‘residences’ they were discussing were the residences of Mabry Manor and Seminole Manor because the Tyson Road residences were already included in the original area. Mr. Sheridan repeated that the minutes stated the vicinity of 4A but not closer than 200 yards from existing residences.” Mr. Sheridan stated that he had included the word ‘existing’ to prevent someone from creating problems because they intend to build in the future. Of course, he continued, what constitutes existing was the vague portion of that statement. Mr. Sheridan further stated that was the language approved, and that the IA approved.

Gregg Patterson stated that perhaps the committee should clarify that statement because as Mr. Henderson stated the committee was discussing the northern 4A not the other end. Kathy Archibald stated that it could be clarified in the motion and that she, as the second, was amenable to that clarification. Michael Sheridan asked her to please phrase the clarification amendment to the motion for the committee. Ms. Archibald stated that **the delineation to the dwellings apply to the existing residences on the northern boundary of alignment 4A, specifically Mabry Manor and Seminole Manor**. Jerry Conger stated that, as the maker of the motion, that sounded correct to him.

Motion and amendments repeated from above discussion:

“Jerry Conger moved to support staff recommendation Option 1 to include Corridor 1 in the PD&E study. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. Gregg Patterson stated that he could support that only if the CAC communicated clearly their strong preference to include the wording that would meet the parameters that Ms. Archibald listed. Corridor 1 had to be given its due diligence in terms of studying it but if all of the reasons for not wanting Corridor 1 - its proximity to the lakes, its drainage basin into the lakes, the National Forest property adjacent, very few communities have their major road pass the parking lot of the airport, it was more appropriate for that spur to become an airport access road, better for diversion of traffic - need to be included in the PD&E as parameters. Ms. Archibald stated that the delineation to the dwellings apply to the existing residences on the northern boundary of alignment 4A, specifically Mabry Manor and Seminole Manor.”

Michael Sheridan called for the vote on the motion as amended (plural) as well as the procedure in which they would opine on the clarity of what was approved in September. He explained that the committee would not be voting on the clarification through email. **The motion passed unanimously.**

III. CONSENT ITEMS

Item #2: Minutes of CAC Meeting: September 8, 2005

Kathy Archibald moved to approve the minutes. Bob Henderson seconded the motion; it passed

8-1 with Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting vote. Ms. Norwood stated that she had a different recollection of the meeting; but due to the recording equipment malfunction there were no tapes to verify the actual discussion.

Item #3: Appointment to the CAC

Bob Henderson moved to accept the reappointment of Dianna Norwood to the CAC. Gregg Patterson seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Item #4: 2006 CAC Meeting Schedule

Gregg Patterson moved to accept the 2006 CAC meeting schedule. Dianna Norwood seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

IV. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Item #5: Election of CAC Chairman and Vice-Chairman (2006)

Michael Sheridan explained that the recent elections were to simply fill the unexpired term of Bill Smith. At that time, Mr. Sheridan moved from Vice-Chair to Chair, and Jess Van Dyke became Vice-Chair. This election was to determine the 2006 Chair and Vice-Chair of the CAC.

Kathy Archibald nominated Michael Sheridan for Chair and Jess Van Dyke for Vice-Chair for 2006. Terence Hinson nominated Michael Sheridan for Chair and Jerry Conger for Vice-Chair for 2006.

Michael Sheridan asked, in Jess Van Dyke's absence, if anyone has spoken to Mr. Van Dyke regarding his views on continuing as Vice-Chair. Bob Henderson stated that at the September meeting Mr. Van Dyke had stated to him that he would not mind serving in that capacity. Dave Bright stated that Jim Davis had spoken to Mr. Van Dyke recently regarding the issue and Mr. Bright's impression was that Mr. Van Dyke did not wish to be in a CAC leadership position, but that Mr. Van Dyke preferred being an extremely active member. Mr. Sheridan stated that he had the same impression from his conversations with Mr. Van Dyke, however it had not been directly discussed. Mr. Sheridan asked if Ms. Archibald had any knowledge of Mr. Van Dyke's preference. She stated that no, and to be honest, thought the actions of the committee at that point were merely a formality. Bob Henderson reiterated that his conversation with Mr. Van Dyke was at the September meeting; it was possible he had reconsidered. Jerry Conger stated that he would be happy to serve as Vice-Chair if Mr. Van Dyke preferred not to. However, he continued, if Mr. Van Dyke preferred to serve then he, Mr. Conger, would vote for him.

Bob Henderson suggested they elect the position of Chair and table the election of the Vice-Chair until the next meeting. Terence Hinson stated that if there had been discussion with Mr. Van Dyke in which he expressed that he was not comfortable with serving in that capacity and they had someone present that was willing to fill the position, he preferred to vote on both the Chair and Vice-Chair at that time and move forward. Gregg Patterson stated that it was a difficult decision because he had great respect for both gentlemen; each brought a unique wisdom and perspective to the committee. He further stated that he felt it would be divisive for the committee to try to guess... Several members of the committee interjected their concurrence at that point.

Michael Sheridan asked again if any of the Blueprint staff were aware of comments Jim Davis might have had with Jess Van Dyke regarding Mr. Van Dyke's position. Mr. Bright reiterated what he had stated earlier, "Mr. Van Dyke did not wish to be in a CAC leadership position; he preferred being an extremely active member." The committee discussed several options regarding how to proceed but felt they were in a quandary.

Jim Shepherd returned to the meeting and stated that he had just spoken to Jim Davis, who happened to have phoned in. Mr. Davis confirmed that he had spoken to Mr. Van Dyke earlier that day; Mr. Van Dyke communicated that he preferred not to serve and his recommendation was to support Mr. Conger. **Kathy Archibald stated that she withdrew her motion and seconded Terence Hinson's motion for Michael Sheridan as Chair and Jerry Conger as Vice-Chair.** Mr. Sheridan stated that, if elected, he would be delighted to serve and encouraged the committee to consider who his replacement would be in 2007. While he wanted to remain a member of the CAC, he felt it was best to rotate the Chairmanship. Jerry Conger stated that he would be delighted to serve as Vice-Chair. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Item #6: Leveraging Update

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint had been awarded a \$980,000 grant from FCT to acquire four parcels within Segment 4 of the Capital Cascade Trail. They had also submitted an application to FCT for phase two of the Booth Property, and while it made the list, it did not have enough points for an award early on, however, it was still in the running if another project were to fall out. Additionally, Blueprint received \$42.6 million from FDOT in SIS funding for right of way (ROW) for Capital Circle from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. Mr. Maher further stated that staff hoped to be able to use it for more than ROW because they currently had \$28 million budgeted for ROW. He stated that staff was working on that question but the worst case was that they could move the \$28 million in Blueprint dollars to other projects.

Bob Henderson stated that he felt as though they were on a slippery slope. It had been stated early on that staff was only to study Capital Circle to Orange Avenue; it was not a commitment to build to Orange Avenue but merely to study it because of the possibility of veering off north of Orange Avenue. Now, however, there was money for ROW to Orange Avenue. Mr. Henderson stated that it seemed that, step-by-step, they were committing to going to Orange Avenue and then using the existing Capital Circle by the Airport as the corridor. Mr. Maher stated that the original PD&E for CCNW/SW was required to go to Orange Avenue...Jim Shepherd interjected and stated that if the committee members would reference the last page of the agenda package (Item 10, e-mail correspondence between Blueprint and FDOT) wherein Mr. Davis asked for clarification, "Does the PD&E study have to go to Orange Avenue?" and FDOT and FHWA stated that yes it did for Blueprint to remain eligible for federal funding. Mr. Shepherd stated that their comment did not indicate that Blueprint must design to Orange Avenue. The design to Orange Avenue was based on the direction the IA gave to Blueprint staff in January. Mr. Henderson stated that he understood, but the point was that staff had stated they would do the design study, now they were saying they would acquire the ROW, and after while we would say, "...well, we spent all this money..."

Mr. Maher stated that he understood Mr. Henderson's point however staff was working within the guidelines and direction of the IA and with the available funding (\$42 million). He further stated that there were three ways that it could play out...Blueprint could be told by FDOT that if they did not go to Orange Avenue they would lose the full \$42 million, it could be prorated, or they could keep it for

ROW.

Jerry Oshesky stated that to answer Mr. Henderson's question, yes, ROW should be acquired to Orange Avenue. FHWA had stated that the logical terminus for the PD&E study of CCNW/SW was Orange Avenue because that was where the capacity problems existed. Mr. Oshesky stated that they would probably prefer Blueprint construct to Orange, however, they would not actually say that. Mr. Henderson stated that once it was constructed to Orange the choice was either to maintain the current route to the Airport or to take Orange Avenue. Why then, he asked, was staff studying 4A for example?

Mr. Oshesky reminded Mr. Henderson that the CCSW project was funded for construction at least eight to ten years out of sync with construction for the segment to Orange. That was because by the time staff studied CCSW it would require an EIS, a full study, then design, ROW, and, construction...therefore in his opinion going to Orange did not preclude Blueprint from re-evaluating and even doing a 4A alignment because that piece of roadway would have been there for 10-15 years before realignment. Mr. Henderson stated that, for clarification, the widening to Orange Avenue would be ten years ahead of a possible 4A route. Mr. Oshesky confirmed that, and stated that any construction on CCSW because of the time length and because staff did not have the funding for construction of CCSW in place at that time.

Kathy Archibald stated that Mr. Henderson was correct in that it did create the foregone conclusion that Orange Avenue would be the route. Mr. Oshesky stated that it did create an impetus to not realign south of Highway 20. Or somewhere south of Highway 20, stated Mr. Henderson, but not Orange Avenue. Mr. Oshesky stated that it did not completely eliminate it but there would be a strong argument to realign south of Highway 20 because Capital Circle would have been widened to Orange Avenue. Jim Shepherd stated that if they went to Orange Avenue they could still, just as easily, go down Tyson Road. However, anything north of Tyson Road would require reconstruction. Kathy Archibald stated that it would preclude 4A. Mr. Shepherd agreed and stated that it would support a Tyson Road or Orange Avenue route.

Mr. Oshesky stated that he did not think it would preclude 4A. He stated that in his career he had seen larger chunks of road reconstructed and realigned in less than ten years. It was only approximately 6/10 of a mile. Gregg Patterson stated that because of the great success in leveraging dollars he was concerned that it would not be 10 years but only two and the perception of the community would be "...look at the government one more time..." Mr. Oshesky stated that even with successful leveraging of dollars the actual time frame was more of a function of the study requirements, design and ROW acquisition.

Mr. Patterson asked if the ROW purchases could be used for airport access without impacting the lakes and neighborhoods and without precluding 4A. Kathy Archibald suggested that staff could buy out the car rental agency and incorporate that land into a portion of the greenway system. She followed that up with asking if it were possible. Dianna Norwood stated that she was about to ask the same question; could the ROW dollars be used for preservation, it did not necessarily have to have asphalt on it? Jerry Oshesky stated that yes, it was ROW dollars for the roadway corridor. Therefore, if the roadway corridor included the acquisition of that rental car facility in one of the alignments, and one of the proposed alignments did exactly that, then yes, the ROW and facility could be purchased as part of the roadway corridor. Kathy Archibald clarified that it was not necessary for it to be asphalt but that it

could be greenway. Mr. Oshesky stated that she was correct. Mr. Henderson suggested possible holding ponds as an alternative to greenway.

Michael Sheridan stated that the CAC should be overly simplistic in their objectives to ensure that the process took into consideration what they ended up doing in Corridor 3. Bob Henderson asked if the estimate for ROW was the \$28 million Mr. Maher mentioned earlier. Mr. Maher concurred. Mr. Henderson asked if the \$42 million was all for ROW. Mr. Oshesky stated that the \$42 million was FDOT's estimate of the ROW. Mr. Henderson asked if they were still in negotiation for what happens if there was any excess. Mr. Maher stated that staff had spoken with the FDOT Secretary and he stated that the funds would revert back to the District for redistribution. Mr. Sheridan stated that his supposition would be not to put Blueprint in a position, regarding negotiations that would preclude the CAC's very strong feeling about where they do not want future roads to go and for them to eliminate those possibilities because a decision had been made.

Kathy Archibald stated that no matter where the road ended up being, whether it was 4A or Orange Avenue, they would still need a certain amount of ROW for improvement and access off of Capital Circle to the Airport. When construction was finally underway it would only be six-lanes to Blountstown Highway then it would transition back to the narrower roadway to Orange Avenue. She asked if she were thinking correctly when, even though there may be asphalt to Orange Avenue it would not be wasted asphalt it could/would be used for the Airport access road. Jerry Oshesky stated that if he understood her question correctly, then yes however, the current proposed alignment, to Orange Avenue, was for six lanes with the transition back to two lanes occurring south of Orange.

Dianna Norwood recommended moving on to Item #10 on the agenda given that the Leveraging Update had segued into a discussion of CCSW and CCNW/SW. She also stated that there were maps attached to that item that might be useful to the committee. Michael Sheridan stated that, if the committee agreed, they would allow Mr. Maher to finish his Leveraging Update and they would move to Item # 10.

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint had received a tentative award of \$4.3 million in TRIP funding for the Tram Road to Woodville Highway segment of Capital Circle SE. It was a 50 percent match award; therefore Blueprint would have to add \$4.3 million to it as well. Mr. Maher explained that the money was from the DOT work program that stemmed out of the growth management legislation. Terence Hinson asked if one person owned the majority of the ROW in that segment. Mr. Maher stated that much of it was owned by SouthWood but that there were also a church, some gas stations, and several other property owners.

Item #10: Capital Circle NW/SW Expanded PD&E Study: Typical Section, Recommended Alignment, and Extended Design Limits Approval (Blueprint Maps 2A and 2B)

Jim Shepherd stated that the agenda item was basically the same as the previous CCNW/SW agenda item reviewed by the CAC therefore he mentioned the highlights. He stated that staff was asking the IA to approve the typical sections that were presented to them at the May 16, 2005 meeting. Since that time staff had taken it to a public information meeting on June 30, 2005, and now they were requesting final approval of the six typical sections; three for Capital Circle roadways, two for bridges on Capital Circle, and one for State Road 20/Blountstown Highway.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the TCC requested the use of depressed medians throughout the project. They recommended staff exchange the typical and the optional section so that the typical section reflected the depressed median and the crowned median became the optional median. Bob Henderson asked why. Jim Shepherd stated that it was for the "perceived benefit" of water quality. He further stated that Commissioner Lightsey had been quite supportive of a depressed median. Staff thought that the original typical sections sufficed. However, the TCC wanted to emphasize the "standard" as a depressed median and the optional as the crowned. Bob Henderson clarified that staff had simply changed the two around. Kathy Archibald clarified that staff was recommending the depressed median. Mr. Shepherd confirmed both.

Mr. Shepherd further stated that staff was also requesting the IA approve the recommended alignment titled Combination Alignment #2, beginning at Orange Avenue. He continued that staff had been requested to evaluate how the drainage in the vicinity of Orange Avenue would be handled. What was being presented was a rough concept, he acknowledged, but staff had considered existing and proposed impervious and the possibility of treating the water within the ROW. He also noted that there was a sinkhole in that area that would have to be avoided. Furthermore, there was a 4(f) issue (public recreation, wildlife, and waterfowl area) south of Orange Avenue. The Tallahassee Museum had a memorandum of understanding with the US Forest Service regarding use of the Lake Bradford tract in that area therefore; staff was trying to resolve the issue.

Mr. Shepherd stated staff wanted the IA to direct them as to which side of the existing road the widening should be on. Staff recommended the alignment to the east, the east side of the sinkhole, because it was farther away from the lake and there was less reconstruction if the alignment were to follow Tyson Road or Orange Avenue. Committee members discussed the slides of the maps presented by Blueprint staff and Dave Bright pointed out that the aerial base photography was taken prior to the recent realignment of the Orange Avenue and Capital Circle intersection.

Bob Henderson stated that the discussion was basically a continuation of his earlier comments except now there was not going to be six lanes just to Orange Avenue but almost to the crossing of the Chain of Lakes. Kathy Archibald agreed. Mr. Henderson further stated that the project was being driven so that they would be destined to use Corridor 1. Ms. Archibald stated it would be Corridor 1 or Orange Avenue. Mr. Henderson stated that they could "weave around their words" but "when you start doing that, you are telling us what is going to happen," he said.

Jerry Oshesky reminded the committee that FHWA stated that Blueprint had to do the PD&E study to Orange Avenue but only had to build to Highway 20. Therefore staff had to develop a preferred alternative that would work, in theory, all the way to Orange Avenue. Kathy Archibald stated that it had been determined that it would be approximately a \$250,000 waste of money. Mr. Oshesky reiterated that Blueprint did not have to build to Orange. To answer Mr. Henderson's question though, he continued, staff had to have approval on paper; but once it was approved they could do several things: (1) build to State Road 20, only (2) begin acquiring ROW from Highway 90 to State Road 20 but not south of State Road 20 (3) begin the new PD&E study.

Mr. Oshesky stated that he did not feel Blueprint would need to buy ROW south of State Road 20 until they knew or had a strong indication of what they were looking at for the realignment. Although it might take eight years to finish, it would not take that long to begin; they could begin right away. Mr. Oshesky stated he wanted to clarify the overlap in time to eradicate the impression that the roadway

had to be built to Orange Avenue. He reiterated that the roadway did not have to be built to Orange Avenue; however, it was necessary to study it in order to have an approved alignment and to have location design approval from FHWA which is needed before staff could make any progress on Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest.

Kathy Archibald stated that was what she was asking earlier regarding the transition point. It was her understanding that the transition point was south of Blountstown Highway but Mr. Oshesky had stated that it was south of Orange Avenue. Mr. Oshesky clarified that the determination of the transition point location was based on the direction staff received from the Board at the January 31, 2005, meeting. The IA wanted the roadway completed to Orange Avenue and with the clarification from FHWA there was no other alternative. Ms. Archibald clarified that Blueprint was not building the transition south of Orange; they were only building to Blountstown Highway and the transition would be north of Orange Avenue. Mr. Oshesky stated that staff did not know for sure yet, but he thought they could design to State Road 20 with a transition that they might, or might not, use south of State Road 20. Then during the PD&E Study for CCSW, to determine the alignment, before anything was built south of 20, including the transition, staff would know or at least have a strong indication of the alignment.

Dianna Norwood asked why Blueprint staff was requiring the CAC to vote on a six-lane concept through Orange Avenue rather than a smaller four-lane design concept. Jerry Oshesky stated that the six-lane concept was a requirement to meet the level of service standard "C" for an SIS facility, based on the traffic volume. Jim Shepherd stated that for the PD&E study, staff's concept was required to be workable in the design year, which was 2030. Jerry Oshesky stated that in order to obtain level of service C, which was required for the SIS, six lanes were required in 2030.

Terence Hinson acknowledged that he had missed several meetings and stated that he did not understand the committee's concerns of going to Orange Avenue. It raised a couple of questions for him. First, why was it a problem, for the future, to have a six-lane road to Orange Avenue? The committee knew that the area would only continue to grow. Why would they not want to construct it with six-lanes now, rather than in the future when the traffic volume increased and became more problematic? Kathy Archibald stated that it was not a question of whether or not to six-lane the roadway, but a question of where they were laying the path for the six-lanes. If they constructed six-lanes to south of Orange Avenue, then it would be much more difficult to look objectively at the other alignments. The argument then would be, if the roadway were built in any shape or form, that it was a waste of money to build a six-lane road that transitioned into a two-lane road that only goes to the Airport.

Ms. Archibald and Michael Sheridan briefly explained the observations and position of the CAC and IA regarding the CCSW alignment to Mr. Hinson. Some of the key points that were reiterated from recent history were the preference for an alignment that avoided residences, avoided the wetlands, and avoided the (perceived) impetus to build over/extend through the existing corridor. Mr. Sheridan stated that the CAC members were concerned about the alignment because staff was attempting to begin a study that they believed would result in a route that traversed north of that (Orange Avenue).

Mr. Hinson asked if the roadway ended up on Orange Avenue; even if other routes were used? Kathy Archibald stated that, yes, eventually the roadway would cross Orange Avenue. Mr. Sheridan agreed that certainly a portion of Orange Avenue would be utilized, but this (indicated to the map) portion of

Orange might not be used. Dianna Norwood mentioned the challenges associated with a six-lane to two-lane roadway in such an environmentally sensitive area. Mr. Sheridan stated that there were factual elements of it to be considered as well, for example, the existing ecological viability. That area could certainly be cleaned up, especially near the car rental site, he stated. Basically, stated Mr. Sheridan, they were concerned and hesitant to make a commitment to any activity that might preclude the study that could bring the alignment "over here" (indicated area north of Orange Avenue on the map).

Jim Shepherd stated that one of the items staff was asking the IA for was final approval for Lochner to design from State Road 20 to Orange Avenue. The CAC's recommendation could be for staff not to do that, he stated. Or to defer, stated Mr. Sheridan. Mr. Shepherd further stated that when the project was originally begun, the PD&E study area was from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue because that was the logical terminus as directed by FHWA. Staff originally intended to design only to Blountstown Highway; however, in January 2005, the IA directed staff to also design from State Road 20 to Orange Avenue. Mr. Shepherd stated that if the CAC did not want that to occur, then that should be their recommendation. Kathy Archibald asked if that would affect SIS funding. Jim Shepherd stated that he did not have the answer to that; however, it was clear that the PD&E would extend to Orange but staff did not have to design to Orange.

Jerry Oshesky stated that he felt it could be made to work in the end. Though at some future decision point, it was possible that Blueprint could lose some of the money. He did not think, if for example Blueprint had acquired 75% of the ROW to Orange, that Blueprint would be required to reimburse the funds. They might possibly not be able to use any remaining dollars. Ms. Archibald asked if by the time they reached that decision point, might not the other PD&E be complete and then we would know what the alignment would be? Mr. Shepherd responded with a no because of the current aggressive design schedule. He stated that if that item had been on the September 19, 2005, IA agenda as originally planned, Lochner would have been working on the design at the time of their meeting. The goal was to begin construction by late 2007 or early 2008; staff was still working within that schedule and trying to meet that goal.

Michael Sheridan asked what would be wrong with performing the studies sequentially rather than simultaneously. Bob Henderson asked for clarification of the construction area; from Highway 90 to Blountstown Highway. Mr. Shepherd confirmed that it was, and stated that Blueprint had the funding in the Master Plan to build from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. Mr. Henderson asked if staff was ready to construct from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. A chorus of no's met his question with numerous small discussions amongst committee members. Mr. Henderson asked if there was a possibility of splitting it into two projects with one lagging behind the other. Mr. Shepherd stated that was what he was trying to communicate by suggesting that staff design to State Road 20.

Kathy Archibald asked what the possible downsides of doing that were because they wanted to make a decision knowing what all of the eventualities were. Phil Maher stated that all staff decisions and actions were based on recommendations and direction from the Board. Ms. Archibald asked what the CAC recommended to the IA in January or did they not make a recommendation. Mr. Maher stated that he was not sure. But because of the lack of guidance regarding priorities for the Master Plan; therefore, staff presented the IA with a list of questions and strongly encouraged them to prioritize projects and funding for Blueprint.

Michael Sheridan interjected that, from the perspective of historian, when the CAC reviewed the issue at that time, there was some presumption that the project would follow the existing alignment to the Airport. Therefore one would certainly have to design to "right there" (indicated Orange Avenue on the map); however, now their presumption was not to do that but something north of it. He further stated that currently, in overly simplistic terms, they were dealing with something that carried forward a momentum that they had circumvented, and he thought they ought to consider how far they could take the project at that point without forcing it into the existing alignment. He stated that they were out of sync in time by several months he thought.

Phil Maher stated that he felt the problem that faced the CAC was that the IA voted to get the roadway to Orange as soon as possible. Bob Henderson interjected that "getting to Orange" did not say to design all the way to the culvert at the Chain of Lakes. Jim Shepherd stated that staff had to extend the improvements through the intersection to ensure that it worked. Michael Sheridan stated that the IA approved "getting to Orange", but that they had changed something else that was a basic premise. Kathy Archibald asked if the IA understood what they were voting on. Jerry Oshesky stated that the IA said, "Get to Orange"; and, he speculated, in the minds of several people that meant stop at Orange Avenue. What was not thought through, or possibly was not apparent, was "get to Orange" required widening through the intersection. The transition could not be completed north of the intersection because the capacity problem was at the intersection.

Michael Sheridan stated that at the September 19, 2005, IA meeting the Board made a decision relative to the alignment; however, they did not revisit the decision made in January regarding "getting to Orange." The September 19, 2005 decision (to not study the existing alignment) was incompatible with the January 31, 2005, decision "to get to the Airport". Therefore the CAC needed to bring that issue before the IA a second time. Kathy Archibald agreed. Mr. Sheridan stated that it was the CAC's responsibility to balance all of the concerns, without losing funds, proceed as well as they possibly could, and allow the studies to occur in the sequence that was appropriate for the consensus of the committee. He further stated that what he heard at the September 19, 2005, IA meeting was a very strong IA vote to study the Tyson Road alignment.

Dianna Norwood moved that the CAC recommend to the IA that they not complete the design phase any further south than Highway 20. Michael Sheridan asked if she would be willing to consider the other portion that he suggested, which was pending the study of the two corridors. (Ms. Norwood continued speaking, however, her voice was not audible by either of the microphones.) Mr. Sheridan called for a second, however, Jim Shepherd requested Ms. Norwood clarify the motion before they proceeded. Mr. Shepherd asked if he understood the motion to be to terminate the study until Southwest was... There was a chorus of "design" from members. In other words, Mr. Sheridan stated, do it sequentially; continue the design south of 20 after they had determined what the corridor alignments were. Jim Shepherd stated that was what he was hearing. Dave Bright interjected, "continue the design after the study."

Dianna Norwood stated that staff did not need to stop studying it. She clarified that her motion was to not design it south of Orange Avenue. She further stated that as the maker of the motion what she heard the Chairman conclude was, "until the results of the CCSW PD&E study come back." Mr. Sheridan stated that it was but he was unable to make a motion. Jim Shepherd clarified that the motion was for staff to not consider the design of Capital Circle from State Road 20 to Orange Avenue until after they knew what would happen on Capital Circle Southwest. Dianna Norwood

stated that was her intent. **Gregg Patterson seconded the motion.**

Gregg Patterson stated that in the CAC's communication with the IA they needed to raise the Board's level of awareness that the IA's guidance to get to the Airport (i.e., Orange Avenue) now conflicted with the PD&E limits for CCSW. Jerry Oshesky stated that the Board was fully aware of that. Gregg Patterson stated that the CAC should reinforce that. Michael Sheridan stated that they should communicate to the Board that the CAC was not attempting to reverse it, but that it had changed in the past few months.

Kathy Archibald stated that she wanted to be certain that the CAC clearly stated that they were talking about the PD&E for Highway 90 to Orange Avenue and the design for Highway 90 to just south of Blountstown Highway for transition. Then they needed to boost funding for the PD&E of Corridor 1, Corridor 3 and 4A so that Blueprint was not caught short when it came time to complete the project. Her reasoning for that was because the SIS funding was for getting to the Airport; therefore they would need additional funding for the other study in order to dovetail the design from Highway 20 to just south of Orange Avenue to follow the new alignment. Additionally, she continued, improvements (transitions, etc) would be necessary on the existing alignment to get traffic to the Airport; those must be accomplished for the project to be complete.

Ms. Archibald stated that the members of the CAC were, regarding that segment of Capital Circle, compartmentalizing when they needed to see the whole picture. They needed to pull the PD&E, obtain funding for it. Jerry Oshesky stated that Blueprint had the funding for the PD&E study; however, he thought the issue would be with FDOT because of timing. He estimated that the PD&E for CCSW would take at least two years to complete, but CCNW/SW would be ready for construction by late 2007 or early 2008. FDOT and FHWA have told Blueprint, in writing, that they both consider getting to the Airport as getting to Orange Avenue. That would be the decision point. He reiterated that Blueprint already had the funding for the PD&E for CCSW.

Anita Davis asked for clarification regarding construction that was currently taking place. Jerry Oshesky stated that the intersection improvements at Capital Circle and Blountstown Highway and Capital Circle and Jackson Bluff Road were to four-lanes; Blueprint would widen them again to six-lanes with the CCNW/SW project. They discussed some of the earlier points and used the map for clarification and emphasis.

Kathy Archibald stated that the CAC should recommend that the IA re-evaluate their decision. Dave Bright clarified that she was referring to their decision to design south of Orange Avenue. She confirmed. Michael Sheridan, sharing his thoughts for discussion but not actually advocating what he was saying; stated that the CAC's recommendation to the IA should be less specific. In light of the fact that they requested a study, that it might preclude widening down to Orange Avenue and ask them to re-evaluate or even reconsider the design they previously approved, prior to the completion of the decision of September 19, 2005. He further stated it would give the CAC some amount of flexibility to interact with them.

Dianna Norwood stated that she wanted to ensure the motion was clear. The recommendation of the CAC was for the IA not to approve designing south of SR 20. Jerry Oshesky stated that the IA had already approved the design. Bob Henderson stated that they had not approved the design. Both Jerry Oshesky and Michael Sheridan stated that the Board had, in fact, approved the design. Mr. Henderson

asked who designed what they approved. Dave Bright stated that the IA had not approved "a design" they had approved Blueprint "to design."

Jim Shepherd, speaking over various discussion in the room, stated that option 4B in the agenda item was for staff to execute a supplemental agreement to the existing contract with H. W. Lochner, Inc. for the continuation of the design to Orange Avenue. If the CAC did not support that, he continued, then they should simply say, "we do not support option 4B."

Terence Hinson asked, what affect would the motion, which was currently on the floor, have on staff's ability to leverage funds. Phil Maher stated that it could potentially be devastating depending on the severity of the language. Currently the language stated that, regarding SIS funds, there was \$42 million for ROW for Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. There was \$8.1 million in Federal Transportation dollars for the construction from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue. Whether or not that money could be used or how much of it could be used for something other than how it was listed would have to be determined by FDOT and FHWA.

Jerry Oshesky reiterated that FHWA had stated that the logical terminus was Orange Avenue. Michael Sheridan asked if FHWA stated that before or after the recent (9/19/05) decision of the IA. Jerry Oshesky and Jim Shepherd both stated that it was said before and after the IA's decision. Jim Shepherd further stated that Blueprint staff asked for clarification of the logical termini, via email, most recently on October 24, 2005. Mr. Sheridan stated that he was not certain that they were in sync and asked if Blueprint had informed FHWA of the IA's decision. Mr. Shepherd stated that FHWA was fully aware of the IA's decision.

Mr. Sheridan asked for the motion to be repeated. Dave Bright stated that what he had written down was paraphrased from what he heard Ms. Norwood say, and he read the following, **"Do not design south of State Road 20 until the PD&E was complete from State Road 20 to Springhill Road."** Dianna Norwood stated that was correct.

Bob Henderson asked what the time frame for the completion of the design for Highway 90 to Orange Avenue and what was the schedule for the PD&E for Corridor 3. Jim Shepherd stated that the original PD&E study and the design to State Road 20 was to have been completed by May 2006, staff had until May 2007 to acquire ROW and obtain permits, and the goal was to begin construction in May of 2007 from Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway. In January, when the IA instructed Blueprint to "get to Orange" staff discussed that with H. W. Lochner, Inc. and for an additional three months on their contract they could include the design from State Road 20 to Orange. That would push the schedule to August/September 2006 for Lochner to have the design plans through, and staff intended to follow as closely to the original schedule as possible. Bob Henderson asked what was the schedule according to the Master Plan with regards to Corridor 3. Jim Shepherd stated that the funding had been allocated for the PD&E study, but staff was waiting on direction regarding the corridors. It would take approximately two to three years to complete the PD&E study.

Jerry Oshesky stated that there was considerable confusion about what the PD&E study was and what constituted design. Many people mistakenly thought that the current process was the full design but it was not; it was the alignment for the PD&E study. Mr. Oshesky stated that he felt it was important to understand that whatever they did, the PD&E corridor alignment study had to go to Orange Avenue. If the CAC, staff, etc decided to halt design at State Road 20 that was a completely separate issue.

Kathy Archibald stated that it had always been known that the PD&E needed to go to Orange; that decision was made prior to her leaving the CAC before. The most that it meant, however, was that they would waste \$200,000, and the Commissioners knew, understood, and voted on that, because they had no intention to construct it to Orange Avenue for the reason of the issues associated with the PD&E on the remainder of the roadway. The project was, historically, supposed to transition south of Blountstown Highway. Furthermore, the CAC members were told at that time that voting to do the PD&E to Orange, and reallocating the funds to do so, would not preclude the ability to use Corridor 3.

Ms. Archibald further stated that they were at the point of talking about the design and somehow the Board had voted to do the design; she did not think they had an understanding of what they were voting on. She stated that she did not think that the Board understood that by voting to design to Orange Avenue would, virtually, set in stone the path for the next leg of the roadway. Jerry Oshesky stated that he believed that for some of the Commissioners, she was correct, but others new exactly what they were doing. Michael Sheridan stated that he thought he was more of an optimist than he was. He clarified that he did not intend that disparagingly but that there was so much momentum to approve it, and he did not recall a discussion to evaluate how it might affect other decision. Additionally, he felt it was appropriate to take it back to the IA.

Mr. Sheridan called for the vote; Terence Hinson requested the motion be repeated one last time. Dave Bright stated, **“Do not design south of State Road 20 until the PD&E was complete for CCSW, State Road 20 to Springhill Road.” The motion passed 8 to 1 with Terence Hinson casting the dissenting vote.**

Bob Henderson stated that, given the confusion surrounding the issue, was there a way to communicate the CAC's recommendation in addition to the agenda. He requested that staff meet with each of the IA members to explain where the CAC felt there were problems. Jerry Oshesky stated that Blueprint staff briefed each Commissioner individually prior to the IA meetings. Michael Sheridan requested that staff convey that the CAC was not attempting to overturn a previous decision they were simply highlighting the incompatibility of an even earlier decision.

Kathy Archibald asked if there was more to Item #10 than what the committee had discussed. Jim Shepherd stated that staff was requesting the Board approve the typical sections and approve the recommended alignment. Even though the CAC had clearly stated they did not want staff to design south of State Road 20, staff had to know what the concept would be because it had to go through the intersection. Regarding the forest, he asked, if the CAC wanted staff to try to move forward even though there was the 4F issue that needed to be resolved. Did they agree with staff's statement that moving away from the lake, toward the east side, down Tyson Road was the best alternative? Did they believe that the alignment should be on the left side, closer to the lake, impacting the rental car facility?

Michael Sheridan asked Mr. Shepherd what Blueprint recommended. Mr. Shepherd stated that staff's recommendation was combination alignment #2, the east alignment, because it allowed the use of Tyson Road and Orange Avenue and kept the road farther away from the lake. Mr. Sheridan stated that he could only speak for himself, but he could not be that specific without guidance from the IA on their position.

Bob Henderson asked about the design of the holding pond near the car rental facility or, with funding for ROW, could Blueprint simply acquire the whole facility and convert it to a holding pond. Mr. Shepherd stated that with a west alignment, yes, the facility would be purchased. Mr. Henderson asked where the outfall for the holding pond was located. Jim Shepherd stated that the design concept was not to that level of detail as of yet.

Jim Shepherd further stated that staff option 1 says that they supported the east side alignment or option 2 to be on the left side. Staff felt, he continued, that it was a significant enough issue that they were asking the IA to tell them which side of the sinkhole to be on. Mr. Henderson asked the Chairman if, procedurally, the CAC was in the position to say if they supported, or not, what staff was taking to the IA. Michael Sheridan stated that his understanding of the motion that had been approved did not address it. In fact, he continued, the motion they voted on, as he understood it, specifically avoided a decision. Kathy Archibald stated "no" now they were referring to the PD&E. Mr. Sheridan asked Ms. Norwood and Mr. Patterson to clarify the previously voted on motion.

Jim Shepherd stated that Ms. Norwood specifically said "design" and, he explained, there was a difference between the PD&E concept to Orange, and the design was the minute details that allow the concept to be constructed. Dianna Norwood stated that there was another step in the process but she also had comments about the concept before they voted on it. Mr. Sheridan stated that there was not a motion on the floor, he was simply asking her for clarification of the intent of her previous motion. Ms. Norwood stated that her intent was not to design it; however, if the committee had issues with the concept they needed to send those along with the fact that they did not want Blueprint to design it until the PD&E study was complete. **Mr. Patterson**, as the second on the motion, stated that he felt it was a separate vote and **moved that any concept of any activity at that intersection (Capital Circle and Orange Ave), with regard to the sinkhole, would cause the least environmental impact. Bob Henderson seconded the motion.**

Dianna Norwood stated that her concern with the design concept was that issues did exist with the rental car facility. She stated that the facility's car wash area was within 10-15 feet of the water; that was obviously one polluter of the lake. The concept proposed to leave that facility as it was (with the east/right of the sinkhole concept) and instead would intrude into the 4F buffer. She further stated that the (Combination #2) concept put more impervious into forestry land. She stated that they thought they were doing a good thing by moving the roadway away from the lake but they were really just taking out 4F buffer and leaving a known polluter of the lake (rental car facility). She stated that she was, personally, against that concept.

Jim Shepherd stated that Blueprint had a letter from the Forest Service that stated that they believed the east side to be 4F but not the west side. However, only FHWA could make that determination. Staff had spoken with both the Forest Service and the Tallahassee Museum, who used the property for field trips two days per month, and the Forest Service did not feel strongly if Blueprint decided to make an argument to the contrary.

Bob Henderson asked Mr. Shepherd to define the term 4F. Mr. Shepherd stated that it meant that it was a public recreation, wildlife or waterfowl area. Dianna Norwood stated that it meant that it was forestland. Mr. Shepherd stated that if the CAC told staff that the east side was the best, he would then have to craft a document such that it made a strong case for it to be on the east side.

Michael Sheridan stated that a motion and second had been made. **Bob Henderson stated he withdrew his second. Terence Hinson seconded the motion.** Mr. Sheridan stated that what was before them was a concept recommendation only which he did not have the vaguest idea why they had to approve that. Jim Shepherd stated that was what he had tried to explain all along. FHWA would only approve the project if staff had reviewed improvements, the concept, from Tennessee Street to Orange Avenue. That was why it was so important for the CAC to either agree or disagree with the concept, so that staff could get FHWA to approve it. What would actually be eventually designed within that section was a separate issue, he said.

Mr. Sheridan asked how they could know, without the study, if the roadway would even go down to Orange Avenue. If the alignment was (possibly) to be north of Orange, why should they approve any concept; would the concept not be just as effective if it were two, four or six-lanes? Mr. Shepherd stated that Mr. Sheridan's statement was extremely valid; however FHWA had made it extraordinarily clear that the PD&E had to go to Orange Avenue.

Kathy Archibald stated that it was necessary if they wanted federal funding. Jerry Oshesky stated, no, if they wanted location design approval. Blueprint would not be allowed to design any of CCNW/SW until they had studied to Orange Avenue. Staff had asked repeatedly if that truly had to be the case and FHWA was unwavering in their determination. Therefore, stated Gregg Patterson, they were required to approve a concept that was most likely a waste of time. Mr. Oshesky stated that was correct, but clarified that it was a portion of a compromise. The compromise was, "...study to Orange, design and build to State Road 20 and then re-evaluate south of State Road 20." Gregg Patterson stated that if they were okay with that then he would rather jack up the price and make it a fly-over!

Michael Sheridan reminded the committee that there was a motion on the floor by Gregg Patterson and seconded by Terence Hinson, which stated...what, he asked. Mr. Patterson stated he withdrew his original and restated that his new motion was that it should be designed as a fly-over having (virtually) no environmental impact. Jerry Oshesky stated that the impacts had to be identified and quantified no matter what the concept was; even if they were only theoretical. Mr. Patterson stated that he made the motion for the least impact.

Dianna Norwood interjected that staff had not shown the committee the other options. Jim Shepherd stated that she was correct. Staff originally had a left, right and center concepts, which had been shared in the past. The only difference between the two was the impact...it was not in the Power Point he stated, but he had it in the paper plan and it was included in the attachments to Item #10.

Michael Sheridan asked was there a motion on the floor, or would someone make a motion, that would address what staff needed at that point. Kathy Archibald stated she did not think that the committee knew yet or had determined what all of the options were. Mr. Sheridan chuckled and stated that he was trying to determine if there was still a motion on the... Gregg Patterson stated that he made an outrageous motion to be facetious. A fly-over was an option that everyone knew was too expensive and would probably never happen, simply to further solidify the committee's opposition to the requirement to go that route anyway.

Mr. Sheridan stated that with no motion on the floor, the lack of consensus amongst the committee members, and the fact that there were other items on the agenda for them to address he would ask staff to bring the item back to the CAC on the next agenda. Staff should clarify and prioritize all of the

elements and that the CAC would make it their top priority for that meeting. Phil Maher and Dave Bright stated that the item was slated for the IA meeting on December 15, 2005; unless the CAC held a special meeting... Dave Bright stated that FHWA had mandated that Blueprint study the segment from Highway 90 to Orange and design US 90 to Blountstown. The argument was moot anyway because staff would re-evaluate the segment from State Road 20 to Orange during the PD&E study of the segment from Orange to Springhill Road.

That being the case, **Terence Hinson moved to accept staff recommendation to approve the east alignment concept, to move the process forward, with the understanding that there would be a re-evaluation of the process prior to design. Jerry Conger seconded the motion.**

Gregg Patterson stated that, in regards to the carwash station at the car rental facility, he thought it was likely a code violation.

Mr. Sheridan called for the vote. **The motion passed 5 to 3 with Bob Henderson, Gregg Patterson, and Dianna Norwood casting the dissenting votes.**

Item #7: Performance Audit – Draft Publication Document

Gregg Patterson stated that the sub-committee had held one brief meeting and that he took personal responsibility for them not being further along in their task. He continued that the sub-committee would reconvene either through e-mail or in person to solidify. What was included in the agenda was a concept, however, he felt it was too broad and segmented. They would consider including a press conference but would like to solidify their actions and bring them back to the CAC first.

Phil Maher stated that what was attached to the agenda item was basically the minutes or notes from the sub-committee's meeting. Bob Henderson stated that one thing he did not see covered in those minutes was a time frame for the audit.

Michael Sheridan asked if they were within the time frame to allow the sub-committee to continue their work or should the CAC authorize the sub-committee to bring it back as a formalized report at the February CAC meeting. Mr. Patterson stated that updates could be made via e-mail also. Mr. Sheridan stated that if it did not violate the Sunshine Law the e-mails would be fine. Mr. Maher stated that the CAC would ultimately have to review the performance audit. In addition to that, the committee had always wanted to produce an annual report to the citizens. While both would utilize the same sources of information they were independent entities. Therefore, he felt that the sub-committee should bring a recommendation to the CAC stating that the CAC should produce a newsletter or report card and so forth. Bob Henderson stated that the time frame response regarded how quickly it should be completed following the performance audit.

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Patterson how he would like to approach it. Mr. Patterson stated that he would prefer to bring a list of action items and time frame, as deliverables, to the next CAC meeting. Mr. Sheridan asked if that was acceptable to the committee at large; everyone concurred.

Sidebar: Gregg Patterson recommended that staff prepare a press release indicating the election of the Chair and Vice Chair positions as well as new appointments to the CAC. Also possibly mention the existing members as well. Mr. Sheridan felt that was a fine idea and further requested Dave Bright update Bruce Ritchie of the Tallahassee Democrat of the day's

proceedings.

Mr. Sheridan requested Jerry Conger chair the meeting through its duration as he had another engagement that he needed to attend.

Item #8: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design (Blueprint Map3)

Dave Bright stated that the IA had not taken action on this item at their September 19, 2005 meeting, therefore, it would once again be on their agenda for December 15, 2005. Basically, he continued, the action staff was requesting was to move into the design phase for Segment 2, the Cascade Park area. Some of the issues raised by the Board were to ensure that the design team with Genesis included a nationally recognized landscape architect/park planning firm, MBE issues, and general concern by the IA regarding distribution of work to various consultants.

Mr. Bright stated that staff's recommendation remained the same as what the CAC had previously voted on with the exception of the stormwater pond in Myers Park. Previously it would have been a part of the consultant contract, however Blueprint would now be conducting an in house feasibility study with their GEC staff prior to a design RFP. **Bob Henderson moved for the CAC to re-affirm their previous actions; Dianna Norwood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Coordination with the Cascade Remediation Project (Blueprint Map 3)

Dave Bright stated that the agenda item was to formalize the coordination of the Cascade Park project with the City of Tallahassee's Remediation project. Gary Phillips, using a Power Point presentation, briefly updated the CAC on the Cascades Remediation project and team which was lead by WRS. The Environmental Engineering Cost Analysis (EE/CA) identified specific areas of concern, which Mr. Phillips spoke briefly on. The plan for area 1, the Landfill, was to cap it rather than excavate it and install a liner for the embankment and into the creek. The plan for areas 2 and 3, where the Coal Gasification Plant was located and where the majority of the contamination was, was to have an excavation area of 15 to 40 feet deep across those areas. It was possible for the excavation to be deeper; that would be determined by what was found once they were underway. Unfortunately, he explained, there was no way of determining the full extent of the contamination prior to excavation.

Kathy Archibald stated that she was under the impression that it was to be excavated to 80 feet. Mr. Phillips stated that while it may go beyond 40 feet, that was the depth listed on the report. Dave Bright stated that he thought the highest depth he had seen was 55 feet. Dianna Norwood asked where the excavated soil would be taken. Phil Maher stated that it would be transported to a hazardous waste facility. Jerry Oshesky explained that there were certified disposal methods and that the process was fully documented.

Mr. Phillips stated that areas 4 and 5 had minimal contamination therefore only approximately 24 inches of soil would be excavated. Area 6, Smoky Hollow, contained no contamination. He further stated that WRS had already received notice to proceed. EPA had approved and WRS was required to complete the Remediation project within the 270-day schedule. Given the tight time frame and the specific requirements from EPA, the coordination of Blueprint's design issues with the City's design and construction needed to be completed quickly in order to meet the schedule.

Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint's goal was to work with WRS and the City to ultimately end up with the grading plan/design/concept; with WRS designing and constructing it. Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint had a reasonable concept for the final grading plan for what the lower pond would look like. Due to the remediation techniques of WRS that concept would need to be modified to allow for geo-textile fabric (a woven plastic fabric) and rip-rap material (rock-like material) to withstand the flow. The geo-textile fabric would be used in the channel to protect the water from the landfill and the soil, which would still be contaminated.

Kathy Archibald asked if there were more attractive materials or options available. Mr. Bright stated that staff was not in favor of the geo-textile/rip-rap option either. That was in part why the agenda item was before the CAC and ultimately the IA; rather than the City allowing installation of this only for Blueprint to replace it in 12-18 months. Mr. Phillips showed the committee examples of other options via the Power Point presentation; some of them included a variety of geo-textiles, a retaining wall, and terra-aqua. Mr. Bright stated that some of the options would allow vegetation to grow, attached to them, which would assist with the aesthetics of the channel.

Gary Phillips stated that what staff was requesting from the CAC and the IA was the authority to work with the City and their consultant, WRS, to design the pond and channel area so that it was consistent with Blueprint's philosophy, was aesthetically pleasing, fit within the cost allowance, and was done correctly from the beginning. Additionally, he stated, the City had agreed to advance fund the design and construction, not to exceed \$2 million. They would be reimbursed by Blueprint when construction dollars became available in 2008.

Bob Henderson stated that the CAC's action would then be to recommend that the IA delegate to Blueprint staff the right to work with the contractor on the design and construction. Mr. Phillips clarified that it was the Intergovernmental Management Committee not simply Blueprint staff. **Bob Henderson moved to approve staff recommendation; Gregg Patterson seconded the motion.**

Terence Hinson asked how the trail crossed Gadsden Street. Dave Bright stated that the section of Gadsden Street from the railroad track up to Bloxham Street would be removed and the trail would cross the tracks, go over the old landfill area and eventually cross Monroe Street via a bridge. Kathy Archibald strongly recommended that the final design be aesthetically pleasing. **The motion passed unanimously.**

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were none.

VI. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were none.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Bob Henderson moved to adjourn the meeting; the Committee seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:49 pm.