INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY MEETING

June 2, 2008
3:00 pm to 5:00 pm
City Commission Chambers

Chairman: Ed DePuy

Agenda

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

II. CAC CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

III. INFORMATION ITEMS
1. Capital Circle NW/SW Access Management Public Hearing  
   Latesa Turner
2. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update and Schedule  
   Latesa Turner
3. Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Landscaping/Park  
   Dave Snyder
4. Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update  
   Marcus Kelly
5. Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 Design Update  
   Gary Phillips
6. Mahan Drive Update  
   Gary Phillips
7. Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel  
   Jim Davis
8. CAC Meeting Minutes (February 7 and April 3, 2008)  
   Dave Bright

IV. CONSENT
   Chairman DePuy
10. Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution  
    Dave Bright
11. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Right of Way Acquisition (Additional Parcels) and Resolution  
    Debra Schiro

V. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION
12. Election of Intergovernmental Agency Vice-Chair  
    Chairman DePuy
13. Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Update  
    Gary Phillips
14. Proposed FY 2009 Blueprint Operating Budget  
    Phil Maher
15. Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009-FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget  
    Phil Maher
VI. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD
   *Citizens desiring to speak must fill out a Speaker Request Form; the Chair reserves the right to limit the number of speakers or time allotted to each.

VII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

VIII. ADJOURN
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Capital Circle NW/SW
Access Management
Public Hearing
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the IA on the Public Hearing held on May 12, 2008, in the Tallahassee Community College Student Union Ballroom, from 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to officially implement the access management reclassification of Capital Circle NW/SW (SR 263) from Orange Avenue (SR 371) to Tennessee Street (US 90).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The section of Capital Circle (SR 263) from the Tallahassee Regional Airport to Interstate 10 is designated as an Emerging Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Road Connector. As a result, Access Management Class 3 criteria has been applied to the design of this project. (See Attachment #1, which is Agenda Item #2 of the June 4, 2007 IA meeting). The Public Hearing was held on May 12, 2008 to present the change in FDOT Access Management Classification along the project, from Class 5 to Class 3, and to receive public comment.

The hearing began with an open house session at 5:30 pm. A formal presentation was given to provide the attendees with an overview of access management and how the application of the access class 3 criteria affected the design of the proposed median openings along the project. In applying access class 3 criteria to the project, four (4) full median openings are proposed at the intersections of Orange Avenue (SR 371), Blountstown Highway (SR 20), and Gum Road, which meet access class 3 spacing criteria. Based on coordination between Blueprint and FDOT, a full median opening will be provided at the north end of the proposed southwest frontage road. See Attachment #2. This full opening will provide access to the existing businesses and residences (via Cascade Drive) located along the frontage road, as well as to the permitted future development located on the east side of Capital Circle, south of Jackson Bluff Road. Since this opening does not meet access class 3 criteria, a design variance is required and is currently being prepared for FDOT approval. Four (4) directional median openings are proposed: at the south end of the southwest frontage road, Moore Circle, Swamp Fox Road, and Shuler Road, which also meet access class 3 spacing requirements.

Immediately following the presentation, the public was given the opportunity to provide oral and written statements to be included in the official transcript of the hearing. Attendees were also advised that the official record of the hearing would be held open for up to ten (10) days following the hearing; written comments could be submitted to Blueprint 2000 up until May 22, 2008.
Blueprint will prepare responses to the comments received. The responses along with the hearing transcript will be forwarded to FDOT in order for them to facilitate the proposed access management change.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

No action required, presented as information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. IA Agenda Item #2 (June 4, 2007 IA)
2. Location of Proposed Full Median Opening at North Entrance of Southwest Frontage Road
SUBJECT/TITLE:  Capital Circle NW/SW Access Classification

Date: June 4, 2007  
Requested By: Staff  
Contact Person: Jim Davis/Paul Hiers  
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the IA of the proposed change of FDOT Access Management Classification for Capital Circle NW/SW (SR 263) from Orange Avenue (SR 371) to Tennessee Street (US 90).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The section of Capital Circle (SR 263) from Tallahassee Regional Airport to Interstate 10 is designated as a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Connector. The Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) criteria for SIS and SIS Connector facilities require a minimum design speed of 50 MPH.

Due to the significant amount of work already completed on this project, FDOT granted a Design Variance for a reduced speed of 45 MPH for Capital Circle NW/SW, however, to achieve the high level of traffic operations and mobility desired from an SIS facility the following commitments were made:

- Facility will be designed for Level of Service (LOS) C in the design year
- FHIS Access Management Class 3 criteria will be applied to the project

The PD&E Study was conducted using Access Management Classification 5. For Classification 5, spacing for full median openings is a minimum of 1/4 mile (1320 ft.) and for directional openings the minimum spacing is 660 ft. The proposed Access Management Classification of 3 doubles the minimum spacing between median openings: 1/2 mile (2640 ft.) for full openings and 1/4 mile (1320 ft.) for directional openings.

A Public Hearing will be held in August 2007 to present this change in Access Management Classification to the public.

- The more restrictive access management classification is consistent with the Blueprint philosophy of beautiful and efficient corridors. This access management classification will not please some business owners along the corridor because of the limited number of median openings.
• FDOT is the final authority for any request for variance to the Access Management Classification 3 requirements.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** For information only.

**Action by TCC and CAC:** None.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Proposed median openings based on Access Management Classification 5
2. Proposed median openings based on Access Management Classification 3
SPACING CRITERIA ACCESS CLASS 5

Full Median Opening 1320
Directional Median Opening 660

PD&E Study
Proposed Capital Circle NW/SW
Median Opening Spacing

H:\Projects_V8\1800\415 ...\spacing criteria2.ppt
Proposed Capital Circle NW/SW
Median Opening Spacing
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Capital Circle SW
Update and Schedule
The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the Agency of the date of the upcoming Alternatives Public Workshop for the Capital Circle SW PD&E Study.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study was initiated in August 2006. Considerable public involvement has occurred including six district forums, a two-day Concepts Charette, and several other meetings and workshops as required by the PD&E Study process. A Community Representatives group comprised of 13 citizens representing the community and other special interests in the area was formed and has met over the course of the study. The current corridors under study are shown on Attachment 1.

The Alternatives Public Workshop is tentatively scheduled for end of August beginning of September 2008. The exact date and time is to be determined. We will provide the Board with this information once it is finalized.

The remaining study schedule is as follows:
- Preferred Alternative Public Meeting Late 2008
- Public Hearing Mid-2009

The Community Representatives will also continue to meet to review and discuss key issues as needed through the remainder of the Study.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required, presented as information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Capital Circle SW Proposed Alternative Corridors
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park

Date: June 2, 2008
Requested By: Jim Davis
Contact Person: David Snyder
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to advise the Committees that contractor bids are anticipated to be received in June 2008 for Regional Pond 1 Park landscaping/amenities/trail, and landscaping of the Capital Circle NW corridor.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The project creates a 4,000 foot long multi-use trail around the Regional Stormwater Pond and installs hardscape items (benches, lighting). The plans call for the use of recycled plastic benches and trash receptacles along the trail. The project also installs landscaping in the Park and along Capital Circle NW from I-10 to south of Tennessee Street and along a portion of Tennessee Street. A budget of $1.2 million for the park amenities and landscaping construction was approved by the IA on September 17, 2007.

Blueprint 2000 is currently working through the project’s permitting issues.

Three contractors responded to the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) process and all three will be provided an Invitation For Bid (IFB).
- CW Roberts Contracting, Inc.
- M of Tallahassee, Inc.
- Sandco, Inc.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required, presented as information only.

Action by TCC and CAC: Presented as information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Park graphic.
Regional Stormwater Pond Trail

Prepared for Blueprint 2000

September 24, 2007

MooreBass Consulting

Regional Pond Trail Features:

A. Existing Bike Lane and Sidewalk Access
B. Park Entrance with Accessible Restrooms
C. 15' Wide Paved Multi-Modal Trail with 12' Bike Lane to be Lined for Adjacent and Small Scale to be Constructed on Maintenance Area
D. Tree Planting to Include Red Maple and Crape Myrtle, Water elm, and Rea Ash for Audubon and Spike
E. Refuge Area with Two Benches and a Trail Reception

This Plan is Conceptual in Nature and Based on Laser Scans of Initial Site Surveys. Changes and Adjustments Should Be Expected as the Plan is Developed.

Tennessee Street
Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update
**REGIONAL STORMWATER POND 1 SNAIL UPDATE**

**Date:** June 2, 2008  
**Requested By:** Jim Davis  
**Contact Person:** Marcus Kelly/Jim Davis  
**Type of Item:** Information

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
This item updates the Board on the efforts underway to control the Channeled Apple Snail infestation at the Regional Stormwater Pond.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**
After considerable discussion among various local and State Agencies, a contract is in effect between Blueprint 2000 and McGlynn Laboratories, Inc. on a multi-pronged effort to control the snails at the Regional Stormwater Pond. The approximate 4 to 6 month contract (and its components) is being funded by Blueprint, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Northwest Florida Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, the City of Tallahassee, and Leon County; other partners are being solicited. The following efforts are underway, and are being performed in a way to determine their effectiveness:

- **Hand picking of the snails:** Bright Futures Scholarship students are assisting Sean McGlynn with this effort; to date, approximately 4,000 pounds of snails have been removed from the pond.
- **Placement of wooden stakes in the shallow areas around the edge of the pond,** on which eggs are laid, and either removed by hand or sprayed with a solution of vegetable oil to block gas exchange.
- **In water traps:** Placement of livestock feed along the edge of the pond, on screens, or in buckets to concentrate snails for hand picking or lifting, and to discourage consumption of the plantings.
- **Stocking of the pond with Redear Sunfish also known as “Shellcrackers”** to eat the juvenile snails; the fish were placed in the pond in early May.
- **Future:** Possible use of a very low concentration of copper sulfate to kill the snails (not yet being tested).
- **Future:** Possible use of floating vegetation mats (inaccessible to the snails; floating plants would assist in improving water quality; not yet tested).

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
No action requested; for information only.

**Action by TCC and CAC:** Provided for information only.
ATTACHMENTS:
A photo summary provided by McGlynn Laboratories is attached, showing the results and progress of these initial efforts.
Control of the Exotic Snails (Pomacea insularum), Regional Stormwater Facility #1 (Gibby Pond) by McGlynn Laboratories Inc and Van Dyke Environmental, April 21, 2008

Result: The pond eventually re-filled with juveniles.

Result: 85 lbs or 1,700 snails, 27 egg clutches, Pomacea insularum. The snails first appeared from the sediments where they were estivating over the winter at this time. The wind was concentrating them in a small cove where they were collected.
Exotic Invasive Snail Harvest: MLI, April 11, 2008.
Result: 422 lbs or 8,440 snails, 75 egg clutches, *Pomacea insularum*. The snails were found throughout the pond, initial attempts at baiting were very successful.

Exotic Invasive Snail Harvest: MLI, April 19-20, 2008
Result: 839 lbs or 16,780 snails, 18 clutches, *Pomacea insularum*. Trapping was more efficient but design has not been perfected.
Bucket trap, with the bucket filled.

Chicken wire trap, set up with fresh bait.
Chicken wire trap, after two days, this collected a lot of snails but the trap did not really facilitate removal.

A key to success is the removal of fresh eggs (Jesse Van Dyke).
The goal of this project is to save the plants that are left.

In some areas the plants are already gone.
Gibby Pond, draft map of surviving plants, April 2008.
Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 Design Update
SUBJECT/TITLE:  Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 Design Update

Date: June 2, 2008  Requested By: Jim Davis
Contact Person: Gary Phillips/Jim Davis  Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
Due to recent budgetary constraints the combined design tasks for Segments 3 and 4 of the Capital Cascade Trail have been reduced to maximize project efficiency and minimize “throw away” work.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Since both Segments 3 and 4 are no longer fully funded for both right-of-way and construction phases in the (proposed) Blueprint 2000 Master Plan, staff has broken up the contract into Phase 1A, Phase 1B, and Phase 2, and reduced the combined design tasks where applicable (see Attachment 1 – Task Summary Per Phase). This approach will minimize completing design work that will become out-of-date or require major re-design for that segment that is not selected for the next phase of construction.

Once Phase 1A and Phase 1B are completed, (which includes surveying, utility investigations, hydraulic modeling and 30% construction plans for the primary stormwater management system), staff will bring this information back to the IA for a decision on whether Segment 3 or Segment 4 is to move into Phase 2 - Final Design.

Phase 2 will be the 100% design for the segment selected to go to construction.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required, presented as information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4: Task Summary Per Phase
Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 Design
Task Summary Per Phase

Phase 1A
- Survey – topo, utilities
- Utilities – conflicts, coordination
- Geo-tech, if needed
- Field sub-consultant coordination
- Environmental – Natural Features Inventory, field assessments, wetland delineations
- Optional – Water Quality Sampling Program
- Permitability assessment
- Hydraulic modeling – model construction, finalize existing conditions
- Investigate additional storage sites potential

Phase 1B
- Constraints and design guidance summary, map
- 30% Construction Documents – Primary Stormwater Management System: stream restoration, wetland creations, stormwater ponds, utility coordination and system integration
- Hydraulic Modeling – proposed conditions, optimization
- Information Summary for Segment Selection decision

Phase 2 – for Selected Segment
- Park Programming and Public Involvement
- 30% to 100% Primary Stormwater Management System
- 0% to 100% Park Facility, Trails Construction Documents including Park Site Civil, Landscape Architecture, and Architecture
- Constructability Analysis
- Final Hydraulic Modeling
- ROW Recommendation, Survey, Final ROW Information
- All Permitting
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Mahan Drive
Update
SUBJECT/TITLE: Mahan Drive Update

Date: June 2, 2008
Requested By: Jim Davis
Contact Person: Gary Phillips/Jim Davis
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item updates the Board on the current status of the proposed Mahan Drive widening from Dempsey Mayo Road to Interstate 10. Mahan Drive is the number one priority for the CRTPA.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
- The Board addressed and approved providing Blueprint 2000 funding to Mahan Drive at their June 4, 2007 meeting. A Public Hearing was held as part of the process to move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1. An excerpt from the June 4, 2007, Minutes follows:

Mahan Drive Update – Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Following the Public Hearing, conduct the supermajority vote in order to move the Mahan Drive project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. An affirmative supermajority vote by each Commission would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and officially commit and appropriate the $10,000,000 reserved for Mahan Drive to the project only to be used if FDOT provides the balance needed for construction.

There were no speakers for the Public Hearing on the Mahan Drive item.

The County Commission meeting convened to vote on this item.

Commissioner Rackleff moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (6-0)

The County Commission meeting recessed and the City Commission meeting convened to vote on this item.

Commissioner Lightsey moved staff recommendation. Mayor Marks seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0)
• $10 Million for the project remains in the Blueprint Master Plan, currently under revision; Blueprint will develop a Joint Project Agreement (JPA) with FDOT regarding the financial commitment.

• Breakdown of Funding Commitments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>$10.0 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Management Services</td>
<td>$13.9 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Federal District Boxed Funds</td>
<td>$7.8 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Statewide Funds</td>
<td>$7.6 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39.3 Million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Key dates:
  o Construction Letting: September 2008; construction would begin in early 2009.

• Mahan Drive is designated a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Connector.

• In the event the final accounting of total funds applied to the Mahan Drive project pursuant to the terms of the JPA is less than the total deposits to date, a refund of the excess will be made FDOT to BP 2000 in accordance with Section 215.422, Florida Statutes (2007).

• FDOT will manage the project construction with an estimated two-year construction duration.

• Existing 200’ Right-of-Way will be utilized; no additional right-of-way is required.

• The project length is approximately 3.1 miles and extends from Dempsey Mayo Road to Walden Road (near I-10).

• Necessary stormwater ponds are permitted and built; Leon County and FDOT have entered into a Joint Project Agreement (JPA).

• The project typical section includes a four lane urban roadway with a 22-foot median, 4-foot bike lanes on each side, 5-foot sidewalk on south side, 5 to 10 foot meandering sidewalk on north side; to preserve trees – (see Attachment 1).

• 165-foot bridge over Alford Arm wetland (near eastern limits).

• Fully signalized intersections are to be located at:
  o Edenfield Road
  o Pedrick Road/Champagne Drive (existing signal location)
  o Vineland Road (existing signal location)

• Flashing beacon at Thornton Road.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
No action requested, presented as information only.

**Action by TCC and CAC:**
No action requested, presented as information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
Attachment 1: Project Typical Sections
SR 10 / US 90 BRIDGE TYPICAL SECTION

NOTES:
- Existing Trees Not Impacted By Construction To Remain
- Meandering Sidewalk to Avoid Existing Trees
- Existing Trees Not Shown
- C&G = Curb & Gutter

SR 10 / US 90 ROADWAY TYPICAL SECTION

NOTES:
- Existing Trees Not Impacted By Construction To Remain
- Meandering Sidewalk to Avoid Existing Trees
- Existing Trees Not Shown
- C&G = Curb & Gutter
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Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel
STATEMENT OF ISSUE: This issue informs the Board of the status of acquiring the property surrounding and including Wood Sink located within the Headwaters of the St. Marks River.

At this time, it appears that the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) desires to purchase and manage the entire 1,057 acre parcel.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
On June 4, 2007, The Board was advised of a potential 200-acre acquisition of property surrounding Wood Sink. Since that time staff has been working with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and Leon County Parks and Recreation to work out the details. In June 2007, Jim Davis indicated to the Board that “the final purchase of the property would be brought back to the Board for approval at a subsequent meeting”; (see attached excerpt from the June 4, 2007 minutes). In 2004, the Wood Sink property was ranked a “Priority 1” by the Blueprint Sensitive Lands Working Group.

The property became available several years ago when the St. Joe Company put up for sale certain lands in the St. Marks Headwaters area (south of Capitola Road and north of US 27 South). Blueprint asked our St. Marks Headwaters Consortium partners for assistance, particularly in preserving the Wood Sink area. In 2006, Blueprint 2000 and The Nature Conservancy requested that the Department of Environmental Protection add the entire 1,057 Wood Sink Tract to the Upper St. Marks River Corridor Florida Forever project boundary. The boundary addition was approved by the State, and in early 2007 TNC purchased the entire tract from St. Joe.

Based on our partnership with TNC, Blueprint 2000 had intended to purchase approximately 200 acres of the 1,057 acres including the area surrounding Wood Sink. This area would have become part of Leon County’s St. Marks Headwaters Greenway; Blueprint planned on submitting a grant application to the Florida Communities Trust for partial reimbursement of our acquisition costs.

Recent information indicates that FWC now desires to own and manage the entire parcel, and that Blueprint and Leon County may no longer need to be involved with the project. If the FWC purchase does not materialize, staff will return to the Board to discuss our continued interest in acquiring and preserving the area surrounding Wood Sink proper. Funds are available in the Headwaters of the St. Marks line item in the Master Plan for this possible acquisition.
Action by TCC and CAC:
The issue to acquire the 200 acres surrounding the sink was previously presented to the CAC and TCC on May 17, 2007 as information only; no action was taken.

The CAC was advised of the recent FWC desire to own and manage the parcel at their meeting on May 15, 2008. The CAC voted that if the FWC deal does not materialize, that they would like Blueprint to follow through with their previous commitment to purchase from TNC the area surrounding Wood Sink.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1: Excerpt from June 4, 2007 IA minutes
Attachment 2: Location Map
June 4, 2007 IA Minutes (Excerpt regarding the purchase of Wood Sink Property)

Mr. Davis stated that he would like to notify the Board that for item #5, Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel, the County Administrator and the City Manager wanted the Board to know that Blueprint was not obligated to purchase this property. He further stated that there was only a general understanding that the Board could possibly participate. He stated that it was a 202 acre parcel that was a number one priority for protecting the Headwaters of the St. Marks River with an active karst feature, and that staff would continue to pursue the purchase if the Board consented. Mr. Davis stated that the final purchase of the property would be brought back to the Board for approval at a subsequent meeting.

Commissioner Lightsey asked if this parcel connected to any of the existing greenway systems. Mr. Davis stated that the property does connect to the previously purchased parcels and that they would all connect through the greenways and trail network. He further stated that The Nature Conservancy has purchased 1,000 acres in this area and that Blueprint was negotiating to purchase 200 of those acres, including Wood Sink, and that The Nature Conservancy hoped to sell the remaining 800 acres to the State of Florida. He mentioned that the State had purchased or has plans to purchase 27,000 acres further south along the St. Marks River that would feature trails, conservation easements and passive recreation throughout. He stated that with this purchase Blueprint would have protected approximately 1,200 acres of the Headwaters of the St. Marks River. Commissioner Lightsey requested that staff provide the Board with the approved greenways map so that the Board would have a view of the big picture of the progress.

Commissioner Thaell stated that during his briefing with staff he had discussed that he was aware that the state was attempting to acquire the entire 1,057 acres, and that he questioned the wisdom of purchasing the property with the impending property tax reforms that were underway. He further stated that Mr. Davis convinced him that it made sense to acquire the property because of previous agreements that were made with The Nature Conservancy and that for the long term benefit to that relationship and the need to partner on this and future purchases that may involve them. He stated that he would support the staff in pursuing the purchase.
Wood Sink Tract
1057.35 +/- Acres
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CAC Meeting Minutes
(February 7 and April 3, 2008)
Tom O’Steen called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
<td>Dianna Norwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Taylor</td>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Brown</td>
<td>Scott Balog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Latesa Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Beth Brenneis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Schiro</td>
<td>Rick Feldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Nichols</td>
<td>Ward Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vontrell Randall</td>
<td>Rita Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy Dolcy</td>
<td>Lindsey Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Carter</td>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
<td>Steve Bailey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

There were several agenda modifications, primarily to readjust the order of the items to allow several guests to leave early. The one additional agenda modification item was the General Engineering Consultant Contract.

**Information Items**

**Item #10: Acceptance of FY 2007 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2007 Operating Fund Balance**

Phil Maher introduced Rick Feldman and Rita Stevens from the City Accounting division and Beth Brenneis from Carr Riggs and Ingram.

Mr. Maher gave a review of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and stated that in the past Blueprint has received an unqualified opinion, which meant that there was no exception to the financial statements and there were no material weaknesses identified. There was a recent change in accounting standards, which took place in December 2007. It was an introduction of a new item that “was a cause of significant deficiencies identified not considered
being material weaknesses”. Regarding the significant deficiencies, the CAFR noted donations of land for permanent easements were not recorded in the general ledger. Blueprint’s response to the comments was that to ensure all accounting issues were considered, weekly meetings between Blueprint and Accounting Services division staff would include discussion and evaluation of Blueprint minutes, contracts and other agreements. On the topic of debt service payments for the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) loans, the CAFR indicated the general ledger did not correctly allocate load principal and interest expense. The recommendation given was to confirm loan balances annually with FDOT prior to closing the books to ensure accurate accounting and reporting. Concerning the Grant Reporting, given the small size of Blueprint’s staff, Blueprint’s Financial Manager prepares all grant reporting and reimbursement requests for Blueprint. There currently was no independent review of those documents and reimbursement request. The suggestion was that all documents prepared for reporting to grantors should be carefully reviewed by someone other than the preparer and all reimbursements requests should be reviewed by the City’s accounting services division for accuracy and compliance.

Gregg Patterson asked for recognition for a breakout of SIB loan interest and principle. Beth Brenneis from Carr Riggs and Ingram, stated that over the life of the loan, by the time Blueprint got to the end of the paying off the loan, the actual cost was $950,992.00 less than what was originally anticipated. The $950,992.00 savings would not have been recorded until the last year of the debt service. Mr. Rick Feldman stated that Blueprint understated the debt services and that it would be corrected and they would continue to keep it updated. Mr. Maher mentioned that he would be open to any comments and reiterated that the CAFR was a draft.

Mr. Patterson confirmed that in the financial world it was something that needed to be corrected but it was not something that needed to raise concern. Kathy Archibald moved acceptance of the Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and the Appropriation of FY 2007 Operating Fund Balance as presented. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

**Item #4: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond**

**Landscaping/Park**

Steve Nichols stated that Blueprint had received the Invitation For Bid and staff was reviewing it. Upon completion it would be turned over to the short-listed contractors, M. Inc., Sandco, and C.W. Roberts for their bids. Mr. Nichols noted that the project was currently in the permitting process. Mr. Nichols confirmed that bids would be received by mid-March 2008.

Dianna Norwood inquired about the pond that was located right off Tennessee Street for which parking issues were being reviewed. Jim Davis stated that the acquisition had not happened due to the requested land price being absolutely astronomical. Mr. Davis stated that there would be 13 parking places, near the right-of-way, as well as having a circular drive with handicap access. County Parks & Recreation stated would be sufficient.
Item #5: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update
Marcus Kelly provided the committee with a brief summary of the 15.3 acre regional Stormwater pond, part of the Capital Circle NW project. Blueprint and FDOT had arranged a work order for hand removal of the channel apple snails. Unfortunately the snails had returned and Blueprint was currently working with local agencies to find some experimental methods to fix the problem. The proposed methods would include hand picking as well as chemical treatments, fish, stakes, and cooking oil. Marcus Kelly noted meetings would continue with the County and other agencies to determine the best method.

Item #1: Leveraging Update
Mr. Maher stated Blueprint was preparing a Federal Transportation Funding Request, since with the downturn of the economy there might be a Federal infrastructure stimulus package. This request would also be used to seek funding in the Highway Reauthorization Bill for 2009. This was the same process that Blueprint went through for the prior SAFETEA-LU allocation for Capital Circle NW and SW. Mr. Davis mentioned that Blueprint was anticipating, during recession, that a stimulus package may be developed and Blueprint wanted to position to be able to pursue some funding.

Mr. Davis gave a brief update on the financial side of things, stating that FDOT was $1.4 billion short in their planned 5-year work program. Fortunately, Blueprint had most of the projects currently under contract and costs were fixed. The economy was in a bit of an anomaly, the housing market was down, but the Right-of-Way was not coming down. Right-of-Way had continued to be outrageously high, and it would take awhile for the commercial property to come down.

Tom O’Steen asked who lobbies on Blueprint’s behalf, when applications were forwarded to a Senator’s office. Mr. Davis confirmed that it was a combination between the City and County and stated that it was coordinated primarily by Rick Speas, the City’s lobbyist. Mr. Davis also stated that Blueprint would work through Allen Boyd’s office to put something together that was justifiable and would identify that Capital Circle NW/SW costs had increased. (Right-of-Way costs had increased, along with the design budget.) Capital Circle was a SIS (Strategic Intermodal System) Roadway; the highest level of the roads in the state of Florida, by definition.

Mr. Maher stated that Northwest Florida Water Management District Florida Forever Grant was not approved. This was the first unsuccessful grant application for Blueprint. Regarding future grants, Blueprint was working on a grant that would provide funding for the Meridian Plaza in Cascade Park from the Department of State/Cultural Facilities Program, as well a grant for water quality improvements in Cascade Park.

Dave Bright stated that staff would be requesting the IA endorse the Cultural Facilities Grant. Blueprint might also request a letter of support from the CAC. Mr. O’Steen inquired about the Florida Forever Grant, was there another cycle to resubmit the application and the likelihood of being declined for one grant, and gives an advantage for another grant. Mr. Bright stated that it was a yearly cycle and he had spoken briefly with Paul Thorpe, from the Water Management District. Mr. Thorpe indicated that this grant was given to counties that were economically deficient and were contingent on that grant funding to complete their projects. Blueprint probably lost about 15 points because they were going to build the project even without grant
funding.

Mr. Davis mentioned that throughout the process, the board members felt that they were giving too much money to Leon County. He also stated that the more successful one was, the harder it became to succeed the next time. He stated that it was inevitable that Blueprint was denied one. Mr. Davis stated that, yes, Blueprint could resubmit the application, and intended too.

**Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail Segments 3 & 4 Design Consultant**

Mr. Bright notified the CAC that Kimley-Horn & Associates was selected by a committee of seven that evaluated the proposals. Blueprint planned to have a contract executed in approximately six weeks. Ward Miller of Kimley Horn was in attendance; it was noted that he had significant experience in the comprehensive Stormwater Management area, 27 years total. Mr. Miller stated that he was looking forward to working on the project, and that he had a passion for functional Stormwater greenways, while the citizens see only a beautiful park. He had worked on projects similar to that one in the past, and looking forward to identify the win-win design solutions with all of the various interests.

Kevin McGorty asked for the record what the other firms were. Mr. Bright stated that there were actually ten firms who submitted for the Request For Qualifications, but did not have them in front of him. He said that he would e-mail them to Mr. McGorty.

**Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 – Design Update**

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint was making progress on five of the six amenity designs. Mr. Phillips noted that there was a mistake in the Item regarding the Meridian Plaza Stage, it was 150 feet in diameter, not 75 feet as shown in the item. Blueprint staff met with Assistant City Manager Michael Wright concerning the concept for the dancing fountain amenity. The Signature Bridges would be A-Frame, 33 foot high and 65 foot span bridges. He also noted that Blueprint was having difficulties with one of the owners signing off on the Lake Hall School House for donation. Unfortunately no significant progress had been made. The History Timeline Fence was projected to have 14 interpretive panels that would document the history of Tallahassee. Peter Martin was working with the Local Historic Society for the wording of the panels.

In regards to permitting, Blueprint had submitted a “Type A” Site Plan Application to COT Growth Management which included the Environmental Impact Assessment. There were three steps, the Natural Features Inventory, Environmental Impact Assessment, and the ERP which was currently under review.

Furthermore, Blueprint staff was evaluating possible green initiatives for the project’s design and construction. A few examples were solar applications for the restroom facility, recycled materials for the pavement areas, and pervious pavers system for the parking areas; along with landscaping.

On January 30, 2008 a constructability meeting was held with several possible contractors including Culpepper, Ajax, Sandco, and M. Inc, to discuss Segment 2 Design and best methodology for construction. The three methods that were discussed were Construction Management at Risk, Design-Build, and Design-Bid-Build with multiple contracts. Mr. Phillips stated that even though the economic conditions were bad, from a revenue side there were some
benefits; mainly that the contractors were looking for work. There was no decision made on methodology.

Mr. Davis stated that the impact to it would be in drafting the Scope of Services. Blueprint would have a decision within the next 30 days. Mr. Davis stated that staff had already considered Construction Management at Risk. After reviewing it in detail, however there was approximately 6% management/risk cost associated with that. 6% of the $26-35 million project cost (with all of the amenities), was a significant amount of money. Blueprint would require prequalification, standard low bid and hard bids that would capitalize on the competitive market.

Nancy Miller addressed a few questions concerning the green initiatives. Ms. Miller was concerned about the issues of porous concrete, pavers, asphalt, and recycled plastic and the wear ability. Mr. Phillips stated maintenance and durability were the biggest issues with the green park elements. Mr. Davis added that Blueprint was trying to incorporate as much of the green initiatives as possible, but the question was whether or not it would be done on a demonstration basis. For example, instead of the entire sidewalk being in pervious concrete, the thought was to do a quarter of a mile in pervious concrete. Blueprint was concerned that some of the technologies were relatively new and potentially high maintenance and that future maintenance could become a burden to the Parks Department. Blueprint was not prepared to make a major wholesale commitment for the entire project, but to use it as a demonstration for a portion. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint wanted the park to be a showcase for green initiatives even if it was not a wholesale demonstration application. The biggest issue that Blueprint was researching was to find a manufacture that was willing to donate the product, in return for having it as a demonstration.

Mr. McGorty agreed with Ms. Miller to find a way, even with a very tight budget, to receive an award in terms of adding education to the community in regards to green initiatives. Mr. McGorty applauded any efforts made by Blueprint to showcase that within the given parameters. It would be an added bonus to the green initiatives project. Hugh Brown asked if the idea was to what Blueprint could do initially with hopes of turning everything green down the road. Because it was stated earlier, that Blueprint did not want to make the full commitment because the materials were still new. Mr. Davis stated that he did not see Blueprint tearing up sidewalks to replace them with pervious concrete after the 5 years of the demonstration, but it would be possible during Segment 3 or 4 that it would be more feasible to add more green items. They planned to use the composite decking where they could. Kathy Archibald agreed with the “reverse metering” for solar generation. Kevin McGorty noted the green components could eventually lead to an award.

Mr. Davis mentioned that the Segment 2 Marketing Team, Loranne Ausley, Janet Hinkle, and Gil Ziffer, had been actively pursing fundraising efforts. He confirmed that Blueprint had received a commitment for half of the cost of the dog park. Also, Capital Health Plan had committed to funding the trail network and the City of Tallahassee and the CRA has committed to funding the dancing fountain. Blueprint also had received a commitment for the design and construction of the Signature Bridges; the name of the firm would be released at a later date. Lamar Taylor inquired about the amount of contributions. Mr. Davis stated that the commitment for the dog park was a verbal commitment for half ($300,000 total), the interactive water park was approximately $2,000,000, and the bridges were $500,000 total.
Mr. Davis presented a PowerPoint presentation to the CAC on the Dog Park; a copy of which is included in the file.

Following the presentation, Nancy Miller stated that the dog waste issues was an educational opportunity that could encourage people to be more conscious of pet waste all over Tallahassee. As well as creating an educational tool for that particular park; the City would be able to implement elsewhere. Mr. Davis stated that the whole concern for the Dog Park was that John Buss (City Stormwater) did not like it because of the location immediately on top of the St. Augustine Branch.

Mr. McGorty stated that the whole issue with public health, in beaches and parks, the bacterial level that people were experiencing; was the rest of the park going to be off limits to dogs? Were dogs only going to be permitted in the dog park? Mr. McGorty mentioned that Central Park in New York has two areas, one for humans and another for dogs. He would hope that new Parks and Recreation Director was saying for an operation standpoint that this was a controlling factor, the best we can control the population of dogs. He was concerned that if the City did not police it in someway, the rampant use of pets may create a public health issue and might discourage the public from actually utilizing the park. Mr. Davis stated that he had not quite through that, but it would most likely be up to City Ordinances. Blueprint had spoken with the interim Parks and Rec. Director about the issues and they are on board. Mr. Davis took a few minutes to discus the issues that City Stormwater had with the park. One being that it was in the wrong place because of the water course, but doesn’t mind the park. Because of the issue of not obtaining the Lake Hall School House, there might be a possible opportunity to move the dog park there. Tom O’Steen confirmed what Mr. McGorty stated in that it was a solution for Parks & Recreation and City Stormwater to deal with.

**Item #3: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update**

Latesa Turner gave a brief update on the status on the PD & E study, it was progressing very well. Blueprint was currently entering into the 17-month of the study development. The PD&E design consultant was currently conducting the environmental engineering analysis collecting data, and continuing to refine the corridor alignments that were identified in May 2007. They were also continuing to develop the corridor alignments alternatives, which would be presented in late April 2008 or early May 2008. Prior to that meeting an update would be given to the CAC.

**Item #6: Capital Circle SE Completion and ribbon Cutting Ceremony**

Margie Quillman informed the Committee that the Capital Circle SE project was expected to be completed in May 2008. A ribbon cutting ceremony would be scheduled for April or May. Staff was targeting April 15, 2008 as the primary date; the Commissioners will be polled as to their availability and additional information would be forthcoming.

**Item #8 FDOT’s Future Right-of-Way Trends**

Debra Schiro provided the committee with a brief summary of a meeting she attended regarding imminent domain, right-of-way costs and funding. A few points that were given were that the FDOT work program was reduced by $1.4 Billion for the next five years. Another interesting point was that Right-of-Way cost continued to increase and the number of parcels acquired had
consequently decreased. She further stated that it might be time to look outside for a private public partnership, legislation for which just passed during last session, HB 985, with an emphasis on some projects in District 4 starting to use existing traffic lanes rather than expanding.

Mr. Davis stated that the public private partnership was a combination of private construction funding with a portion of state funding. It was complicated; the businesses would either get a portion of the tolls or get the tolls for a certain amount of years, and then it would revert to public ownership.

Consent Items

Item #9: CAC Minutes: December 6, 2007
Nancy Miller stated that there was a typing mistake regarding to the sales tax, it was listed as 0.4% decrease and was supposed to be 4% (page2 of 7, item #1). Mrs. Miller moved that the committee pass the minutes and Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #11 Capital Circle NW/SW: Us 90 to Orange Avenue – Right-of-Way Acquisitions (Additional parcels) and Resolution
Ms. Schiro stated that Blueprint intended to present a resolution to the IA, February 25, 2008, for an approval to acquire six (6) additional parcels on CCNW/SW that had been deemed necessary for the project. Blueprint was asking the IA for approval of a resolution to acquire them, either by a donation, voluntary purchase or condemnation. Of the six parcels, four of them were located on Swamp Fox Road, used for mitigation, one located on Pensacola Avenue, used for drainage.

Mr. Patterson asked if the economic downturn had impacted the Blueprint projects. Mr. Davis confirmed that Blueprint was okay for now. As far as Right-of-Way acquisition, it appeared that Blueprint would not have enough money as originally planned for Capital Circle NW/SW. The original estimate did not include the mitigation properties, but there was additional funding in the construction budget that could be moved if necessary.

Mr. Davis explained that when the original construction budget was compiled, the plan was to have a long grade level bridge across Gum Swamp; in the final design, there was a 100 foot long bridge, but in return, Blueprint agreed to purchase some mitigation property to offset the fill. Because of that, there was a net reduction in cost, so part of the “construction” money was available for purchase of the mitigation property.

Item #12 Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental
Mr. Davis stated that CSX had stated that they were planning to install an additional track in the future. The impact of that would be that the bridge over the current track and over the CSX ROW would need to be longer, because the abutments would still be within CSX’s Right-of-Way. This was the primary issue with this project. There were several other unresolved issues, however, Blueprint was in the process of negotiating the supplemental agreement with Lochner
and was still negotiating a final cost of the supplemental. No money would be diverted from another project; it was the same project, just moving funds from construction to design.

Jim Shepherd addressed the funding for the pond cross section and stated that once the ponds were built the surveyors verify the constructed volume against the design plans. That had not been negotiated in the original contract. Blueprint will have inspectors on site that work for us and make sure that the ponds are functioning before it takes. Blueprint is asking permission to find a firm that is their specialty, and insure that the project is built according to the approved drawing specifications properly.

Kevin McGorty moved to approve staff recommendation that the cost not exceed $350,000. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #13 Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Construction Engineering and Inspection Services**

Latesa Turner stated that Blueprint was requesting authorization to initiate the procurement process to secure Construction Engineering Inspection services. This project was anticipated to start construction by the end of 2008 or beginning of 2009, and the plan is to secure the CEI services prior to this. Also, the Agenda Item is requesting that the IMC be authorized to negotiate and award a contract once the CEI has been selected.

This particular CEI contract would be different from previous Blueprint CEI contracts. Blueprint would be requiring on-site environmental inspectors, and more stringent environmental oversight to avoid disrupting anymore land than was necessary during the construction process and to be proactive in maintaining environmental safeguards. It will be a fairly expensive CEI contract due to the additional environmental requirements; otherwise it was a standard solicitation procedure that Blueprint has used in the past.

Kathy Archibald moved for approval and Nancy Miller seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

**Item #14 Sales Tax Receipts Update**

Mr. Maher gave a brief overview of the Sales Tax receipts and impacts to the Master Plan. The Master Plan had originally used a 4.5% annual growth projection based on a recommendation of the Finance Committee, which at that time was considered conservative. Over the previous years, the cumulative average growth rate of the optional sales tax from 1992 thru 2006 had been 6.4%. For 2007, even though there was a 0.5% increase in collections, there was still a $1.2 million deficiency based on projections. When projected out for the term of the tax, this number becomes astronomical. For the short term, no more than two years, Blueprint doesn’t see anything that would jeopardize any priorities and everything that is under contract would be fine. Blueprint and the Finance Committee met and asked to run the financing model with two different scenarios, one where the growth factor should be 0.5% for two years and then bring growth back up to 4.5% annually; and the second scenario was with a growth of 2% for two years and then backup to 4.5%. Total reduction in Blueprint project funding over the 15 years was in the range of $59 million to $73 million. Mr. Taylor stated that if Blueprint was conservative, then maybe Blueprint would take action in the near term by scaling back planned projects now, that might result in cost savings down the road. Mr. Taylor also pointed out,
however, that there was a downside to being too conservative in that the organization could cut projects too much and miss out on cost savings that could be obtained from economies of scale. These are simply the tensions inherent in long-term planning. Mr. Taylor asked what current long-term contracts were in place that the organization was financially and legally committed to (that the organization cannot cancel without threat of legal action). He indicated that these are the “base line” items that must be funded, leaving everything else as the universe of projects that could be scaled back.

Mr. Maher stated that currently there were none; all the contracted projects were in the short term. Mr. Taylor offered the idea creating a list of projects that could potentially be eliminated as a result of funding short falls, to be presented to the IA. Mr. Maher reminded the committee that when Blueprint began, there were only three segments of Capital Cascade Trail funded and not all of Capital Circle was funded. It was through grant funding that they were able to finance additional segments of the Capital Circle (Tram to Woodville), Segment 4 of the Capital Cascade Trail was added, as were the Park amenities.

Mr. Davis stated that the Master Plan was a dynamic document by design, it would be updated every year, and Blueprint would develop options and then present them to the CAC at the next meeting and again before staff presents it to the IA along with the 2009 Budget. The importance of this item was to convey Blueprint is being affected just like the rest of the economy in a range somewhere between $59 million to $73 million. Blueprint would offer some reasonable recommendation as to how to deal with the change.

Mr. McGorty asked the Chairman if the item could be placed early in the Agenda for the following meeting, so that they could continue a thorough discussion, and stated that the analysis needed to be done. Mr. McGorty mentioned when it was presented to the IA, it could also be an opportunity to eliminate something that may not want to be eliminated. While also mentioning moving the important items closer to the top of the agenda.

Mr. Davis mentioned that the GEC contract with the LPA Group was awarded in 2004 for five years, with one five year option to extend, and with one year extensions after that thru the end of the tax in 2019. The contract is coming up for renewal in about a year and Blueprint wanted to get started early on procurement in case the recommendation is to go out for a new solicitation. It would take about a year to get someone new on board. Blueprint staff has made the recommendation to exercise the option for the next five years with the LPA Group.

Kathy Archibald moved for approval and Dianna Norwood seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Citizens To Be Heard

Steve Bailey, an attorney representing Tanglewood Estates, a possible mitigation site for the Capital Circle NW/SW project requested to speak. Mr. Bailey stated he had recently heard that the Tanglewood mitigation site was going away in lieu of acquiring four new parcels for mitigation along Swamp Fox Road, because of cost. Tanglewood is a low income, mobile home park, 20-30 years old, and on small lots. Mr. Bailey briefed the committee on the background of
Tanglewood, the County drained the swamp, which created drier property and Tanglewood was developed. He acknowledged that Blueprint looked at a lot of mitigation sites, which included Swamp Fox Road, and Tanglewood, and determined that Tanglewood would be a location for flood plain mitigation. Just over a year ago, the IA approved condemnation on just the areas of Tanglewood which flood. These properties had also been placed on Leon County’s flood buy back program. Relocation agents and appraisers had been out, talked to the tenants, and discussed what would occur if the property were purchased and they were required to move. The tenants had made no plans but all of those people were expecting it to happen, including his father.

Mr. Bailey stated that now all of the County’s money has been spent, and now finding out that the other sites are way better. He is asking the committee to look into these issues, he does not see how these other sites can be less expensive, than an older mobile home park, it seems like a lot of money and time has been spent on this mitigation, to now say there is another site that is better. He stated that from an equity standpoint, not just a financial standpoint, and what is right for this park which floods there should be a huge benefit to change the path of this at this point.

Mr. Davis stated that Tanglewood was initially identified by the County as a mitigation site if Blueprint could not acquire certain parcels and if they were moving in that direction. An opportunity presented itself to acquire a different piece of property that would meet the mitigation standards and was far cheaper. Blueprint had made no decision on it as of yet, however, they were in discussions with Leon County and are looking into what the costs for each option would be. If the costs were close, Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint could be inclined to go with acquiring Tanglewood, to reduce the flooded properties. However the initial numbers were significantly different, in the millions, not including relocation costs. Blueprint was considering both options and would hopefully have a better idea within 30 days. Mr. Bailey requested that Blueprint keep him informed of the status and what might transpire. Mr. Davis stated that was Blueprint’s intentions; along with keeping the Board informed as well.

Mr. Bailey stated that his father and brother owned the majority of Tanglewood, and would be willing to negotiate. He offered to be the point of contact.

Mr. O’Steep stated that the opinion of the committee was to negotiate the best deal.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 p.m.
Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tom O’Steen</th>
<th>Jerry Conger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald (telephonically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Brown</td>
<td>Scott Balog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dave Bright</th>
<th>Gary Phillips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Latesa Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Orr</td>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Gates</td>
<td>Harry Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bailey</td>
<td>Nathan Bailey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications for this meeting. Although, Dave Bright introduced new staff members David Snyder, GEC Program Manager and Ray Youmans, Right-of-Way Manager, and intern Andrew Orr.

Sales Tax and Master Plan Workshop

Jim Davis stated that the projected decline in sales tax revenue was worse than expected. Therefore staff would be taking a revised Master Plan to the Board at the June 2, 2008 Intergovernmental Agency meeting that reflected anticipated reductions in revenue. He solicited input from the Committee and clarified that staff was not making any recommendations as to which projects would have decreased funding or be eliminated all together. However, Blueprint was faced with a $100 million reduction to the total budget.

Phil Maher explained that Blueprint’s sales tax revenue came two months in arrears. Therefore the agency had only just received the January 2008 allocation which was approximately 2% below last year’s level. There was an 8% decrease in December 2007 which was extraordinary; when and or if that leveled off remained to be seen.
Mr. Maher stated that he had met with the Legislative staff economist shortly after the conclusion of the state’s Revenue Estimating Conference. He distributed a copy of the executive summary of that conference and offered a brief overview of their perspective for the next five years. The conference offered a base line, however, he did not think that Blueprint would follow the same trends as the state.

Blueprint staff would be meeting with their Finance Committee and financial advisors on Monday, April 7, 2008. The purpose of which was to come to a consensus on growth rates for Blueprint to use in the Master Plan and for the Capital Budget. He reminded the Committee that things were subject to change in one to two years.

He stated that Blueprint based the original Master Plan on a 4.5% growth rate in tax receipts. At the last Finance Committee meeting they evaluated the Master Plan with 0.5% growth for two years before returning to 4.5%, and a second scenario with 1.5% growth rate for two years before returning to 4.5%. Presently, however, staff felt even that was extremely optimistic. Mr. Maher could not estimate what Blueprint would use until staff met with the Finance Committee. He suspected however that there would be no growth in the current year and only minimal growth in the next. Whether Blueprint returned to the 4.5% growth the following year (2010) would be questionable. He used the 0.5% growth estimate for the analysis before them; it also provided the $73M reduction in tax receipts listed.

Mr. Maher stated he received an e-mail from Lamar Taylor who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Taylor felt that the Committee should be focusing on two things. First identifying and quantifying the current financial and legal commitments of the organization that cannot be scaled back without threat of legal action. Second identifying and prioritizing from the remaining projects, those projects which could be scaled back or cut if funding dries up.

Mr. Maher reviewed the Master Plan by year: Beginning in 2006 there was a $350,000 reduction; that was reflective of the County Water Quality allocation. The Master Plan was modified to show the allocation in the same fiscal year as indicated in County documents (2006 to 2007). Staff worked from an approved $109M budget in 2007, but only $44M was actually invoiced. The difference was carried forward to the 2008 budget.

Also, Mr. Maher reviewed the Master Plan by project: There were no changes made to the $50M allocated for Water Quality for the City and County, nor to the Sensitive Lands projects. There should have been $10M in the Land bank, however, at the beginning of 2008 the IA authorized staff to transfer $2.6M to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 for an early implementation of the design; with the understanding that the design dollars, in the out years, would be moved to the Landbank. It was a net loss, for the short term at least. Mr. Maher stated that he did not make any further cuts to the Landbank because it allowed Blueprint to acquire land early (ROW or Sensitive Lands). Secondly, the land bank was a contingency.

Capital Circle NW (I-10 to 90) is complete with the exception of additional stormwater retrofit in the out years. The $9M proposed for that was eliminated. The $2M for Greenways in 2008 remained untouched. For Capital Circle NW/SW (90 to Orange) again, the stormwater retrofit, in the out years, was reduced by approximately $3.3M and moved out by one year. However Blueprint had acquired between $6M and $7M in stormwater and mitigation property along the
corridor. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had $42M in State SIS funds and $8M in Federal funds that they were using to acquire ROW. Blueprint received that funding based on commitments to both entities that the project would be built. Therefore, “let’s not do that segment anymore” was not an option from staff’s perspective.

Mr. Maher continued, Capital Circle SE E1 (Connie to Tram) was under contract and nearing completion. CCSE E2 (Woodville to Tram) was currently under contract and under construction. The 60% design had been completed for CCSE E3 (Woodville to Crawfordville); construction on E3 was never funded. On Capital Circle SW W1 (Crawfordville to Orange) the $27M allocated for design and ROW had been eliminated.

Mr. Davis noted that W1 was partially funded at best to begin with. Depending on the alignment construction could be around $200M; Blueprint had only $27M allocated. Kathy Archibald clarified that staff would complete the PD&E and determine the future alignment but they were not moving forward with ROW acquisitions or design. Mr. Davis concurred and stated Blueprint would be able to protect the identified alignment and ROW based upon City Ordinances until the money became available.

Capital Cascade Trail General and Segment 1 would be completely unfunded under the new scenario. It would have been the last segment of Capital Cascade Trail to be completed at approximately $43M. The $9.7M listed in program management for General/Segment 1 was actually the Program Management allocation for all segments of Capital Cascade Trail. Mr. Maher reiterated that under the proposed 0.5% growth scenario Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 would be eliminated.

Kevin McGorty questioned how eliminating Segment 1 would affect the total stormwater engineering concept. Mr. Davis explained that each segment had been identified, from a concept standpoint, to function independently. Segment 2 would make some improvements to the stormwater issues but it would not eliminate the flooding on Franklin Boulevard. Segment 2 had been designed to accommodate the storm water from Segment 1 however; that remained unchanged. Nevertheless, due to the restraints of the ditch and the dip in the road on Franklin, that area would continue to flood. Even the $5M proposed for interim improvements was no longer available under this scenario.

However, if Segment 3 and Segment 4 could be implemented to store the water in those areas the impact to the whole stormwater system would be greatly enhanced. Water would be captured, attenuated, and treated. Also staging of the water in the park itself could be controlled as well. Until Segment 1 was completed though, the amount of water entering the park itself could be controlled as well. Until Segment 1 was completed though, the amount of water entering the park would remain unchanged from today. The overall drainage structure would be improved but not to the optimum.

Jerry Conger noted that the public perception that would be generated by eliminating Segment 1 might not be the type of recognition Blueprint wanted. Mr. Davis agreed but also stated that the IA determined that Segment 1 would be the last segment to be addressed. Construction was not programmed until 2016. Mr. Maher stated that the $43M included design; a decision could be to eliminate another segment or project. The scenario was at the point where someone would be required to make difficult choices and decisions. All of the projects were viable but the cuts had
to come from somewhere. Segment 3 and Segment 4 were moved out a few years under the
0.5% growth scenario. By doing so however, inflation caused the cost estimates to increase.

Mr. Maher stated that when staff returned with the Master Plan in May/June 2008 it could be less
than the $549M; if, coming out of the Finance Committee meeting on April 7, 2008, the numbers
were less (worse) than the 0.5% growth for the next two years and 4.5% there on out, what was
left of the Master Plan would be negatively impacted.

Regarding Segment 3 and Segment 4, Mr. Davis stated that staff was in the preliminary phase of
designing them. Once they reached 60% design the impacts could be evaluated and the decision
made as to which segment would be carried to 100% design, Segment 3 or Segment 4. Based
upon that decision one segment would move forward but not both.

Mr. Davis requested that the Committee propose a prioritization of the projects to be reduced or
for elimination. Kathy Archibald stated she was more concerned with how they would be re-
prioritized once revenues increased. Mr. Maher noted Blueprint’s success with grants, and stated
they would continue to target those that were applicable. Also, FDEP had a revolving loan
program that Blueprint could borrow money for stormwater projects. It would be less costly than
selling bonds. However, Mr. Davis stated, the state was experiencing their own economic
shortfalls. In fact, there was currently a bill before the Legislature that would take $3.3 Billion
from the Transportation Trust Fund over five years. The current five-year Work Program was
$1.4 Billion short. Furthermore, he stated, that he would not be surprised if TRIP, SIB loans,
and additional SIS funding were significantly reduced.

Kathy Archibald agreed that times were tough and recommended that staff focus on completing
as much of Capital Cascade Trail as they could. Having the designs in place so that they were
ready when the funding became available was, she felt, appropriate. However, eliminating
Segment 1 of Capital Cascade Trail was not to her liking either. She commended staff for
making the best of a bad situation however.

Tom O’Steen questioned what would happen if rather than the anticipated 0.5% growth there
was zero or even negative. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint would have their financial advisors
run a cash flow proforma of the revenue consensus. The projects would be readjusted to balance
the bottom line which might mean moving them out or eliminating them. As it stood the next
projects to be eliminated would be construction of another segment of Capital Cascade Trail or
some of the environmental or Sensitive Lands projects.

Mr. Maher stated that under the current cash scenario, funding was available to finance the cost
of the projects for the next couple years. Beyond that it would cause staff to increase the next
bond sale in order to fund the remainder of the projects. Blueprint sold $75M in bonds in
September 2007 and anticipated returning for a third bond sale in 2010 and another smaller one
after that. He did not see any reason to readjust the current year budget. Mr. Davis stated that
Blueprint’s priority was to complete the projects they had begun as well as, to protect the Water
Quality money and the Land Bank.

Kevin McGorty questioned the reduction to funding in projects when $10M was still allocated
for the Mahan project. Mr. Maher stated that the State was to sign the development order soon
for the Capital Circle Office Center DRI. The development order was contingent upon Mahan Drive being completed within three years. Under that the State has made a commitment to fund FDOT $26M, along with Blueprint’s $10M, over the next three years to build Mahan. Reallocating that $10M would result in the loss of the $26M match.

Mr. McGorty stated that he was extremely concerned with the elimination of Segment 1 of the Capital Cascade Trail. He did not agree with shifting funds from C2, C3 or C4 to fund C1. The only reason C1 was delayed was because they were struggling to reach consensus on flooding, design, the roadway, and what Leon High School might contribute. He commended Mr. Maher for his talent in trimming the budget as he did and requested that the CAC, at a minimum, be strongly in favor of the restoration of those funds when funding became available.

Mr. Maher concurred and stated that it could be the time to take a hard look at some of the environmental projects. Money had been allocated for the Lafayette flood plain, for example, for several years, yet there had been no identifiable parcels to acquire. That could be an interim solution for flooding in C1. There were few road projects remaining that the funds could be transferred from. Mr. McGorty stated that what remained should be balanced. He did not want to say at the end, that the balance was tipped for roads with only fragments of environmental projects being completed. That was, in his opinion, what Capital Cascade Trail represented. Mr. Maher agreed and stated that Capital Cascade Trail was an environmental project.

Nancy Miller disagreed and stated that it was environmental opposition that caused the IA to change the priority on Franklin Boulevard. Mr. McGorty stated that he did not have any solutions but wanted to bring the subject to everyone’s attention. Mr. Davis stated that using 0.5% as the base line for projected growth there remained approximately $140M in Capital Cascade Trail Segments 2 through 4. If the CAC offered guidance of reallocating funds from non-defined specific projects (Headwaters of the St. Marks, Lack Jackson Basin, Lafayette Floodplain) to the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1, because they recognized it to be a greater priority than stormwater retrofit on CCNW/SW; staff could clearly do that.

Ms. Archibald stated she would be more inclined to re-appropriate the nebulous greenway and stormwater funding from CCNW/SW to CCT Segment 1 than to move Sensitive Land funding. Mr. Maher clarified that of the $42M in NW/SW ROW included approximately $6.5M in mitigation property. It was reflected in ROW on the Master Plan but was in actuality stormwater retrofit and was unrelated to the road itself. Mr. Davis stated that he was reticent to move all of it because there were indications that Blueprint would be short ROW dollars on NW/SW. The use of some of the stormwater retrofit allocations could pay for mitigation properties, if necessary. However, he also understood the validity of the funding being in the out years. Nonetheless, they could be re-allocated if they remained in the same years (2018-2020) and were not lost.

Nancy Miller stated that, in her opinion Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 was a road project and by re-allocation those funds it appeared that they were moving stormwater money to a road project. In reviewing a breakdown of the costs, more money would be spent on pavement than on stormwater. Segment 1 was merely conveyance anyway. Ms. Archibald agreed and noted that it was not anyone’s “fault” there was a road on top of the conveyance system.
Jess Van Dyke noted that the sentiments expressed were the heart of the controversy with Segment 1. It was a flooding issue not a water quality issue nevertheless it was still stormwater. Ms. Archibald felt it was more of a public relations / public perception issue than anything. Ms. Miller stated that she understood and would support it if the other segments were built first, as they were of a higher priority. The Committee agreed.

Mr. Davis stated that the plan then would be that staff would re-appropriate the full $11.7M currently designated for greenway and stormwater retrofit near CCNS/SW in 2018-2020 to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 in the same years. The committee concurred. Mr. Davis confirmed that doing so would have no impact on Blueprint’s ability to meet the deliverables or objectives of the grants received.

Information Items

**Item #2: Leveraging Update**
In regards to the return of grant funding from Florida Communities Trust (FCT), which would have acquired the Myers Industrial Park, Kathy Archibald questioned if it was because it required matching funds. Mr. Davis stated that funding from FCT came with so many restrictions and conditions; Blueprint simply could not satisfy them. Mr. McGorty questioned if there would be any political fall out from Blueprint declining the grant. Mr. Bright stated that with FCT there were no problems and FCT was grateful that Blueprint did not drag the process on longer than necessary so that they could reallocate the funds.

**Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update**
Mr. Davis stated in regards to the Dog Park, that City Stormwater had lobbied against the Dog Park to the City Commission. It therefore did not make it beyond the City’s Environmental and Energy Resources Target Issue committee.

Gary Phillips briefly discussed the amphitheater area and noted that in the worst rain event conditions, the stage area could flood. However, the Meridian Plaza was at a high enough elevation for it not to flood, even during the worst storms.

In regards to the natural fluctuation of water, Ms. Archibald questioned how much water would be stored with the construction of the park. Mr. Gary Phillips stated that it would total 82 acre-feet of storage.

Ms. Archibald also referred to the Development Standards of Environmental Management and strongly recommended the collection of samples for water quality analyses. Therefore if there were any questions later regarding the quality, there would be documentation to show that it was in fact improved with the project. Mr. Phillips stated that samples had been collected as part of the alum injection study. Ms. Archibald suggested collecting samples on a more regular basis for backup data. Along with having a warning system to vacate the park in case of the magnitude of the storm that would flood the stage. Ms. Archibald also mentioned that there was a certain public liability that went along with flooding or a storm approaching with a large amount of rainfall. Mr. Phillips stated that there were emergency call boxes throughout the park and could be used as speakers from the control area. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had talked
about the lights flashing in those situations, along with a very stern message coming out of Boca Chuba.

Scott Balog stated that Ms. Archibald brought up a good point and in regards to higher education in what has happened at Virginia Tech, in consideration to finding ways to communicate effectively to a larger audience in an emergency. Mr. Phillips stated that a police substation would be adjacent to the bathhouse. It would allow the police to be in the park on a regular basis, with a computer system to be able utilize the speaker system. They would also be able to help with the security in the park in general.

Ms. Archibald questioned the steel sheet pile walls versus the concrete wall. Would there be vegetation covering them, or was it an architectural element of itself? Dave Snyder stated that the steel sheet pile wall would have plants which would eventually cascade over the walls and cover the rustic steel sheet piling. The sheet piling was designed to retain the fill adjacent to the railroad. With the railroad setting, the park planner wanted a steel sheet system running to both ends of the Boca Chuba bridge, with cascading vegetation. The particular steel sheets would oxidize within one year and then stop, then have a rustic look.

**Item #4: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park**

Nancy Miller stated that she would like to use recycled plastic materials for the benches and hoped to see Blueprint continue this trend with future projects. Mr. Snyder stated that Blueprint was filing for permits and he reviewed the specs for the use of recycled plastic material.

**Item #5: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update**

Mr. Van Dyke stated in regards to the possible donation of fish from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation, there was a fish called the red-ear sunfish (shell cracker), which ate snails. It would be beneficial to have a large population of them, as a biological control, to protect the vegetation. He also requested to have the county post a sign stating that it would be ok to fish there; that was the caveat to getting “free” fish from FWC. Mr. Davis stated that rather than a sign allowing fishing he felt we should try to keep the County from putting up signs saying “No Fishing”. The County’s concern would be the human consumption of fish harvested from a pond that by design, was intended to remove impurities from runoff.

Wilson Barnes questioned if there would be an agency to periodically check the water quality for a minimal threshold for health requirements. Mr. Van Dyke stated that he did not feel there was enough analyses on all of the water bodies in the region. The fish consumption advisories were based on the quantity of meals per month. Realistically, however, he did not see how Blueprint could fund the extensive and expensive study to determine whether or not the fish from Regional Stormwater Pond 1’s fish would be fit for consumption or not. There were other issues to worry about; if though Blueprint could receive free fish and keep the vegetation alive, he did not see that it would bring harm to anyone.

**Mr. Van Dyke moved for the committee to state a preference to allow fishing in the pond in order to receive free red-ear sunfish. Mr. McGorty seconded the motion.**

Mr. Van Dyke stated that he would like to have signage suitable that would satisfy FWC
requirements, and worried that without the signs Blueprint would not receive the fish. Mr. Davis stated that he would rather allow passive fishing than actively disallow it.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Item #6: Capital Circle SE Completion and Ribbon Cutting Ceremony**
This item was informational only.

**Item #7: Capital Circle NW/SW Access Management Public Hearing**
This item was informational only.

**Consent Items**

**Item #8: CAC Minutes: February 7, 2008**
Dave Bright noted that Lamar Taylor had provided language revising a few sentences to clarify what he stated in reference to the legal commitments that couldn’t be changed in the Master Plan, and Dave noted he would revise the minutes per Lamar’s comments (on page 8 and 9 of 10). **Mr. McGorty moved approval of the minutes. Mr. Van Dyke seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

**Presentations/Discussion**

There were no presentations for the Committee.

**Citizens To Be Heard**

James Bailey expressed his concern with the Tanglewood properties; he stated that he and his son own approximately 23 lots; 14 of which have homes on them. He gave an extensive history of Tanglewood. The recent history included: In 2005 Blueprint selected Tanglewood as the site for flood plain and wetland mitigation. In 2007 Blueprint received authority from the Intergovernmental Agency to acquire property within Tanglewood. Throughout 2007, relocation agents and appraisers visited Tanglewood making contact, discussing acquisition with the owners and tenants. The property owners were told to expect offers by November/December 2007 and then again in January/February 2008. In January owners met with appraisers and right-of-way agents and were told that they would be relocated. February 7, 2008, owners (the Baileys) attended the TCC and CAC meetings to find that Blueprint had found another site. Furthermore, Blueprint stated that the new site was cheaper; but he has not seen actual figures on that. He also shared photographic examples with the CAC of the repercussions of flooding in Tanglewood.

Mr. Davis stated that he concurred with Mr. Bailey and that everything stated was accurate. Tanglewood was a problematic area. It was identified by the County for Blueprint to try to acquire for mitigation. Blueprint started an evaluation process, standard procedure, looking at Tanglewood. Right-of-way estimates were done, but they had not gotten to the appraisal part in the process. They identified each mobile home site at $75,000 and used that amount as the basis for the budget process.
Blueprint was looking at the Tanglewood site for attenuation and water quality purposes. As part of the investigation, Blueprint also investigated an alternative site on Gum Road. That site appeared to be more financially advantageous, and it provided more water quality than originally thought. Tanglewood was originally looked at for flood plain mitigation. However the alternative site was better suited for Blueprint’s requirements.

Letesa Turner stated that Tanglewood was initially looked at as mitigation for a flood plain. It was believed that if Blueprint needed it to be from a flood plain mitigation perspective that additional wetland and water quality could be provided for on that site. The Board approved acquisition of the parcel off of Gum Road for potential additional flood plain mitigation, as well as storm water management. That was not the new alternative site that Mr. Bailey is alluding to. It was another parcel that Blueprint had previously received approval to acquire for a storm water pond.

Ms. Turner further stated that Blueprint received additional geotechnical information that determined that all of the flood plain mitigation requirements could be met on the site off of Gum Road, where the pond is proposed for construction. That site could not only provide storm water management for the project, but well and above and beyond, in terms of capacity, for flood plain mitigation as well. The alternative site that continued to be mentioned was something that Blueprint would continue to look at for additional wetland mitigation.

Mr. Bailey stated how amazed he was on the timing and how recently this was discovered. Ms. Turner stated Blueprint had not received the geotechnical information until December 2007. Mr. Davis stated Blueprint tried to be proactive through the entire process. The information available had changed. The bottom line was that the Tanglewood property was no longer needed for the project. Mr. Davis stated that a letter was drafted and approved by him and would be sent to the property owners and tenants. Blueprint had to follow the relocation rules provided by the Federal Government because there was federal money involved. Blueprint received $8 million for that segment, for construction, however there was no additional money for relocation.

Mr. McGorty stated that he did not believe that the issue was in the purview of Blueprint and that staff did their due diligence. From a timing standpoint, he stated that he wished that there was better communication because expectations were raised and people’s lives were affected.

Jerry Conger noted that Mr. Davis stated that a letter was forthcoming that would provide the information that Mr. Bailey requested.

**Items From Members Of The Committee**

There were none.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 p.m.
Chairman Ed DePuy called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**

Mr. Davis stated that there were two agenda modifications, Item #12, Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue- Right-of-Way Acquisition (Additional Parcels) and Resolution was pulled and would be deferred until the June 2, 2008 IA. Staff was unable to get the parcel maps
in time to act on them at the current meeting. Also, additional cost information had become available for Item #13, Capital Circle NW/ SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Design Supplemental, which included the final negotiated fees for the contract revisions.

II. CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) CHAIRMANS REPORT

Mr. Davis stated that there would be no report from the CAC. Mr. Tom O’Steen (Vice-Chairman) was not present to give the report on the February 7, 2008 meeting due to illness. Furthermore, Mr. Conger was not able to attend the February meeting due to a death in his family. Mayor John Marks requested that the report be deferred until the June 2, 2008 IA meeting.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Capital Circle SE Completion and Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

This item was presented as informational only.

2. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update

This item was presented as informational only.

3. Capital Cascade Trail Segments 3 & 4 Design Consultant

This item was presented as informational only.

4. Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park

This item was presented as informational only.

5. Regional Pond 1 Snail Update

This item was presented as informational only.

6. Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 - Design Update

This item was presented as informational only.

7. FDOT’s Future Right-of-Way Trends

This item was presented as informational only.

8a/b. CAC Minutes (October 18, 2007 and December 6, 2007)

This item was presented as informational only.
IV. CONSENT

9. IA Meeting Minutes: September 17, 2008

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve minutes as provided.

10. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the nomination of Hugh Brown as the Capital City Chamber of Commerce representative to the CAC.

11. Endorsement of Cultural Facilities Grant Application

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize City and County Commissioners to sign the document in support of the Cultural Facilities Grant Application.

13. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Design Supplemental

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize a new contractual limit for Contract 772 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. for consultant services for the Capital Circle NW/SW (US 90 to Orange Avenue) in the amount of $5,207,000 which includes the previous contract amount of $4,970,776 (including Supplemental Agreements Numbers 1 through 6 with H.W. Lochner, Inc.), the new Supplemental Agreement No. 7 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. in the amount of approximately $200,000, and a $100,000 contingency.


RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Accept the FY 2007 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2008 Operating Budget of $31,832 for encumbrances and $34,864,131 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund.

Commissioner Debbie Lightsey stated that modified agenda Item #13 included a redesign of the frontage road on Capital Circle Southwest which moves it closer to the lake’s edge. She requested a map of the project and more detailed information because she felt it could be problematic. Mr. Jim Shepherd, Project Manager, stated that the design change was required to reduce damages to a parcel and that there were modifications to the south end of the frontage road that were limited to the Enterprise Rental Car property, therefore it was not any closer to the lake than previously shown. Mr. Davis stated that a map would be provided.
Mayor John Marks moved to accept the consent items. Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

15. Sales Tax Receipts Update

Mr. Davis stated that each commissioner was briefed on the status of the sales tax revenues. The purpose of the item was to inform the Board that Blueprint 2000 was being affected by the downturn in the economy and of the potential impacts to the program. Staff provided the Board with two scenarios, a reduction in the projects that ranged from $59 to $73 million, and the possible results of that reduction. He stated that in June staff would bring back recommendations for the modification of the Master Plan based upon the best data at that time. He further stated that the funding estimates for the program had projected a 4.5% annual growth in revenues. However last year the actual growth was only 0.5%.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that one of the money saving proposals provided by staff was the delay in greenways and stormwater retro-fit for Capital Circle NW/SW from US 90 to Orange Avenue. She stated that as one of the most environmentally sensitive areas of the community, it would be ill advised to leave that item on the list as a potential cost saver. She emphasized that the lake system must be protected.

Commissioner Lightsey moved to delete it (Delay in greenways and stormwater retro-fit project for CCNW/SW from US 90 to Orange Ave.) from the list for consideration as a project to be eliminated as a cost saver. Commissioner Rackleff seconded the motion.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he would like staff to bring back all of the possible recommendations before a decision was made about which items to modify.

Commissioner Thaell stated that he would like to know the total savings that could occur with each modification. He further requested greater detail as well as a look at the whole program. He further stated that his sentiments were with Commissioner Lightsey, but that he would not support the motion. He asked if the possibilities provided were the only range of possibilities. Mr. Davis stated that they were not. Commissioner DePuy asked if staff was going to bring this item back to the June 2, 2008 meeting and provide further details. Mr. Davis stated that staff did intend to come back with greater detail. Commissioner Thaell added a substitute motion to direct staff to bring back all possibilities for addressing the $59 – $73 million reduction in funding to the program.

Mr. Davis clarified that no action was necessary on the item because it was an informational item that he felt need to be discussed. Commissioner Gillum stated that the motions should be disposed of since staff intended to bring the item back to the Board in June 2008. Commissioner Rackleff stated that his impression was that it was a list of possible impacts and that it was not provided as direction to staff to start making cuts. Commissioner Thaell withdrew his substitute motion. Commissioner Lightsey withdrew her motion.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required

16. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Construction Engineering Inspection Services

Mr. Davis stated that this item was to request authorization to move forward with the advertisement for a Consultant for Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) Services for the construction of Capital Circle NW/SW. He noted the firm would come on board early so that they could review the plans for construction and provide other quality control comments.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize the advertisement for Consultant Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) Services for the Capital Circle NW/SW (US 90 to Orange Avenue) Project, at a cost to not exceed $2,750,000.00, which includes a 10 percent contingency. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and award the contract once Consultant CEI selection activities are complete.

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a CEI Firm for Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest from West Tennessee Street (US 90) to Orange Avenue (SR 371), to include solicitation of qualifications, short listing and issuance of the RFP to no less than three firms. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a CEI budget of $2,750,000.00, which includes a ten percent contingency ($250,000.00).
3. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award a contract with the selected firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.

Mayor Marks moved the staff recommendation. Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

17. Approval for the Extension of General Engineering Consultant Contract

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the extension of LPA’s contract for an additional five (5) years.

Commissioner Katz moved the staff recommendation. Commissioner Dailey seconded the motion. Commissioner Gillum asked if the GEC stayed within the contracted amount or if they had used contingency funds. Mr. Davis confirmed that they had stayed within the budget. However, it fluctuated, he stated, because it was based on the activities of each project. There was no contingency money in the GEC contract. Furthermore, the GEC budget was presented to the Board each year with Blueprint’s annual budget. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no requests by citizens to speak to members of the Board.
VIII.  ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no items brought forward by the Commissioners.

IX.  ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman DePuy adjourned the meeting at 3:15 pm.

APPROVED:  ATTEST:

________________________   __________________________
Ed DePuy      Shelonda Gay
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA   Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
#10

Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution
SUBJECT/TITLE: Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution

Date: June 2, 2008
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
A resolution is required from the Intergovernmental Agency indicating matching funds are available toward the Cultural Facilities Grant Application being submitted to the Florida Department of State in July for the Meridian Marker Amphitheater and Plaza.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Blueprint 2000 is preparing a grant application to be submitted to the Florida Department of State requesting $500,000 toward the construction of the Meridian Marker Amphitheater and Plaza. A 2 to 1 funding match is required ($1,000,000 in local funds is required to match the $500,000 grant request.) The grant application requires a resolution from the applicant indicating the funding match is available and committed to the project.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve the Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution and authorize its signature by the Agency Chair.

Option 2: Provide Board direction

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution and authorize its signature by the Agency Chair.

CAC Action: The CAC was advised of the Cultural Facilities Grant Application in February and advised that the IA would be requested to provide support through a Resolution; in addition, the CAC was advised that the Chairman would be asked to sign a letter of support.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Cultural Facilities Grant Application Resolution of Support
RESOLUTION No. __________

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEON COUNTY-CITY OF TALLAHASSEE BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AUTHORIZING FUNDING MATCH FOR THE CULTURAL FACILITIES PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MERIDIAN MARKER AMPHITHEATER AND PLAZA.

WHEREAS, the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (Blueprint 2000), formed by Interlocal Agreement on October 27, 2000, has been created, among other things, to implement certain infrastructure and environmental projects funded through the local option sales tax approved by the voters of Tallahassee-Leon County in November 2000; and

WHEREAS, a signature project of the Blueprint 2000 Program, as identified in the Blueprint 2000 and Beyond Project Definitions Report, is the construction of the Capital Cascade Trail project through the core of the City, providing stormwater flood relief, water quality improvements, and a major green space and linear trail for residents of and visitors to the City to use and enjoy; and

WHEREAS, Segment 2 of the Capital Cascade Trail project is known as Cascade Park, whose location is historically significant to the founding of Tallahassee as the Capital City of Florida; and

WHEREAS, Cascade Park is being designed with a Plaza and Performance Stage able to accommodate outdoor performances for audiences of up to 4,000; and

WHEREAS, a key tenant of the Blueprint 2000 program is to leverage its revenues with outside funding sources, and as such, Blueprint 2000 is preparing a Cultural Facilities Program Grant Application to the Division of Cultural Affairs within the Florida Department of State to be submitted in July 2008; and

WHEREAS, the grant application requires a resolution from the applicant indicating the funding match is available and committed to the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY, as follows:

1. The Chairman of the Agency is hereby authorized to execute this Resolution committing $1 Million in Agency Funds for construction of the Meridian Marker Amphitheater and Plaza as match to the $500,000 being requested in the Cultural Facilities Grant Application, and that these match funds be identified in the Blueprint 2000 Program Master Plan.

2. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED this ____ day of June 2008.

BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

By: ________________________________
Chairman

Attest: ________________________________
Secretary

Approved as to form:

By: ________________________________
Legal Counsel
#11

Capital Circle
NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue Right of Way Acquisition (Additional Parcels) and Resolution
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

This item requests approval to proceed with the acquisition of right-of-way that has been identified for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

On November 15, 2004, the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) approved the Blueprint 2000 Real Estate Policy. Section 105.09 of the policy titled Acquisitions for Capital Improvement Projects, provides for the approval by the IA of a Resolution (Attachment 1) stating the public purpose of a project and the necessity of acquiring parcels needed to construct the project, which are identified in the Resolution. The acquisition of the necessary parcels can be in the form of a negotiated settlement or through condemnation. There are four additional parcels and three temporary construction easements that must be acquired from property owners in order to complete the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street. The parcels are described in Exhibit A to the Resolution and are depicted on the location map (Attachment 2). Funding for the right-of-way consists of $42 Million of SIS funds.

OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing right of way acquisition of four (4) additional parcels and three (3) temporary construction easements necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Option 2: Board Guidance
RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing right of way acquisition of four (4) additional parcels and three (3) temporary construction easements necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Action by TCC and CAC: Presented to TCC and CAC as information only; no action required.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution with Exhibit A which describes the boundaries of the four (4) parcels and three (3) temporary easements to be acquired.

2. Location Map
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-01

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR CAPITAL CIRCLE NORTHWEST/SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FROM ORANGE AVENUE TO WEST TENNESSEE STREET.

A RESOLUTION OF LEON COUNTY – CITY OF TALLAHASSEE BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY RECOGNIZING AND ESTABLISHING THAT A VALID PUBLIC PURPOSE IS SERVED BY THE IMPROVEMENT, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE CITY OF TALLAHASSEE AND LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, LOCATED ON CAPITAL CIRCLE NORTHWEST/SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR FROM ORANGE AVENUE TO WEST TENNESSEE STREET, KNOWN AS THE CAPITAL CIRCLE NORTHWEST/SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND DETERMINING THAT THE AREA ADJACENT TO AND SURROUNDING CAPITAL CIRCLE NORTHWEST/SOUTHWEST IS NECESSARY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT; AND AUTHORIZING BLUEPRINT 2000 AND ITS AGENTS OR DESIGNEES TO ACQUIRE THE NECESSARY PROPERTY BY GIFT, DONATION, PURCHASE, OR THE EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS.

WHEREAS, Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (the Agency) was formed by Interlocal Agreement on October 27, 2000, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.01, Florida Statutes; Article VII, Sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution of the State of Florida; Chapter 166, Florida Statutes; Chapter 125, Florida Statutes; Section 202.19(5), Florida Statutes, Chapter 212; and other applicable provisions of law, to undertake the acquisition, financing, planning, constructing, managing, operating, servicing, utilizing, owning and exchanging of the Blueprint Projects as set forth in Section 8 of Part V of the Interlocal Agreement, as the same may be amended from time to time by agreement of the City and the County; and:

WHEREAS, in order to accomplish its purposes the Agency shall have the power, pursuant to direction or authorization by its Board of Directors, by its bylaws or by the powers granted by the Interlocal Agreement to appropriate property by gift, donation, purchase, or by exercising the right and power of eminent domain, including the procedural powers under Chapters 73 and 74, Florida Statutes, pursuant to its
delegated authority as set forth generally in Chapters 125, 127, 163, 166 and 337, Florida Statues, and more specifically as set forth in Section 163.01(7)(f); and

WHEREAS, Section 8 of Part V of the Interlocal Agreement identified the need to expand the capacity of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest by making improvements to the section located between Orange Avenue and West Tennessee Street, including portions of Blountstown Highway and Pensacola Street (SR 20), for future transit; and

WHEREAS, the Agency intends to expand capacity on and improve Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street, which is within the boundaries of the Agency’s first priority projects as approved by the County and City Commissions on July 10, 2000, and such improvements are being funded from proceeds of the Dedicated Sales Tax, Strategic Intermodal System Funds, private funds and other funds that may be available and approved by the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the Agency on September 18, 2006 by Resolution No. 2006-04, February 26, 2007 by Resolution No. 2007-01, June 4, 2007 by Resolution No. 2007-04 and September 17, 2007 by Resolution No. 2007-06 authorized the acquisition of transportation rights-of-way and temporary construction easements from the owners of property located between Orange Avenue and West Tennessee Street, including portions of Blountstown Highway and Pensacola Street (SR 20) through donation, purchase, gift, or condemnation proceedings for the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Corridor Improvement Project; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to such approvals the Agency has determined that additional parcels should be acquired for the completion of the project; and

WHEREAS, the additional property required to complete the project consists of four parcels needed for mitigation purposes and three temporary construction easements, which are needed in order to permit the removal of demolished structures from remainder parcels and such property is depicted and identified on Exhibit “A” attached to this resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY LEON COUNTY – CITY OF TALLAHASSEE BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY, that:
Section 1. The Agency reaffirms that the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Corridor Improvement Project (the Project) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street, comprised of road rights-of-way, regional storm water facilities, drainage and utility structures, recreational facilities and amenities, and harmonizing the new road project with the adjoining properties, represents a valid Agency public purpose.

Section 2. The Agency hereby approves the revised map of location identifying the additional property necessary for implementation of the Project as the official Right-Of-Way Map for the Project, copies of which will be made available at the Agency’s office located at 1311 Executive Center Drive, Suite 109, The Koger Center, Ellis Building, Tallahassee, Florida, 32301, and determines that the additional right-of-way depicted and described therein, and as further shown on Exhibit “A” attached hereto, is necessary for implementation of the Project.

Section 3. The Agency hereby authorizes, empowers and directs Blueprint 2000’s legal counsel, its designees and/or agents, to acquire by gift, donation, purchase, or by the exercise of the powers of eminent domain a fee simple interest in the properties identified on Exhibit A as Parcels 247, 248, 249 and 250 reserving to the owner his right of ingress and egress over said parcels to his remaining property, if any, which right is not to be inconsistent with the Project.

Section 4. The Agency hereby authorizes, empowers and directs Blueprint 2000’s legal counsel, its designees and/or agents, to acquire by gift, donation, purchase, or by the exercise of the powers of eminent domain a temporary construction easement interest in the properties identified on Exhibit “A” as Parcels 717, 718 and 719 reserving to the owners rights of ingress and egress over said parcels to their remaining property, which right is not to be inconsistent with the Project.

Section 5. The Agency acknowledges that additional unidentified properties may be necessary for the completion of the Project, and that, upon the determination by engineers and surveyors of those additional properties, this resolution shall be supplemented to include identification of any such additional necessary properties.

Section 6. The Agency acknowledges that, in the course of implementing the Project, the boundaries of the property identified in Exhibit “A” may differ from those of the properties actually acquired because of engineering design changes, negotiated
changes resulting in savings in the cost of acquisition, or other such changes made in the best interest of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, and the Agency agrees that the authority granted by this resolution shall extend to any acquisition of property involving such changes.

Section 7. The Agency’s legal counsel is hereby authorized to institute eminent domain proceedings as necessary to complete the acquisition of the parcels as set forth herein by the earliest possible date, which authority shall include signing of the Declaration of Taking and use of any and all statutes of the State of Florida applicable thereto, and to compensate the interested parties as required by law.

Section 8. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

INTRODUCED, PASSED AND ADOPTED by Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency of Leon, County, Florida, this _____ day of June, 2008.

By: __________________________
    Ed DePuy, Chairman
    Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency

ATTESTED

By: __________________________
    Shelonda Gay
    Blueprint 2000 Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM

By: __________________________
    Debra W. Schiro, Esquire
    Blueprint 2000 Legal Counsel
EXHIBIT "A"
**PARCEL NUMBER**  2131200070010

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**  PARCEL 1 (ALSO KNOWN AS "PARCEL A")
COMMENCE AT A CONCRETE MONUMENT MARKING THE
SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 31, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH,
RANGE 1 WEST, LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, AND RUN NORTH
ALONG THE EAST BOUNDARY OF LAND DESCRIBED IN
OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1785, PAGE 575 OF PUBLIC RECORDS
OF LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, A DISTANCE OF 3645.46 FEET TO A
POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY BOUNDARY OF THE
SEABOARD COASTLINE RAILROAD (120 FOOT RIGHT OF WAY)
FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING. FROM SAID POINT OF
BEGINNING, CONTINUE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST BOUNDARY
A DISTANCE OF 327.27 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTH 89 DEGREES
34 MINUTES 31 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE NORTH BOUNDARY
OF SAID LANDS A DISTANCE OF 882.42 FEET, THENCE RUN
SOUTH 00 DEGREES 54 MINUTES 34 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE
EAST BOUNDARY OF LANDS DESCRIBED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS
BOOK 628, PAGE 278 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF LEON
COUNTY, FLORIDA A DISTANCE OF 365.41 FEET TO A POINT ON
THE AFORESAID NORTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY BOUNDARY OF
THE SEABOARD COASTLINE RAILROAD, THENCE RUN NORTH 87
DEGREES 07 MINUTES 24 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID
NORTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY BOUNDARY A DISTANCE OF 889.32
FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

**OWNER(S):**  Danny Hollon

**BY:**  Warranty Deed recorded in O.R. Book 2691, Page 616, Public Records
Leon County, Florida.
PARCEL NUMBER 2132202130000

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: COMENCE AT A CONCRETE MONUMENT MARKING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA AND RUN THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST 473.96 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 53 MINUTES 12 SECONDS EAST 60.0 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT ON THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY OF A 60.0 FOOT DRAINAGE AND ROADWAY EASEMENT, THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY 100.74 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING. FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING CONTINUE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY 60.10 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 55 MINUTES 55 SECONDS EAST 111.90 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE SOUTH 86 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST 59.05 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 17 SECONDS WEST 116.05 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

OWNER(S): Donna K. Douglas f/k/a Donna Tucker (as to fee simple) and Danny Hollon (as to vendee interest)

PARCEL NUMBER 2132202170000

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: COMMENCE AT A CONCRETE MONUMENT MAKING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, AND RUN THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST 473.96 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 52 MINUTES 12 SECONDS EAST 299.95 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY OF THE SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD (120.0 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY) FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING. FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING RUN NORTH 00 DEGREES 53 MINUTES 12 SECONDS WEST 239.95 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT ON THE SOUTHERN RIGHT OF WAY BOUNDARY OF A 60.0 FOOT DRAINAGE AND ROADWAY EASEMENT, THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY 100.74 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT, THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 17 SECONDS EAST ALONG A FENCE LINE AND PROJECTION THEREOF 244.0 FEET TO A CONCRETE MONUMENT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY OF SAID SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD, THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY 103.0 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

OWNER(S): Danny C. Hollon

PARCEL NUMBER 2132202180000

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: COMMENCE AT A CONCRETE MONUMENT MARKING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, AND THENCE RUN SOUTH 00 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST 329.45 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SEABOARD COASTLINE RAILROAD FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING. FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING RUN THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 30 SECONDS WEST 329.45 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY BOUNDARY OF A 60 FOOT DRAINAGE AND ROADWAY EASEMENT, THENCE RUN NORTH 89 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY AND DRAINAGE EASEMENT 313.12 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTH 00 DEGREES 59 MINUTES 55 SECONDS EAST 171.90 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTH 86 SECONDS 27 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST 59.05 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTH 00 DEGREES 23 MINUTES 17 SECONDS WEST 127.95 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SEABOARD COASTLINE RAILROAD, THENCE RUN WESTERLY ALONG THE RIGHT-OF-WAY 372.50 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

OWNER(S): Capital City Collision, Inc., a Florida corporation

BY: Warranty Deed O.R. Book 1954, Page 533
STATE ROAD No. 263
Temporary Construction Easement
PARCEL 717

A portion of that property recorded in Official Records Book 1352, Page 1632, and a portion of that property recorded in Official Records Book 1312, page 195 of the Public Records of Leon County, Florida, being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCE at a found 4" Concrete Monument No 1D marking the Southwest corner of Section 32, Township 1 North, Ranges 1 West, Leon County, Florida said monument being on the centerline of survey of Jackson Bluff Road run thence North 89 degrees 29 minutes 30 seconds East along the southerly boundary of said section and for a distance of 2659.53 feet to a point on the centerline of survey of S.R. 263 (Capital Circle S.W.); thence departing said line run North 00 degrees 08 minutes 04 seconds East along said centerline of survey a distance of 448.71 feet to a point on a curve marking the intersection of the centerline of survey of S.R. 263 and the centerline of survey of S.R. 20; thence leaving said centerline of survey of S.R. 263 run westerly along said centerline of survey of S.R. 20 and a curve concave to the northwest with a central angle of 01 degrees 56 minutes 36 seconds with a radius of 2210.30 feet for an arc distance of 74.97 feet (choir of said curve bears South 66 degrees 54 minutes 58 seconds West 74.96 feet) to a point marking the centerline intersection of the centerline of survey S.R. 20, and centerline of survey S.R. 263, thence departing said curve and centerline of survey of S.R. 20 and run North 00 degrees 24 minutes 55 seconds West along the centerline of survey of S.R. 263 for a distance of 1067.84 feet to a point; thence leaving said centerline of survey run North 89 degrees 35 minutes 05 seconds East a distance of 50.00 feet to the existing easterly right of way line of S.R. 263 and the westerly boundary line of that parcel described in the Official Record Book 1352, Page 1632 of the Public Records of Leon County, Florida; thence run along the south boundary line of said parcel South 75 degrees 06 minutes 53 seconds East a distance of 60.31 feet to a point on a curve concave southeasterly; thence run along said curve with a radius of 50.00 feet through a central angle of 74 degrees 44 minutes 32 seconds for an arc distance of 65.22 feet (choir bears North 52 degrees 12 minutes 49 seconds East a distance of 60.70 feet) to a point; thence North 00 degrees 24 minutes 55 seconds West for a distance of 5.72 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. From said POINT OF BEGINNING continue North 00 degrees 24 minutes 55 seconds West a distance of 92.48 feet to a point on a curve concave southeasterly; thence run along said curve with a radius of 418.00 feet through a central angle of 6 degrees 36 minutes 02 seconds for an arc length of 48.15 feet (choir bears North 8 degrees 46 minutes 53 seconds East a distance of 48.13 feet) to a point; thence run North 89 degrees 33 minutes 25 seconds East a distance of 3.86 feet to a point; thence run South 00 degrees 32 minutes 29 seconds East a distance of 140.00 feet to a point; thence run South 89 degrees 37 minutes 18 seconds West a distance of 11.80 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; containing 1471 square feet (0.034 acres), more or less.

Brett C. Wood
Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper
Certificate No. 5750
Firm Certificate of Authorization No. LB 6844

NOT VALID WITHOUT THE SIGNATURE AND THE ORIGINAL RAISED SEAL OF A FLORIDA LICENSED SURVEYOR AND MAPPER

Diversified Design & Drafting Services, Inc.
2840 Pablo Avenue, Tallahassee, FL 32308 Phone: 850-385-1133 Fax: 850-385-1236
www.dddsinc.com
A portion of the property recorded in Official Records Book 1105, Page 2328 of the Public Records of Leon County, Florida, being more particularly described as follows:

**COMMENCE** at a 4 inch square concrete monument marking the Southwest Corner of Section 32, Township 1 North, Range 1 West with no ID; thence run along the south line of said Section 32, North 89 degrees 29 minutes 30 seconds East a distance of 2,659.53 feet to a point on the centerline of survey of S.R. 263 (Capital Circle SW); thence leaving said section line run along said centerline of survey North 00 degrees 08 minutes 04 seconds East a distance of 446.71 feet to a point on a curve concave to the Northwest and the centerline of survey of S.R. 20 (Blountstown Highway); thence leaving the centerline of survey of S.R. 263 run along the centerline of survey of S.R. 20 and said curve with a central angle of 01 degrees 56 minutes 36 seconds, a radius 2210.30 feet and an arc length of 74.97 feet (chord bears South 66 degrees 54 minutes 58 seconds West a distance of 74.96 feet) to a point on the centerline of survey of S.R. 263; thence leaving the centerline of survey of S.R. 20 run along the centerline of survey of S.R. 263, North 00 degrees 24 minutes 55 seconds East a distance of 1,281.22 feet to a point; thence leaving said centerline of survey run North 89 degrees 30 minutes 05 seconds East a distance of 50.00 feet to a 4 inch square concrete monument (top broken) marking the southwest corner of said property also being the easterly right of way line of S.R. 263; thence run along the south boundary line of said parcel North 89 degrees 30 minutes 05 seconds East for a distance of 154.33 feet to a point on a curve concave to the southeast; thence leaving said south line run along said curve with a central angle of 5 degrees 23 minutes 17 seconds, a radius of 418.00 feet and an arc length of 39.31 feet (chord bears North 22 degrees 12 minutes 41 seconds East a distance of 39.29 feet) to the **POINT OF BEGINNING**. From the **POINT OF BEGINNING** continue running along said curve with a central angle of 4 degrees 37 minutes 47 seconds, a radius of 418.00 feet and an arc length of 33.78 feet (chord bears North 27 degrees 13 minutes 12 seconds East a distance of 33.77 feet) to a point; thence run South 2 degrees 21 minutes 12 seconds East for a distance of 29.43 feet to a point; thence run South 87 degrees 51 minutes 24 seconds West for a distance of 16.66 feet to the **POINT OF BEGINNING**, containing 253 square feet (0.006 acres) more or less.

---

Brett C. Wood
Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper
Certificate No. 5750
Firm Certificate of Authorization No. LB 6844

NOT VALID WITHOUT THE SIGNATURE AND THE ORIGINAL RAISED SEAL OF A FLORIDA LICENSED SURVEYOR AND MAPPER

Diversified Design & Drafting Services, Inc.
2840 Pablo Avenue, Tallahassee, FL 32308 Phone: 850-385-1133 Fax: 850-385-1236
www.dddssinc.com
STATE ROAD No. 263
Temporary Construction Easement
PARCEL 719

A portion of the property recorded in Official Records Book 2557, Page 1671 of the Public Records of Leon County, Florida, being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCE at a found 3.5" square concrete monument with the top broken, marking the Southwest Corner of Section 29 of Township 1 North, Range 1 West, Leon County, Florida; thence run North 00 degrees 17 minutes 13 seconds West along the westerly section line of said Section 29 a distance of 1168.10 feet; thence leaving said section line run along the north line of said property North 85 degrees 29 minutes 12 seconds East a distance of 264.01 feet to a point; thence leaving said north line run South 35 degrees 26 minutes 30 seconds East a distance of 52.52 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. From the POINT OF BEGINNING continue running South 35 degrees 26 minutes 30 seconds East a distance of 58.06 feet to a point; thence South 85 degrees 48 minutes 38 seconds West a distance of 38.87 feet to a point; thence North 04 degrees 50 minutes 27 seconds West a distance of 41.70 feet to a point; thence North 54 degrees 33 minutes 30 seconds East a distance of 12.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; containing 1,147 square feet (0.026 acres) more or less.

Brett C. Wood
Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper
Certificate No. 5750
Firm Certificate of Authorization No. LB 6844

NOT VALID WITHOUT THE SIGNATURE AND THE ORIGINAL RAISED SEAL OF A FLORIDA LICENSED SURVEYOR AND MAPPER
Parcels 247, 248, 249, 250 (Hollon)

Date Created: 5/8/2008

TLCGIS Map Disclaimer: This product has been compiled from the most accurate source data from Leon County, the City of Tallahassee, and the Leon County Property Appraiser. However, this product is for reference purposes only and is not to be construed as a legal document or survey instrument. Any reliance on the information contained herein is at the user's own risk. Leon County, the City of Tallahassee, and the Leon County Property Appraiser assume no responsibility for any use of the information contained herein or any loss resulting therefrom.

Bert Hartsfield,
Property Appraiser
850/488-6102
TLCGIS Map Disclaimer: This product has been compiled from the most accurate source data from Leon County, the City of Tallahassee, and the Leon County Property Appraiser. However, this product is for reference purposes only and is not to be construed as a legal document or survey instrument. Any reliance on the information contained herein is at the user's own risk. Leon County, the City of Tallahassee, and the Leon County Property Appraiser assume no responsibility for any use of the information contained herein or any loss resulting therefrom.

Bert Hartsfield,
Property Appraiser
850/488-6102
#12

Election of Intergovernmental Agency Vice-Chair
SUBJECT/TITLE: Election of Intergovernmental Agency Vice Chair

Date: June 2, 2008  Requested By: Chairman DePuy
Contact Person: Jim Davis  Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The IA will be requested to elect a Vice Chairperson for the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The By-Laws of the Agency specify:
1. The Vice-Chairperson shall be elected for a term of two years, the second of which will be as Chairperson
2. The Chairman shall serve for a period of one year effective June 1.
3. The Chair of the Agency shall rotate annually between the City and County Commissions.

The current IA Vice Chairperson and the incoming IA Chair is City Commissioner Andrew Gillum. The newly elected Vice Chairperson should be a County Commissioner.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
That the Agency conducts an election for a Vice Chairperson in accordance with the approved By-Laws.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Not presented to either committee.
#13

Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Update
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

This item provides the Board with an update on the status of the Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2. Discussion includes:

- **Dog Park**
- **Veterans’ Memorial**
- **Permitting**

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Amenities: Cascade Park Amenity and Landscape plans are approaching 90% complete.

- **Dog Park**: The one-half acre dog park proposed for south of the CSX railroad has been removed from the Cascade Park plans due to concerns expressed by the City’s Energy and Environmental Resources Target Issue Committee which includes Mayor Marks and Commissioner Lightsey. Of primary concern was the potential high concentration of uncollected animal waste in close proximity to the St. Augustine Branch and the impact on water quality if the park is not well maintained. While it is thought that the dog park will increase dog patronage overall, it should be noted that the action to remove the dog park from the plans will not eliminate animal waste runoff in the greater park. In general, parks where dogs are allowed should not be located near water features.

- **Veterans’ Memorial**: The proposed Veterans’ Memorial Plaza is a unfunded amenity that will be located in close proximity to the Korean War Memorial; it is planned to memorialize all veterans of Leon County. The attached rendering shows a military star that symbolizes the five branches of the military with vertical elements in each corner providing branch specific details (Attachment 1). The central shade structure is a stainless steel Silver Star, an emblem of bravery, that will permit sunlight to highlight information embedded in the paving below.
Permitting: COT Growth Management has halted its review of the Capital Cascade Park Site Plan Application pending review and approval of several variances to the City of Tallahassee Land Development Code. Staff is developing the necessary variance request that will be presented to the City Commission at a regularly scheduled meeting. Below is a list of Public Sector Linear Infrastructure Variances that must be approved by the City Commission before the construction permits can be obtained. Attachment 2 provides the specific codes and a detailed justification for each variance.

1. Development in preservation areas (unaltered floodplains, historical site)
2. Development in conservation areas (altered wetlands)
3. On-site stormwater treatment below a 25-year event treatment capacity
4. Flood water will exceed 6” depth on particular sidewalks and amphitheater
5. Not all retaining walls meet approved standards for height, separation, and material
6. Minimum 50’ vegetated buffer cannot be accommodated during construction
7. Required sidewalk is not feasible on portion of Bloxham and on southside of Cascade Lane

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required, presented as information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1 – Veterans’ Memorial Rendering
Attachment 2 – Public Sector Linear Infrastructure Variance
March 10, 2008

Mr. Bob Herman
Director of Growth Management
City of Tallahassee Growth Management
Frenchtown Renaissance Center
435 Macomb Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Re: Capital Cascade Park
Type A Site Plan (TSP070086)
Public Sector Linear Infrastructure Variance

Dear Mr. Herman:

As you are aware, Blueprint 2000 is in the process of preparing the application for a Public Sector Linear Infrastructure Variance for Capital Cascade Park. Please find attached a list of Land Development Code sections that we believe will require a variance. In addition the list includes a brief justification for the variance.

The list is provided for your review and comment prior to finalizing the variance application. Thank you for your assistance in expediting the variance process. We look forward to receiving your comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James H. Davis
Executive Director

/GP, Genesis
Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Article IV. Development Standards

Section 5-81. Conservation and preservation area development standards

(a) Development Standards

(1) Preservation areas (unaltered floodplains, historical site) – “Development activity is prohibited in preservation areas ...”

Unaltered floodplain – The 100 year floodplain located within Capital Cascade Trail is considered to be “unaltered” based on the City of Tallahassee’s definition.

“Unaltered floodplain means a floodplain will be considered unaltered if an area is subject to a one-percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year and the area is not within the footprint of an existing structure, paved vehicular area, or an area where fill (placed less than 25 years prior to time of development review) has diminished the flood storage.”

The Capital Cascade Park area experienced significant construction in the early 1980’s (over 25 years ago). This work included re-grading of the property and the placement of stormwater control facilities along with certain park features. The majority of the stormwater control features are in poor conditions due to the erosive velocities that the park experiences during larger storm events. Most recently, the lower park was excavated to remove contamination and associated work.

The proposed improvements to Capital Cascade Park will expand the existing floodplain, remove vertical walls that constrict the floodplain and enhance the aesthetics of the floodplain.

Historic Sites – There are three historic elements within Capital Cascade Park.

- Electric Utility Building – the project will not impact this building.
- Centennial Field Wall – the Division of Historic Resources has accepted the project approach to preserving, protecting and restoring the wall.
- Centennial Field area – the master plan for Capital Cascade Park has set aside space to celebrate the Centennial Field history.

Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Article IV. Development Standards

Section 5-81. Conservation and preservation area development standards

(a) Development Standards

(2) Conservation Areas (altered wetlands) – “Development activity may be permitted in conservation areas ...”

a. Altered wetlands. Protection of topography and hydrocycle. “Existing natural topography shall be maintained within wetland areas. No alterations shall be made within a wetland area to the natural fluctuation of water levels or flows unless such alterations are part of an approved stormwater detention or retention system ...”
Existing natural topography – The existing wetland within Capital Cascade Park follows along the St. Augustine Branch top of bank. The construction of the park will include re-grading the existing wetland area to create organically shaped ponds and natural stream bed connecting the ponds.

Natural fluctuation of water levels and flows – The project also includes a bypass culvert that will divert larger storm events directly to the lower pond. The lower pond will then stage up and back-flood the park. This approach will protect the upper pond and enhanced stream from erosive velocities during intense rainfall events. The existing fluctuation of water levels and flows will change; however, the facilities will be designed to accommodate the change and enhance the natural system.

a.1. Construction allowed in an altered wetland. Any structure or road located within a wetland area shall be elevated on pilings or piers or otherwise constructed off-grade, except for structures that are a part of a stormwater management or other utility system and except for road crossings that do not impede or restrict the circulation and flow of water, provided the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the director that such structures or roads do not interfere with the ecological functions of the wetland area.

Structures or roads do not interfere with the ecological functions of the wetland area – Construction of the Meridian Plaza and Stage will require the stream to be directed to a culvert located under the plaza (approximately 160 feet long). During larger storm events the lower pond will back-flood the stage area.

a.2. Constructed water bodies. Water bodies approved to be constructed within altered wetlands shall be designed to provide water quality and storage benefits which approximate natural healthy water bodies. Minimum requirements to ensure these benefits include:
A. Side slopes from the design high-water to the bottom must be 5:1 or flatter

Constructed water body side slopes – The side slopes for the naturally shaped constructed water bodies within the park will be 4:1 or flatter to a depth of four (4) feet below the normal pool elevation, then 2:1 or flatter to the bottom.

Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
Article IV. Development Standards
Sec. 5-86. Stormwater management design standards
(c) Water quality treatment standards
(1) Generally. Stormwater shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c)(2) below, before it is discharged off-site, unless the stormwater is approved for discharge into an approved master stormwater treatment facility permitted for the site. All treatment facilities shall be designed and constructed so as to remain completely functional for the intended treatment purposes during a 25-year return frequency storm. Water quality treatment shall be provided as a part of all development activity that requires a stormwater application under this chapter and is consistent with the redevelopment provisions of article V.
All treatment facilities shall be designed and constructed so as to remain completely functional for the intended treatment purposes during a 25-year return frequency storm – The Environmental and Economic Consensus Committee (EECC) described the Cascade Park stormwater component as follows:

"Stormwater – The system uses the open spaces within this segment to provide flood control, water treatment and park-like amenities."

The current design meets and exceeds the objectives established by the EECC through the construction of the wet ponds and stream creation, along with an alum injection system that will treat smaller storm events. The intent of the Cascade Park design is to retrofit the existing stormwater conveyance to provide stormwater treatment to the greatest extent possible within the constraints of the property. The proposed Stormwater treatment will be provided to enhance the water quality discharging from the site through the use of stormwater ponds with “Florida Friendly” side bank vegetation, aeration fountains, aeration from stream riffles, and alum injection along with stream bank “Florida Friendly” landscaping. The retrofit treatment will occur below the 25-year return frequency storm within the ponds and stream. The alum injection system will only provide treatment up to the volume that the ponds can handle. The alum system will automatically turn off for larger storm events. Treatment volume for an additional two (2) acres of impervious area will also be accommodated below the 25-year return frequency storm.

Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
Article IV. Development Standards
Sec. 5-86. Stormwater management design standards
(d) Rate control standards.
(5) Rate control and conveyance level of service standards
b. Twenty-five year or less critical storm event
1. No flood water more than six inches deep in local roads, parking lots, or other non-street vehicular or pedestrian use areas.

No flood water more than six inched deep in pedestrian use areas – Capital Cascade Park has been designed to flood during large storm events. Sections of sidewalk and the amphitheater stage area will flood more than six inches deep during the twenty-five year or less critical storm event. These areas have been minimized to the greatest extent possible. In addition, the park is designed with a perimeter sidewalk that is located above the twenty-five year or less critical storm event.

Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
Article IV. Development Standards
Sec. 5-86. Stormwater management design standards
(f) Stormwater management facilities design standards
(7) Retaining walls. The height of all retaining walls (excluding stem walls constructed as part of a building foundation) shall not exceed 15-feet. Multiple retaining walls may be allowed for
terracing. The distance between retaining walls shall be, at a minimum, twice the height of the wall that is abutting the area and higher than the area. Any retaining wall three feet or greater in height shall require a building permit. In addition, when retaining walls are utilized they shall be constructed of finished concrete, concrete block, natural rock or architectural concrete block. Raw concrete block walls shall be provided with an approved vegetative cover capable of achieving 80 percent wall coverage within three years from the time of planting. Painting or staining shall not be considered an architectural finish.

The height of all retaining walls shall not exceed 15-feet – There are a few locations in the lower park and adjacent to Bloxham Plaza that are taller than 15 feet but do not exceed 22 feet in height. A structural engineer will design the walls and the appropriate building department permit will be obtained.

Multiple retaining walls may be allowed for terracing. The distance between retaining walls shall be, at a minimum, twice the height of the wall that is abutting the area and higher than the area – a terraced steel sheet pile retaining wall system will be constructed on the south side of the lower pond. The distance between the retaining walls is approximately 1.7 times the height of the wall that is abutting the area and higher than the area. A structural engineer will design the walls to ensure the structural integrity of the wall system.

Retaining walls shall be constructed of finished concrete, concrete block, natural rock or architectural concrete block – The retaining walls located on the south side of the lower pond will be steel sheet pile walls. Steel sheet piles are an important aesthetic element of the lower pond.

Chapter 5 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
Article IV. Development Standards
Sec. 5-88 Sediment and erosion control standards
(11) Projects discharging to wetlands. For a project that will be discharging directly to a wetland, waterbody, or watercourse, an applicant must provide reasonable assurance that construction activities will not cause sedimentation and that filtration of runoff will occur prior to discharge into these features. It is presumed that this standard will be met if, in addition to implementation of the plan, any one of the following criteria is met:

a. A minimum 50-foot width of undisturbed vegetation must be retained landward of the feature. During construction, runoff (including turbid discharges from de-watering activities) must be allowed to sheet flow across this undisturbed vegetation as the natural topography allows. Concentrated or channelized runoff from construction or alteration areas must be dispersed before flowing across this undisturbed vegetation. Limited disturbance necessary for the construction of outfall structures may occur within this area of undisturbed vegetation.

A minimum 50-foot width of undisturbed vegetation must be retained landward of the feature – The project construction will include a comprehensive Sediment and Erosion Control plan that will protect downstream. Since the project itself serves as mitigation for wetland impacts within the park, it is not possible to provide this buffer and complete the stream restoration and enhancement.
Capitol Cascade Trail Segment 2 – Capital Cascade Park
Public Sector Linear Infrastructure Variance
List of Code Sections and Explanation

Public Works Design Standards
Division 6 – Street Design Standards
6.5 Sidewalks
Sidewalks are required on at least one side of all local residential streets and on both sides of all minor collector streets with development frontage.

Allow for no sidewalk along the south side of Bloxham between Monroe Street and Gadsden.
- A sidewalk at this location would require the removal of the Historic Centennial Field stone wall. Removing this wall will not be accepted by the Division of Historic Resources.
- The stone wall also serves as a retaining wall for Bloxham Street.
- A City of Tallahassee natural gas pressure reducing station is located just west of the intersection of Bloxham and Gadsden Street within the park. This facility would be impacted by the placement of a sidewalk along Bloxham Street.
- A parallel sidewalk will be constructed within the park.
- Three (3) connections will be provided from the interior sidewalk to Bloxham Street (Monroe Street, Calhoun Street, and Gadsden Street).

Allow for no sidewalk to be constructed on the south side of the new Cascade Park Road.
- The Capital Cascade Trail is located on the north side of Cascade Park Lane.
- The CSX Railroad is located on the south side of Cascade Park Lane.

Other Potential Issues:

1. Utilize the existing well located on the Cascade Park property for pond augmentation during dry periods.
2. Utilize the existing well located on the Cascade Park property for landscape irrigation until such time as re-use water becomes available.
3. Cascade Park Lane will be classified as a local street.
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Proposed
FY 2009
Blueprint Operating Budget
Agenda Item

**OBJECT/TITLE:** Proposed Fiscal Year 2009 Blueprint Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>June 2, 2008</th>
<th>Requested By:</th>
<th>Blueprint 2000 Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Type of Item:</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
The Blueprint 2000 Budget Policy, approved by the Board of Directors of the Intergovernmental Agency on June 17, 2002, provides a procedure for the annual adoption of the operating budget. This agenda item presents the Proposed FY 2009 Operating Budget to the Citizens Advisory Committee for their review and approval.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**
- In accordance with Blueprint 2000’s Budget Policy, the Executive Director shall develop a proposed operating budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Once the budget has been developed and approved by the Intergovernmental Management Committee, the Director shall place the proposed budget on the agenda for the next Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting. Concurrently the Executive Director shall schedule an opportunity for public comment on the proposed budget.
- **A Public Hearing is advertised for the Blueprint 2000 CAC meeting on May 15, 2008, at 5:30.**
- At the September 8, 2008, Intergovernmental Agency meeting, a public hearing on the recommended budget will also be conducted prior to adoption of the budget and approval of the budget resolution. This action will formally appropriate the funds for the FY2009 Operating Budget, which commences October 1, 2008.
- Changes to the Budget are highlighted on attachment 1. Blueprint is requesting the higher of the City or County’s proposed pay raise be appropriated to Blueprint. A 3% pay raise is currently included in the Salary Enhancement account as a place holder for Blueprint’s salary increases.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Review and comment on the FY 2009 Operating Budget.

**ACTION BY THE CAC:**
Approved by the Citizen Advisory Committee

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
(1) FY 2008 Budget Comparison
(2) FY 2008 Budget Narrative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2007 Actual</th>
<th>FY2008 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY2009 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511000 Salaries</td>
<td>$446,615</td>
<td>$515,957</td>
<td>$515,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511500 Temp wages</td>
<td>$31,918</td>
<td>$43,710</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512000 Overtime</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512400 Other Salary Items</td>
<td>$11,979</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515000 Pension-current</td>
<td>$41,260</td>
<td>$49,362</td>
<td>$50,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515100 Pension-MAP</td>
<td>$33,560</td>
<td>$41,279</td>
<td>$42,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515600 Mandatory Medicare</td>
<td>$6,847</td>
<td>$7,675</td>
<td>$7,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516000 Health Benefits</td>
<td>$26,670</td>
<td>$43,259</td>
<td>$43,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Health Benefits Retirees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Flex Benefits</td>
<td>$12,251</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$611,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$730,686</strong></td>
<td><strong>$741,751</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521010 Advertising</td>
<td>$3,511</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521030 Reproduction</td>
<td>$3,407</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521040 Professional Fees/Services</td>
<td>$61,166</td>
<td>$120,969</td>
<td>$92,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.Audit, Fin. Audit, Fin. Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Disclosure Serv. ERD, and Internal Control Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521100 Equipment Repairs</td>
<td>$1,543</td>
<td>$6,193</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521160 Legal Services</td>
<td>$58,631</td>
<td>$45,582</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521180 Uncl. Contractual Services</td>
<td>$17,884</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521190 Computer Software</td>
<td>$4,147</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522080 Telephone</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523010 Chem-Med-Lab</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523020 Food</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523030 Gasoline</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523050 Postage</td>
<td>$1,859</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523060 Office Supplies</td>
<td>$16,893</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524020 Journals and Books</td>
<td>$5,233</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523080 Unclassified Supplies</td>
<td>$2,078</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523100 Vehicle Non-Garage</td>
<td>$3,597</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524010 Travel and Training</td>
<td>$12,398</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524030 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524050 Rental of Office Space</td>
<td>$76,921</td>
<td>$92,731</td>
<td>$94,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524080 Unclassified charges</td>
<td>$3,226</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$277,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>$303,694</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540040 Liability Insurance Premium</td>
<td>$20,790</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>FY 2007 Actual</td>
<td>FY 2008 Amended</td>
<td>FY 2009 Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Svcs/Charges</strong></td>
<td>$20,790</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550030 Office Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550040 Computer Equipment</td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550060 Unclassified Equipment</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560010 Human Resource Expense</td>
<td>$5,231</td>
<td>$5,678</td>
<td>$5,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560020 Accounting Expense</td>
<td>$32,232</td>
<td>$10,603</td>
<td>$40,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560030 Purchasing Expense</td>
<td>$22,835</td>
<td>$16,504</td>
<td>$16,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560040 Information Systems Exp.</td>
<td>$11,380</td>
<td>$32,785</td>
<td>$63,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated Costs</strong></td>
<td>$71,678</td>
<td>$32,785</td>
<td>$63,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Inter-fund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Eng. Consultant</td>
<td>$882,000</td>
<td>$885,506</td>
<td>$845,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>$1,870,408</td>
<td>$2,052,579</td>
<td>$1,982,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Other Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects</td>
<td>$14,390,676</td>
<td>$48,399,851</td>
<td>$8,153,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611300 Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$9,586,704</td>
<td>$14,222,495</td>
<td>$14,988,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,941,685</td>
<td>$5,276,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for future years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,864,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>$60,711,919</td>
<td>$68,616,610</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2007 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2008 Amended</th>
<th>FY 2009 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$27,832,864</td>
<td>$34,864,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbrance carry forward</td>
<td>$15,106</td>
<td>$31,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (interest, admin fees)</td>
<td>$1,869,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Proceeds</td>
<td>$30,988,777</td>
<td>$33,738,014</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of inv. From DSF</td>
<td>$5,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$60,711,919</td>
<td>$68,633,977</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 Budget Narrative

511000 Blueprint is requesting the higher of the City or County’s proposed pay raise be appropriated to Blueprint. Currently there is 3% in the Salary Enhancement account as a place holder for Blueprint’s Salary increase.

511500 Temp wages includes Intern during the summer $10,000 and $10,000 for temporary help to replace full time temp employee.

516100 This is a new charge being allocated to Blueprint to cover the cost of the City’s share future employees health Benefits.

512000 Overtime for Admin Asst and OPS staff

521010 Public hearing notices, CAC annual report ($4,000) and, etc.

521030 Copies, letterhead, CAC’S performance report.

521040 Unclassified Professional fees; Financial Audit $22,100 Performance Audit $25,000, Financial Advisor $20,000, Bond Information Services $6,000, ERD $4000, and $15,000 Internal Controls Review

521100 Equip repairs, copier maintenance contract and copies, recording equipment, power point projector no longer on warranty, fax machine.

521160 Legal services includes outside General Counsel Attorney services

521080 Unclassified Contract Services includes two FSU planning interns $16,000 and ISS support $3,000 and $4000 misc.

521190 Computer Software $4,000, maintenance, software licenses $1,000.

522080 Telephone long distance and 5 cell phones

523020 6 CAC meetings, workgroup meeting, lunch meetings, and 1 evening IA meeting

523060 Office supplies printer toner, paper, and general office needs.

523080 Unclassified Supplies, items such as surge protectors, safety vests, same as last years

523100 Repairs and service on 3 Vehicles. Average of age of vehicles is 7 years

524010 Travel includes trips similar to Chattatanooga, Chamber Retreat, Team Florida, FCT related seminars and includes $4000 Florida Bar conferences.

524020 Journals and Books including legal subscriptions

524040 Membership dues Government Finance Officers Association and Certificate of Achievement Program, Florida Bar dues and etc.

524050 Rental of 5152 sq. ft. of full service office space.

524080 Unclassified Charges, Paying Agent charges Reward and Recognition $1000 and etc

540040 Liability Insurance Premium includes Workers Comp, General Liability, Automobile, Public Officials, Employment Practices liability and consultant services

550030 Office equipment any office equipment over $1000.

550040 Computer equipment, additional computer and miscellaneous equipment

550060 Unclassified equipment includes items such as filling cabinets, camera, and miscellaneous equipment needs
560010-40 Blueprint’s share of Allocated Costs. Accounting Services expense increase is to bring the charge inline with actual usage.

612400 General Engineering Consultant $845,519 and transfer of sales tax revenue to Capital Project.
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Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009-FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Revised Master Plan and Fiscal Year 2009-2013 Blueprint Capital Budget

Date: June 2, 2008  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Phil Maher  Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

This item is to provide an opportunity for the Board to review and comment on the Revised Master Plan and FY 2009-2013 Capital Budget.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

At the February 25, 2008 meeting IA meeting the Board was informed of our declining sales tax revenues and the impacts that had on our cash flow forecast used in the Master Plan. The forecast is currently predicated on a 4.5% growth rate. At the time it was felt that growth should be lower to between ½% and 2% growth for the next two years. This decrease in growth rate resulted in a reduction in projects in the range of $59 million to $73 million. The Board was also informed that Blueprint would meet with Finance Committee and Financial Advisor to determine the proper growth to use in our forecasting.

The result of the Finance Committee meeting was the agreement that the City, County, and Blueprint would utilize the same projected growth rate for their sales tax projections. The consensus of the Committee was that the growth rate would be -3% for this fiscal year, 1% for FY 2009, 2% for FY 2010, 2% for FY 2011, 3% for FY 2012, and 4.5% there after. These reductions to the growth rate resulted in $109.4 million decrease in projects from the approved Master Plan.

To balance the Master Plan we not only have to reduce the dollar amount of projects but also match the timing of revenues. Since this process requires a multitude of runs of the financial model only one Master Plan was developed, which can be use as the basis to make other changes. Option 1 is the Master Plan reflected in attachment 1. This option was developed considering financial and legal commitments as well as prior Board priorities. These priorities included completing Capital Circle Northwest Southwest, Blueprint’s signature project Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2, City and County Water Quality dollars, and Land Bank which is used to acquire ROW, Sensitive Lands and provides a needed contingency.

The following are the options for reducing the Master Plan:
Option 1

- Northwest Florida Water Management match allocation of $2,500,000 for the Headwaters of St. Marks reduced by $1,000,000. This leaves $ 1,264,985 still available for match. No change was made to the non-match dollars for the Headwaters of St. Marks.
• Lafayette Floodplain was reduced by $4,250,000 leaving $892,237. To date no parcels have been identified for acquisition.
• Land Bank was reduced by $2,828,855. After the reduction $8,881,776 remains for early acquisition of ROW and Sensitive Land. Land Bank is also utilized as a contingency by Blueprint.
• Capital Circle Northwest allocation cost associated for Stormwater Retrofit, Greenways and Program Management was reduced by $10,505,130. $500,000 still remains for providing a trail network thru the Atkins parcel.
• Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest FY 2017-2019 allocation for Program Management, Greenway and Stormwater Retrofit of $15,491,126 was eliminated from the approved Master Plan. Although $4,438,000 of the ROW and Construction originally reflected in the approved Master Plan was used to acquire Stormwater Retrofit.
• Capital Circle Southwest allocation for Program Management, Design and ROW in the amount of $27,490,304 was eliminated.
• Capital Cascade General and Segment 1 cost associated with the design and construction was delayed to FY 2019 thru 2020 and was reduced by $37,171,500. The overall Program Management for Capital Cascade Trail was reduced by $812,554.
• Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 was reduced by $17,981,689 which allows for ROW acquisition and partial Construction.
• Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4 Design was deferred by 2 years and Construction by 3 years. The cost of the project was also increased by $5,121,152 due to inflation.

Option 2
Modify Option 1 as follows:
• Eliminate uncommitted Land Bank and Sensitive Land funds to restore Greenways and Stormwater Retrofit included in Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest.

Option 3
Modify Option 1 as follows:
• Eliminate uncommitted Land Bank and Sensitive Lands fund to restore the complete construction of Segment 3 of the Cascades Trail.

Option 4
Modify Option 1 as follows:
• Eliminate the partial construction of Segment 3 of the Cascade to restore the Greenway and Retrofit funds for Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest.

The $513.5 million reflected in the proposed Master Plan represents a 17.6% decrease from the previous $622.9 million in projects. While this is a dramatic decrease, it should be noted that the original approved Master Plan was only $520 million.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Review and comment on the revised Master Plan Capital Budget.
ACTION BY THE CAC:

The CAC recommended approval of the Master Plan subject to re-examination of Capital Cascade Trail, in terms of funding of complete segments and Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest for legal and financial ramifications of termination or delay of that project.

ATTACHMENT(S):

Attachment 1 Proposed Master Plan
Attachment 2 Approved Master Plan
Attachment 3 Proposed FY 2009 – 2013 Capital Budget
Attachment 4 Comparison of Corridor and Environmental Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Preliminary)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Final)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Construction)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Third Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Fourth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Fifth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Sixth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Seventh Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Eighth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Ninth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Tenth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Eleventh Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Twelfth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Thirteenth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Fourteenth Year)</th>
<th>Capital Budget (Fifteenth Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality/Sensitive Lands &amp; Misc.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$10,470,221</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$385,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIDAR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Quality/Sensitive Lands &amp; Misc.</td>
<td>$4,503,962</td>
<td>$278,037</td>
<td>$4,523,817</td>
<td>$7,742,119</td>
<td>$27,391,461</td>
<td>$18,848,408</td>
<td>$3,477,300</td>
<td>$1,985,342</td>
<td>$3,052,183</td>
<td>$3,162,031</td>
<td>$3,195,023</td>
<td>$3,771,299</td>
<td>$3,143,244</td>
<td>$1,934,302</td>
<td>$2,021,346</td>
<td>$2,553,701</td>
<td>$2,207,360</td>
<td>$385,835</td>
<td>$94,176,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Water Quality</td>
<td>$8,646,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$713,255</td>
<td>$1,662,031</td>
<td>$1,695,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Water Quality</td>
<td>$20,486,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks NWFWMDS</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks</td>
<td>$4,516,224</td>
<td>$555,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson Basin</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar</td>
<td>$349,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank ROW/Sen.Land</td>
<td>$8,550,034</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Lands and Land Bank</td>
<td>$401,748</td>
<td>$47,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCNW from I-10 to U.S. 90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$759,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$51,694,644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$25,058,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$4,285,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$83,798,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,410</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCNW from US 90. to Orange Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,500,150</td>
<td>$641,351</td>
<td>$561,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering and Design</td>
<td>$4,987,177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$51,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$47,887,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,500,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>$641,351</strong></td>
<td>$561,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Schedule</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Connie to Tram</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$2,985,058</td>
<td>$38,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$4,656,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Build Contract</td>
<td>$36,488,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$44,129,058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Tram. to Woodville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,568,015</td>
<td>$848,172</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,604,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$13,174,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$20,560,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$36,907,431</td>
<td>$848,172</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Woodville to Crawford.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$553,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,435,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,988,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSW Crawford to Orange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$740,927</td>
<td>$344,117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,160,927</td>
<td>$344,117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Cascade Trail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,858,767</td>
<td>$819,336</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$2,904,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,762,767</td>
<td>$819,336</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Cascade Trail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,672,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$26,347,205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$31,299,805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Schedule</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,667,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,667,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,072,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,052,720</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,958,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$381,011,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,344,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,765,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,003,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,612,031</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master Plan 2008

- Corridor Improvement 49%
- Environmental 48%
- Other 3%
Master Plan 2009

- Corridor Improvement: 54%
- Environmental: 43%
- Other: 3%
## MASTER PLAN 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality City</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality County</td>
<td>$20,928,293</td>
<td>$20,928,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks NWFWMD</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks</td>
<td>$10,470,221</td>
<td>$10,470,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/Fred George</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>$5,142,237</td>
<td>$5,142,237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIDAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>$349,817</td>
<td>$349,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,218,634</td>
<td>$12,218,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback City</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,780,856</td>
<td>$1,780,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback County</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,788,536</td>
<td>$1,788,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management Sensitive Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>$401,747</td>
<td>$401,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW</td>
<td>$76,622,709</td>
<td>$15,041,126</td>
<td>$91,663,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW/SW</td>
<td>$107,169,690</td>
<td>$15,041,126</td>
<td>$122,210,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram to Connie</td>
<td>$48,629,057</td>
<td>$48,629,057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram to Woodville</td>
<td>$33,377,431</td>
<td>$33,377,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Woodville to Crawfordville</td>
<td>$1,988,746</td>
<td>$1,988,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSW</td>
<td>$31,995,344</td>
<td>$31,995,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>$198,926,216</td>
<td>$198,926,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$309,782,977</td>
<td>$296,993,395</td>
<td>$16,191,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$622,968,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED MASTER PLAN 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality City</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality County</td>
<td>$23,616,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,616,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks NWFWMD</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks</td>
<td>$10,470,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,470,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/Fred George</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>$892,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIDAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>$349,817</td>
<td></td>
<td>$349,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,389,779</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,389,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback City</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,780,856</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,780,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback County</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,788,536</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,788,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management Sensitive Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>$449,741</td>
<td></td>
<td>$449,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW</td>
<td>$76,362,119</td>
<td>$4,785,996</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,148,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW/SW</td>
<td>$102,926,041</td>
<td>$4,438,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$107,364,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram to Connie</td>
<td>$44,167,559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,167,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram to Woodville</td>
<td>$37,857,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,857,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Woodville to Crawfordville</td>
<td>$1,549,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,549,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSW</td>
<td>$4,505,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,505,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,083,625</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,083,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$277,368,447</td>
<td>$222,778,529</td>
<td>$13,362,988</td>
<td>$513,509,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |         |               |       |       |
|                      | 54.0%   | 43.4%         | 2.6%  | 100.0% |