Chairman: Andrew Gillum

Agenda

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

II. CAC CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Tom O’Steen

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Wood Sink Tract Acquisition
   Dave Bright
2. Billingsley Property Conservation Easement
   Jim Davis
3. Cascade Park/Meridian Monument Plaza Design Modification
   Due to Property Constraints
   Gary Phillips
4. CAC Meeting Minutes (August 21, October 16, and
   December 4, 2008)
   Dave Bright
5. Naming of Regional Pond/Park after Martha Wellman
   Jim Davis
6. Sales Tax Receipts Update
   Phil Maher

IV. CONSENT

7. IA Meeting Minutes: September 15, 2008
   Chairman Gillum
8. Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville
   Road Landscaping Plans
   Dave Snyder
9. Acceptance of FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial
   Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2008 Operating
   Fund Balance
   Phil Maher/
   Rick Feldman
10. Assignment to City of Tallahassee of Any/All of Blueprint’s
    Vested Rights in Delta Industrial Park
    Jim Davis
11. Blueprint Participation in Lafayette Heritage Trail Park/
    Bridge Project
    Dave Bright

V. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION

12. Capital Cascade Trail - Segments 3 and 4 Design Update
    Gary Phillips
13. Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to
    Crawfordville Road - Design/Build Project
    Dave Snyder
14. Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Construction Project Limits  
   Latesa Turner
15. Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Resolutions  
   Debra Schiro
16. EECC Presentation Regarding Capital Circle Southwest  
   Kathy Archibald
17. Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study – Recommended Corridor Segment Solutions  
   Latesa Turner

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
#1

Wood Sink Tract Acquisition
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to advise the Intergovernmental Agency on the acquisition of the Wood Sink Tract by The Nature Conservancy and the tract’s subsequent sale to the State of Florida. The property is located within the Headwaters of the St. Marks River, a key sensitive lands target area for Blueprint 2000.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Nature Conservancy (TNC) led the effort to secure the 1,068-acre Wood Sink Tract, located in eastern Leon County. This parcel extends from near Capitol south to Apalachee Parkway and is immediately south of the 754-acre St. Marks Headwaters property owned by Leon County and acquired in partnership with the Florida Communities Trust. TNC purchased the land from the St. Joe Company and subsequently sold the property to the State of Florida (The Trustees of The Internal Improvement Trust Fund). The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission will be the land managers (through a lease).

No Blueprint 2000 funding was required for this important acquisition.

In 2004, the subject properties were ranked Priority 1 and Priority 2 for acquisition by the IA-appointed Sensitive Lands Working Group. The Blueprint-organized St. Marks River Consortium requested that the properties be added to the FDEP Upper St. Marks River Corridor Florida Forever Project. Once the properties were added to the DEP Project boundaries, The Nature Conservancy purchased the property in early in 2007.

On June 4, 2007, The Board was advised that The Nature Conservancy had purchased the property, and that TNC, based on discussions with the Consortium, had approached Blueprint about buying approximately 200 acres immediately surrounding Wood Sink (all Priority 1 property). Although no vote was conducted, the Board generally concurred in the potential purchase. Jim Davis stated that any proposed purchase of the property would be brought back to the Board for approval at a subsequent meeting. Ultimately, the State desired the entire 1,068-acre parcel and TNC completed the sale to the State of Florida.
OPTIONS
For information only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested, except for Blueprint’s sincere thanks to The Nature Conservancy for coordinating and completing this transaction!

Action by TCC and CAC:
Provided for information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
Location Map
Upper St. Marks River Corridor - The Nature Conservancy

Sections 01 - 03, Township 01 South, Range 02 East
Sections 34 - 36, Township 01 North, Range 02 East

Leon County, Florida
#2

Billingsley Property Conservation Easement
SUBJECT/TITLE: Billingsley Property Conservation Easement

Date: February 23, 2009  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright  Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to advise the Board that the Northwest Florida Water Management District (NWFWMD) Governing Board did not approve the purchase of a conservation easement proposed on the Billingsley Property located in the St. Marks Basin (Black Creek) near the intersection of Miccosukee Road and McCracken Road.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The NWFWMD staff with assistance of George Willson of The Conservation Fund has negotiated a conservation easement over 192 acres of property located within the Headwaters of the St. Marks River, located east of the Miccosukee Land Coop near the intersection of Miccosukee Road and McCracken Road.

Cost of the conservation easement is $900,000 and would have been shared equally between the Water Management District and Blueprint 2000 per our Agreement to acquire conservation easements within the Headwaters.

Staff is discussing if or how to proceed on the easement.

OPTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested.

Action by TCC and CAC:

ATTACHMENTS:
Location Map
Billingsley Property Conservation Easement Location Map
#3

Cascade Park/Meridian Monument Plaza Design Modification Due to Property Constraints
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this item is to inform the IA of the design modification to the Meridian Monument Plaza due to property constraints.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Meridian Monument Plaza was designed under the supposition that the City of Tallahassee would purchase the Records Building located on the north side of Bloxham Street. The building was to be demolished and the land sold for redevelopment. Due to current economic conditions, the City has not purchased this property which has necessitated a modification to the Meridian Monument Plaza in the northwest quadrant utilizing existing right-of-way (See Attachment 1).

Blueprint 2000 staff is working with DMS staff to obtain a lease agreement and temporary construction easement for the partial Meridian Monument Plaza, adjacent sidewalks and landscaping. Blueprint 2000 will continue to work with DMS or the property’s (eventual) new owner(s) to obtain the necessary rights-of-way to construct the entire Meridian Monument Plaza as envisioned in the approved Master Plan.

OPTIONS
For information only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Provided for information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Meridian Monument Plaza Design Modification
CAC Meeting Minutes

August 21, 2008
October 16, 2008
December 4, 2008
Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Conger</th>
<th>Lamar Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Amnott</td>
<td>Hugh Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald (telephonically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Balog (telephonically)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dave Bright</th>
<th>Margie Quillman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Harry Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Ryan Wetherall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Hurd</td>
<td>Ed Ringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latesa Turner</td>
<td>Ward Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Modifications

There were none.

Director’s Comments

This item was informational only.

Master Plan / Capital Budget Items

**Item #1: Blueprint Projects: Corridor and Environmental Breakouts**

Jim Davis stated that staff followed through on the requested research from the May CAC meeting regarding the breakout of cost allocations on corridor and environmental projects. The historical data, from the original article printed in the Tallahassee Democrat regarding the referendum, the split would be 40% for environmental projects; to include sidewalks, bike lanes, stormwater, etc. Staff recalculated the program and found that with the original program, prior to the $109M reduction, the split was 48% for environmental. The new program, after the $109M was taken out was 43% environmental. That did not include any costs associated with bike lanes, sidewalks, or the meandering trails. The inclusion of those, he was certain would drive environmental expenditures into the 50% bracket. The numbers, he felt, reflected an
appropriate split of green and gray projects.

Kathy Archibald stated that the City and County each took 10% of the collected sales tax off the top, in addition to the $25M for Water Quality projects, for their own lists of projects. Out of that 10%, either the City or the County, possibly both, but one of those entities (noting that she was working from memory; her records were in Tallahassee and she was not) had a significant amount going to bicycle/pedestrian projects. She felt that was possibly what Mr. Jeff Hunter was alluding to with his comment of $16M in stand alone bike/ped projects at the June 2008 IA meeting. She suggested reference to the City and County’s 10% projects be added to the Agenda Item for the IA and also suggested that the IA review how each Agency had utilized those funds. Furthermore, she felt that the 10% allocations should be subject to the Performance Audit also; base on the actual language of the amendment.

Tom O’Steen moved to request an explanation from the City and County, via the IA, of how those funds, the 10% of sales tax revenue, had been spent over the years. Not to necessarily participate in the Blueprint Performance Audit; recognizing that each Agency was subject to their internal auditing processes. Mrs. Archibald requested to include the $25M for Water Quality as well. Mr. O’Steen agreed. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 & 4 Phase I Improvements; Segment 1 Interim Improvements**

Jim Davis stated that the Board’s guidance to staff at the June IA meeting was not to analyze how funds could be reallocated from CCNW/SW but instead, to review Capital Cascade Trail Segments 1, 3 and 4 and identify the highest payoff items. They wanted to see where Blueprint could receive the most “bang for the buck” from the water quality mitigation standpoint possibly at the expense of the amenities.

Ed Ringe discussed the recommended Phase I or interim improvements that were detailed in the agenda item for Segments 3, 4 and 1. Even though the proposed improvements did not include the amenities in the original concept, choosing the off-line treatment for the water would allow them to be included in a second phase of construction.

Kathy Archibald questioned the inclusion of allocations for contamination remediation in each segment and why the current property owners were not responsible for any necessary remediation work. Phil Maher stated that it was dependent upon the future use of the site. The current property owners would not be liable for any contamination that is contained presently, but would be disturbed by future development. Mr. Davis stated that Phase 2 Environmental Analysis would be completed prior to purchase of property in that area. Furthermore, in the case of the Myers Industrial Park part of the conditions of sale were that the current property owner would be released of liability for remediation.

Mrs. Archibald felt that the interim improvements to Segment 1 were a “total waste of money” because they were not great improvements for the cost, they would all be lost in the final improvements to Franklin Boulevard, and the public would think the problem would be solved and question why it still flooded even if the frequency of flooding was reduced. Members of the Committee agreed that it appeared to be a “no win” situation for Blueprint to take it on, even if
simply from a Public Relations perspective.

Kevin McGorty stated that the proposed Segment 1 interim improvements were as ludicrous as the statement of “the number one priority of the IA was to get to the Airport.” That was not the battle when the EECC went out on referendum. Furthermore, if this type of short-term thinking was the IA’s response to budget cuts they were losing not only money but vision too. Gregg Patterson stated “don’t throw out the Blueprint vision due to a few months of economic downturn.”

Mr. Ringe stated that $5M interim improvements were better than the possibility of no improvements if the $25M necessary did not become available in the out-years as anticipated. Mr. Ringe noted with the interim improvements that flooding would occur once every three years versus three times per year. Mr. O’Steen stated that the original referendum did not indicate that revenue would be added to a pot, and as they went along Blueprint would determine how to spend it. There were specific projects that were identified; that was how support for the referendum occurred. From a Public Relations perspective it would be “very uncomfortable” to spend a significant amount of money for roadway improvements that, for all practical purposes, the public would perceive as having corrected something; the genesis of the Segment 1 project. He suggested, somewhat facetiously, re-advertising the Master Plan that went along with the funding. He felt that was the only way to suggest an interim project, spend that kind of money, and do it with the conscious that the public understood how the money was being spent. He understood the point but it was not Blueprint’s task. Phil Maher stated that the Master Plan currently included the $5M for interim Segment 1 improvements in the year 2019.

Kathy Archibald stated that the other improvements would benefit the system as a whole once it was completed. However, the proposed improvements would be “literally throwing money away” to incorrectly fix a problem that had plagued Tallahassee for many years.

Gregg Patterson questioned if Governor Crist’s initiative to accelerate infrastructure in Florida could potentially have a positive effect on Capital Cascade Trail, Segment 1 specifically. Mr. Davis stated that based upon staff conversations with FDOT there would be no positive impact to Blueprint. The amount of money in the pot would not change; they were trying to move some projects forward. If however, some projects on a State level were not to come to fruition and FDOT funds became available as a result, Blueprint was positioning itself to be able to move rapidly into the construction phase on CCNW/SW. Thereby un-encumbering $47M of Blueprint’s money, should they receive that much from FDOT, to be reallocated elsewhere. Mr. Davis was more hopeful that would materialize than in regards to the helpfulness of them advancing other projects.

Nancy Miller stated that the interim plan, in regards to Segments 3 and 4, was a sound plan. The concerns were in regards to Segment 1 and that continued flooding was bad public relations. **Tom O’Steen moved to support interim projects that did not have to be removed or changed in order to implement the Master Plan.** Nancy Miller seconded that motion; it passed unanimously.

**Item #3: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009-FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget**

Phil Maher stated (segueing into Master Plan agenda item) that staff provided several short term
options that could be quickly implemented. Staff considered what could be done within the next
door to five years; with ROW and additional ponds being acquired for Capital Cascade Trail
Segment 3 and Segment 4 in the out years. Also, Segment 3 and 4 were originally separated on
the Master Plan, with ROW and Construction broken out. In the revised Master Plan those
Segments and the right-of-way/construction items had been consolidated into one line.

Kevin McGorty stated that the CAC requested a review of both legal and financial ramifications
of delaying CCNW/SW; as he understood, a legal analysis was not completed. Mr. Maher stated
that Blueprint was not under contract to construct the roadway. There were, however, strong
financial ramifications from the Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) between Blueprint and
FDOT. The JPA stated that if Blueprint did not complete the project, FDOT could mandate its
completion and that Blueprint would have to fund any cost incurred.

Mr. Maher stated that if Blueprint were to eliminate the construction of CCNW/SW they would
loose $8M because the Federal grant would be gone. If the project were delayed, the money for
construction would remain encumbered. The incurred interest savings would be lost on inflation.
Jim Davis stated that the $8M in Federal funds had to be spent within a certain time frame or
they would expire.

Lamar Taylor reiterated the sentiment that it would only delay the issue and further increase the
cost. He agreed that as unpalatable as it was to look at that source of money, the $50M from
Capital Cascade Trail, and recognize that there was no other option but to complete the corridor
project on CCNW/SW. Mr. McGorty stated that they were looking for options. He felt that at a
minimum the CAC should recommend that when the economy turned and revenues increased,
the funding would be dedicated back to the projects that have been cut. Mr. Taylor agreed that it
was important to be mindful of that, however, there were tradeoffs, for example with leveraging.

Mr. McGorty agreed with Mr. Taylor and further stated that he understood the political climate.
He reiterated his position of prioritizing the funding the projects that were being cut from the
Master Plan. He stated that Capital Cascade Trail as a whole, not specifically Segment 2, was
the signature project of Blueprint 2000. If they began fragmenting projects it would disillusion
the next group that decided to go out on public referendum and create a gap in trust.

Harry Reed stated that FDOT had a silo structure to their funding system. Being in the position
to leverage funds, as Mr. Davis stated, to move into construction, etc. was critical. Tallahassee
was lucky to have received funding for Mahan Drive but they were in the ‘right place at the right
time.’

Jerry Conger reminded the committee that they were previously on record as stating in essence,
that when the economy improved they should return to the plan as originally conceived, written,
and approved. That statement could be reiterated to the IA if the committee chose to. Mr. Davis
spoke briefly on the status of several projects to illustrate that Blueprint was in an optimal
position to compete for any additional funding including environmental grants.

**Kevin McGorty moved to approve the Master Plan as presented with the caveat of when
funding became available that projects identified for cuts today, in regards to Capital
Cascade Trail, would be fully funded before any other project. Steve Amnott seconded the**
motion; it passed unanimously.

### Information Items

**Item #4: Leveraging Update**
This item was informational only.

**Item #5: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Landscaping/Park**
This item was informational only.

**Item #6: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update**
This item was informational only.

**Item #7: Capital Circle NW/SW: SR 20 Parcels**
This item was informational only.

**Item #8: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study – Update on Alignments, Evaluations and Upcoming Alternatives Public Meeting**
Dave Bright stated that since the Agenda was distributed, the date for the Alternatives Public Meeting had been set, for November 13 at TCC. Kathy Archibald stated that there was no distinction, detailed analysis or ranking of the criterion used. Nor could she identify how the community would benefit overall from one alignment to another. Jim Davis stated that it was not supposed to at that time. There was an approved criterion and weighting system that had not yet been applied. It was simply the data collected, to go back to the public explaining that, without orders of magnitude. Mrs. Archibald stated that she was referring to within each category. She was disappointed with what had been presented thus far.

**Item #9: Downgrade of Blueprint 2000 Series 2007 Bond Insurer**
This item was informational only.

**Item #10: FY 2007 Performance Evaluation**
This item was informational only.

### Consent Items

**Item #11: CAC Minutes: May 15, 2008**
Kevin McGorty moved to approve the minutes as presented; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #12: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 – Design Supplemental Services Approval**
Nancy Miller stated that she wanted to see the use of recycled material/options included in the Scope of Work. Gary Phillips stated he would take it under advisement.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
1. Authorize a new contractual limit of **$5,461,721.39** for Contract 533 with Genesis Group consistent with this Supplemental Services Request No. 8.
2. Approve the Supplemental Services Request for up to $378,400.00 to fund design additions for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.
3. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

Item #13: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 – Contamination Remediation Authorization
Gary Phillips gave a brief overview of the areas of remediation. Jim Davis stated that Blueprint intended to have the remediation complete prior to the construction of the park.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Authorize the advertisement for Contamination Remediation Services or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors for the CCT Contamination Remediation project, at a cost not to exceed $500,000 plus a 10 percent contingency.

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a Hazardous Material Firm or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a budget of $550,000, which includes a ten percent contingency of $50,000.
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.
4. Waive the MBE/WBE requirements for these services in that no qualified local firm exists.

Item #14: Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
1. Authorize a new contractual limit for Contract 772 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. for consultant services for the Capital Circle NW/SW Project (US 90 to Orange Avenue) in the amount of $5,467,000 which includes the previous contract amount of $5,207,000 (including Supplemental Agreements Numbers 1 through 8 with H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
2. Authorize Supplemental Agreement #9 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. an amount not to exceed $110,000
3. Authorize the reinstatement of $50,000 in Supplemental Agreement No. 7 for post-design services; and,
4. Authorize the replenishment of approximately $100,000 for contingency.
5. The $260,000 requested in this agenda item will come from the project’s construction budget.

Item #15: Proposed Meeting Dates

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Approve dates as presented.

Kevin McGorty moved to approve the consent agenda; it was seconded by Tom O’Steen. It passed unanimously.
Presentations/Discussion

**Item #16: Modification of the Fiscal Year 2009 Operating Budget Request**
Phil Maher stated that the modification was to include a temporary attorney for approximately 10 months and authorize a budget change of $50,000. Kevin McGorty questioned if there could be any assistance from the City or County Attorney Offices if law suits grew beyond the expected scope. Mr. Davis stated that, like the City and County in similar situations, if that were to occur Blueprint would contract the legal services out with the expense being charged to the related project as a ROW outlay. **Kevin McGorty moved to approve the modification; it was seconded by Nancy Miller. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Item #17: CAC Appointments**
Dave Bright reiterated for the Committee what was stated in the agenda item. He noted that the nominees would not become active until the nominations were acted on by the Board. It was noted that with the return of Burt Davy there would be two Planning Commissioners on the CAC and that would be added to future meeting notices. **Nancy Miller moved to accept the nominations; it was seconded by Gregg Patterson. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Item #18: CAC Status Report on Blueprint 2000**
Tom O’Steen moved to approve the report as presented. **Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:32 pm.
Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Conger</th>
<th>Scott Balog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Hugh Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Taylor</td>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald (telephonically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dave Bright</th>
<th>Latesa Turner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Gil Ziffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
<td>Mark Llewellyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Thomasson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Modifications

There were none.

Information Items

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**
This item was informational only.

**Item #2: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update**
Mr. Davis stated that at the September 2008 IA meeting the Board authorized Blueprint to spend up to $7,000 to continue to maintain the pond for an additional year. The pond was now owned by Leon County and they would control the snail population. Blueprint would be providing Leon County the allocated $7,000 toward that effort. Furthermore, in the future less delectable plant species would be used in landscaping as a deterrent for the snails.

Consent Items

**Item #3: CAC Minutes: August 21, 2008**
Kevin McGorty moved approval of the August 21, 2008 minutes. It was seconded by Kathy Archibald; it passed unanimously.
Regarding the CAC’s desire for an update on the use of the city and county’s 10% of the sales tax revenue, the CAC clarified that they would prefer the City and County prepare a report on how the funds were utilized (to be attached to the Blueprint Performance Audit) rather than including the City/County expenditures as part of the Audit.

**Presentations/Discussion**

**Item #4: Election of CAC Chairman and Vice Chairman**

Jerry Conger stated that he did not wish to serve a second term as Chairman and called for nominations for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions. Kathy Archibald nominated Tom O’Steen for Chairman. Jim Davis stated that Mr. O’Steen confirmed prior to the meeting that if nominated and elected as Chairman, he would serve. Nancy Miller moved approval of Mr. O’Steen as Chairman; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Nancy Miller nominated Lamar Taylor as Vice-Chairman. Mr. Taylor consented. Greg Patterson moved approval of Mr. Taylor as Vice-Chairman. The motion was seconded by an undistinguishable voice and passed unanimously. Newly elected officers would assume their duties at the February 5, 2009 meeting.

**Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail Update: Design/Fundraising**

Mark Llewellyn stated that a portion of the 90% construction plans had previously been submitted to Blueprint in draft format. There was additional work to be completed on the retaining walls. Also the plans for amenities were well on their way but were lagging behind the engineering design plans. Sixty-percent landscape plans had been submitted and reviewed; they were being finalized at the time of the meeting. Additionally, Mr. Llewellyn shared a Power Point presentation with the Committee which is included in the file.

Kathy Archibald questioned what the cost for the Smokey Hollow misting fountain would be. Gary Phillips stated it was estimated at $200,000.

Scott Balog questioned if the areas were designed to include park like amenities. He stated that from earlier discussions he understood that the park was designed to flood but also so that it could drain as quickly as possible. If water were retained in a “rain garden” type environment for treatment purposes in the upper park would that change the overall design? Mr. Llewellyn stated that it would enhance the look and feel because it was a more natural setting. The “rain garden” facilities would be designed to accommodate the smaller rain events. The larger rain events were the ones that would potentially flood the park depending upon the speed of the rainfall and run-off. Nancy Miller stated that following Tropical Storm Fay, an organization she is involved with requested feedback from owners of rain gardens regarding how they were affected by the storm. There was a 30% response rate with all responses positive in terms of functionality.

Nancy Miller questioned the interaction between the railroad track and the park. Mr. Llewellyn stated that the majority of it would be fenced or separated by Cascade Lane. The trail in the lower park would be directly adjacent to it but offset by approximately 100-feet with a fence between the two.
Ms. Miller further questioned how the proposed improvements to Lafayette Street by the County would affect Blueprint if either Agency could no longer afford them. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it would not have any affect on the park. Jim Davis stated that there were several things, if done collectively that had the potential to represent savings. For example, there was funding available to construct the Lafayette Street pedestrian tunnel (although if pursued, it would federalize the entire park project) and a strong possibility that once the Park construction contract had been awarded that the cost for improvements to the underpass could come in much lower simply because Blueprint would have hired a contractor and their mobilization costs, etc would be under that contract. He further stated that Blueprint was receptive to all options that made sense and were at no additional cost to Blueprint. Ms. Miller stated that the improvements to Lafayette were on the City/County’s list of original projects to be funded by the 10% from the sales tax … if that mattered any longer.

Gary Phillips spoke briefly about the fundraising efforts and introduced Gil Ziffer for a more in depth update. Mr. Ziffer stated that the fundraising efforts had been focused on large donors throughout the community. The names of the donors were to be held in confidence until official announcements were made. Regarding donor recognition plaques, Mr. Ziffer stated that the design would be forthcoming but would be tasteful yet unobtrusive. Some examples that were being discussed were: “Sponsor Name” Meridian Plaza Stage or Cascade Waterfall brought to you by “Sponsor Name.”

Furthermore discussions were underway with a local firm regarding the design or construction for the Signature Bridges within the park. Also, another local company had expressed a “tremendous amount of interest” in sponsoring the Meridian Plaza. He hoped to have that commitment within the next 60-days.

Mr. Ziffer stated that the Cascade Park website was active and they hoped to begin listing individual amenities and the associated costs for people with lesser giving opportunities to make commitments for those. A third round of giving would come at a later date for even smaller priced items, such as bricks, that individual donors could contribute to. At that time however, the man-hours were being spent to chase the bigger dollars.

Regarding charitable contributions from individual donors, Mr. Ziffer stated that he was a member of the Board for Capital City Ventures a local non-profit organization. They had been working with the City on the Water Works Restoration. Mr. Ziffer anticipated that they would come forward to help with finding funding and tenets for the Electric Building and other historical facilities in that area. It worked well because it would support and benefit blighted areas or areas in need of economic development such as the south side of Tallahassee. He felt that they would most likely use Capital City Ventures as the ‘flow through.’ Individuals could make tax deductible contributions to them. Capital City Ventures would then make a contribution to Blueprint 2000 for use in the Park.

Regarding the Smokey Hollow Plaza, Mr. Ziffer stated that a local law firm was being courted as the major sponsor of that amenity. It was one of the higher amenities on the list to secure funding for, stated Mr. Ziffer; as was the Lake Hall Schoolhouse.
Jim Davis stated that unfortunately the Community Redevelopment Agency was not realizing the revenues they anticipated. Therefore the funding that Blueprint was hoping to attain from them was not looking as promising as once hoped. The $26M for the base line facility was still in the Master Plan however. He also complimented Mr. Ziffer, Loranne Ausley, and Janet Hinkle for their outstanding efforts in fundraising.

Mr. Davis stated that he was a bit concerned with cash flow. Normally Blueprint had been flush with cash via their successful bond sales. They were at a point however, where they could be faced with adopting a new strategy. He did not feel that it would impact Capital Cascade Trail however; he was reticent to begin a project until all of the cash was in hand.

Additionally, Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was moving forward with the acquisition of the Myers Industrial Park off of FAMU Way. It was expensive but it was a high-payoff water quality/stormwater interim solution. The property was 5.5-acres that are destined to become a stormwater pond. The intent was to continue to operate the Industrial Park as such for a period of years until it was needed and to benefit from the revenue that would be generated from renting those spaces. Rent management would be contracted out and Blueprint would use the profits to defray some of the acquisition costs.

Regarding the shade structure of the Veteran’s War Memorial, Mr. Davis stated that the renderings did not show clearly that the structure roof included small stars and that other panels would include the names of fallen service personnel from Leon County. The sunlight would filter though the stars onto the visitors below. Also, Mr. Davis noted that there would be fund raising kickoff on Monday, November 10, 2008 at the Moon. It was a separate effort from that of the Cascade Park Marketing Team. The War Memorial group was looking to raise $1.8M which would include an endowment for the maintenance of the facility.

**Citizens To Be Heard**

There were none.

**Items From Members Of The Committee**

There were none.

**Adjourn**

Nancy Miller moved to adjourn; it was seconded by several committee members. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.
Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Conger</th>
<th>Scott Balog (telephonically)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Taylor</td>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald (telephonically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Davis</th>
<th>Ed Ringe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Latesa Turner</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>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Alisha Wetherell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

Mr. Davis stated that a letter from Henree Martin had been distributed and was additional information for item number 7. Also information was provided regarding the Billingsley Conservation Easement for item number 1.

**Information Items**

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Phil Maher stated that based on the outcome of the last State Revenue Estimating Conference he did not anticipate an infrastructure loan program in the coming year. Additionally, FDOT District 3 was facing a cut back of $250M. That could potentially affect repayment to Blueprint of the $1.3M in design for Capital Circle NW/SW which the FDOT had delayed until 2009. Blueprint was trying to transfer that money to a different category because the design would be nearly complete by that time.

Regarding the Billingsley Conservation Easement, Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint had a five year Agreement with the NWFWMD to acquire conservation easements and split project costs 50/50. The Billingsley parcel was a 192-acre Priority 1 parcel. Blueprint is expecting to contribute approximately $500,000 toward the proposed easement. Jim Davis stated that the Billingsley easement would bring the total land protected in the Headwaters of the St. Marks to
approximately 2,200 acres. Furthermore he did not anticipate a problem at the IA.

**Item #2: Mahan Drive Local Funding Agreement**

Jim Davis stated that the Mahan Drive Local Funding Agreement was a true testament to the value of a positive working relationship between Blueprint and the District. Key points of the funding agreement are:

1. $400K of the Blueprint $10M will be withheld and turned over to the Leon County Public Works Department to be used for permit mitigation. (That would be used for tree mitigation or landscape but could not be phrased as such in the Agreement due to constraints with the FDOT.) This $400K has been made up in the construction budget by the Department.

2. The first $800K of any savings realized in the award and construction of the project will be returned to Blueprint 2000 and subsequently provided to the County Public Works Department for use on landscaping for the project. (Blueprint asked for $600K).

3. Any additional savings in excess of the above will be split 50/50 between the Department and Blueprint 2000 with the proviso that any of these funds must be used on the state roadway system. Blueprint has requested that the funds be usable for roadways in Cascade Park.

Mr. Davis stated that (bullet number three above) those funds could be used for Cascade Lane or improvements to Suwannee Street or the intersection at Lafayette; in light of the CAC’s recommendation that “any money be returned in the reverse order.” They would be transportation related but also a part of the Capital Cascade Trail project.

Kevin McGorty questioned the County’s justification for requesting $1M rather than $400,000. Mr. Davis stated that in conversations with Tony Park, Leon County Public Works Director, Mr. Park indicated that the expectations would be for Mahan Drive to be landscaped to look like Capital Circle. The County was unable to fund that level of landscaping. Mr. Davis stated however that it would not be a Blueprint corridor; it would look similar but would be different. He confirmed that there was one set of landscape plans that would cost $1M and would be completed by the County. Once the plans were submitted to Growth Management the permit would be issued. FDOT would let the job in February 2009 (approximately) with construction beginning in (probably) July 2009.

**Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3: Myers Industrial Park**

Jim Davis stated that the Phase 2 environmental assessment for the Myers site raised serious questions about the potential costs for site remediation. Furthermore, the seller’s sale conditions included an indemnification of liability for environmental remediation in addition to the premium selling price. Those factors caused the reversal of Blueprint’s earlier decision to acquire that location. An alternative site farther east was available at one-third the cost to Blueprint.

Kevin McGorty questioned what would happen to the money that was allocated for the purchase of Myers Industrial Park. Phil Maher stated that it was to have been borrowed from the Land Bank. Mr. Davis stated that given the state of the economy, he liked having the cushion.

Tom O’Steen questioned if the alternative site was previously unavailable or why it was not
considered earlier. Mr. Davis stated that the alternative site was not as good from a strategic standpoint as the Myers Industrial Park, but it was a flooded area that would work. Blueprint would however continue to look at other options.

**Item #4: Capital Circle NW and Regional Pond Landscaping**
Dave Snyder stated that M. Inc of Tallahassee was the low bidder for the project at $1,004,567. It was the same company and subs (Greenways America) that worked on the E-1 project. A preconstruction meeting would be held in December 2008 with a Notice-to-Proceed anticipated for January 2009. The work was expected to take approximately 180 days to complete.

The 15-acre pond was located west of Capital Circle on West Tennessee Street. The additional improvements would include a parking area, 4,000’ multi-use trail with seating for patrons, lighting, etc. Naming and dedication of the park was expected to officially occur in the middle of 2009.

**Item #5: Leon County Veterans Memorial Design and Funding Update**
This item was informational only.

Nancy Miller requested the use of porous pavers at the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consent Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item #6: CAC Minutes: October 16, 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Archibald moved to approve the minutes as amended. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item #7: Naming of Regional Pond #1 Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis stated that the IA delegated the naming of the pond to the County; who in turn requested Blueprint prepare an agenda item to present it to them. Blueprint recommended that the pond and park be named for Martha Wellman in honor of her civic and environmental contributions. Nancy Miller moved approval; Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. It passed unanimously. Nancy Miller was on point to coordinate with the Wellman family regarding their approval and attendance at the naming ceremony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens To Be Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items From Members Of The Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin McGorty requested a brief update of the recent CCSW Public Meeting. Jim Davis stated that it was a rather predictable meeting but, overall, went very well. There were approximately 70 people in attendance. The project alignments were broken out in segments with each option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
listed for each segment. Opinions of the attendees had not changed, he stated. Staff would take the recommendations of that meeting and formulate a staff recommendation that would move forward to the IA (returning to the CAC first). Kathy Archibald stated that the EECC would like time on the next IA agenda to remind the Board of the original purpose of the realignment of that portion of CCSW.

Kevin McGorty moved to adjourn; it was seconded by Tom O'Steen. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.
#5

Naming of Regional Pond/Park after Martha Wellman
SUBJECT/TITLE: Naming of Regional Pond/Park after Martha Wellman

Date: February 23, 2009  
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff 
Contact Person: Jim Davis  
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE: This item is to update the Intergovernmental Agency on the proposed naming of Regional Pond 1 and the surrounding Park after Martha Wellman, a member of the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee which created Blueprint 2000.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Regional Pond 1 located on West Tennessee Street was constructed as part of the Capital Circle Northwest widening project. In keeping with the Blueprint program’s holistic philosophy, over 70 percent of the pond’s treatment capacity is for stormwater retrofit; and a paved trail with park amenities and landscaping is currently under construction.

In September 2007, the IA authorized $1.2M for the construction of the Park as well as for landscaping along Capital Circle NW and West Tennessee Street. The Board also delegated the naming of the Pond and Park to Leon County as owners of the facility. Leon County Parks and Recreation is preparing an Agenda Item to be presented to the County Commission. The Park dedication ceremony will be scheduled for this fall.

The CAC voted unanimously to endorse naming the Pond and Park after Martha Wellman at its December 4, 2008 meeting. Staff has discussed the naming of the Pond and Park after Martha Wellman with EECC members. EECC member Henree Martin has submitted correspondence to County Commission Chairman Desloge supporting the naming, and EECC member Nancy Miller has been in contact with Martha’s companion and family. The naming of the Park and Pond after Martha Wellman has received full support.

OPTIONS For information only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: No action requested.

Action by TCC and CAC: Provided for information only.

ATTACHMENTS: None
#6

Sales Tax Receipts Update
SUBJECT/TITLE:  Sales Tax Receipts Update

Date: February 23, 2009  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Phil Maher  Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to update the IA on the FY 2008 sales tax collections and projected growth rates.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Every year Blueprint prepares a cash flow forecast, which is the basis for developing our Master Plan. Last year’s forecast projected a 3% decline in sales tax revenues from the prior year. This resulted in estimate of $30,100,539. Actual collections were $30,013,278, $87,261 less than projected. Last years’ forecast also had also projected a growth rate of 1% in FY 2009, 2% in FY 2010, 2% in FY 2011, 3% in FY 2012, and then back to our normal growth rate of 4.5%.

Blueprint recently met with our Finance Committee and Financial Advisor to discuss the current economic downturn and Blueprint’s projected growth rates. The consensus of the group was that the current short term estimates needed to be adjusted downward. Also the Committee felt after the initial recovery, the normal growth rates we had experienced in the past would be at a more reduced level. The Committee recommended revising the rates to -3% in FY 2009, up 1% in FY 2010, up 1% in FY 2011, up 2% in FY 2012 and between 3% and 3.5% there after. The preliminary estimate of these adjustments would mean an additional reduction of approximately $24 million from the plan. The impact of such a change could possibly result in the combination of the following.

- Decrease in Land Bank which also is used as a contingency for Blueprint 2000
- Reduction to the Headwaters of the St. Marks
- Reduction to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 & 4

Blueprint will continue to work with our Financial Advisor to refine the proper adjustment to our cash forecast model. We will present this to the committees in May/June as well as our Master Plan and Capital Budget for their review and comment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required.
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Chairman Andrew Gillum called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Davis stated that there was one agenda modification for Item #10, Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue Right-of-Way Acquisition (SR 20 Parcels) and Resolution, which provides additional information. He stated that it included the right-of-way maps for State Road 20.

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

Mr. Conger stated that he would like to bring 3 points to the Board’s attention from the CAC. The statement that Mr. Conger provided to the Board is attached for review.

Commissioner Thaell thanked Mr. Conger and the CAC members for their participation in the program and providing over-site of what the policy makers are doing. He stated that the Board was dealing with revenue shortfalls and that he would like to direct staff to reprioritize projects when funding is available.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Capital Circle NW/SW Erosion Control Risk Reduction Techniques

This item was presented as informational only.

2. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study - Update on Alignments, Evaluations and Upcoming Alternatives Public Meeting

This item was presented as informational only.

3. Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Landscaping/Park

This item was presented as informational only.

4. Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update

This item was presented as informational only.
5. Blueprint Projects: Corridor and Environmental Breakout

This item was presented as informational only.

6. Downgrade of Blueprint 2000 Series 2007 Bond Insurer

This item was presented as informational only.

7. CAC Meeting Minutes (May 15, 2008)

This item was presented as informational only.

8. CAC Status Report on Blueprint 2000

This item was presented as informational only.

Commissioner Gillum asked if anyone would like to pull any of the informational items for discussion. Commissioner Desloge moved to accept the information items. Chairman Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

IV. CONSENT

9. IA Meeting Minutes: June 2, 2008

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve minutes as provided.

10. Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue Right-of-Way Acquisition (SR 20 Parcels) and Resolution

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing acquisition of seven (7) parcels and two (2) corresponding temporary construction easements, revised as the result of design changes, one (1) additional fee acquisition, two (2) new temporary construction easements and one (1) new drainage easement necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

11. CAC Appointments

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the nominations as proposed.
- EECC Member: Kevin McGorty
• Chair/Representative from the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Commission: Burt Davy
• Planner - nominated by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC): Tom O’Steen
• Representative from the Disabled Community: no nomination received

12. Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 - Design Supplemental Services Approval

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1:
1. Authorize a new contractual limit of $5,461,721.39 for Contract 533 with Genesis Group consistent with this Supplemental Services Request No. 8.
2. Approve the Supplemental Services Request for up to $378,400.00 to fund design additions for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.
3. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

13. Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 – Contamination Remediation Authorization

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize the advertisement for Contamination Remediation Services or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors for the CCT Contamination Remediation project, at a cost not to exceed $500,000 plus a 10 percent contingency.

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a Hazardous Material Firm or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a budget of $550,000, which includes a ten percent contingency of $50,000.
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.
4. Waive the MBE/WBE requirements for these services in that no qualified local firm exists.

14. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1:
1. Authorize a new contractual limit for Contract 772 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. for consultant services for the Capital Circle NW/SW Project (US 90 to Orange Avenue) in the amount of $5,467,000 which includes the previous contract amount of $5,207,000 (including Supplemental Agreements Numbers 1 through 8 with H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
2. Authorize Supplemental Agreement #9 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. an amount not to exceed $110,000
3. Authorize the reinstatement of $50,000 in Supplemental Agreement No. 7 for post-design services; and,
4. Authorize the replenishment of approximately $100,000 for contingency.
5. The $260,000 requested in this agenda item will come from the project’s construction budget.

15. Transfer of ROW Appropriation from CCT Segment 2 to CCT Segment 3

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the transfer of $1,280,000 from Segment 2 of Capital Cascade Trail to Segment 3.

16. Proposed 2009 Meeting Dates

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the dates as presented.

Intergovernmental Agency (Tallahassee City Commission Chambers)
- Monday, February 23, 2009, from 3:00-5:00 pm
- Monday, June 8, 2009, from 3:00-5:00 pm
- Monday, September 21, 2009, from 5:00-8:00 pm (FY 2010 Budget Public Hearing at 6:00 pm)

Commissioner Desloge moved to accept the consent items. Chairman Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

17. Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 & 4 Phase I Improvements; Segment 1 Interim Improvements

Mr. Davis stated that the CAC Chair had attended the June 2, 2008 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting and stated the CAC’s desire to do all of segment 3 or all of segment 4 instead of parts of each. Mr. Davis stated that since Cascade Park was a stormwater project, the Board’s guidance to staff was to look at high payoff stormwater/water quality functions within each segment at the expense of the amenities. He pointed out that there was no money for the projects for these segments until 2012 and there wasn’t a lot of detail in the renderings for this reason. Mr. Davis referred the Board to the three concept maps that were provided and discussed items on each map. He stated that staff was not recommending doing any improvements to segment 1. He reiterated that there would not be any money available for these projects until 2012 and that
the Board would review the master plan at least four more times before the funding becomes available. More detailed plans will need to be prepared prior to moving forward.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

1. Complete Phase I Master Plan concepts from Segments 3 and 4 as funds become available.
2. Complete Segment 1 Interim Improvements after Phase I Master Plan concepts are completed.

**Commissioner DePuy moved the staff recommendation.** The motion was seconded.

Mr. Joe Schreiber introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that on several occasions Sean McGlynn recommended the key to remedying the flooding on Franklin Blvd would be the installation to 2 circular pipes from the St. Augustine Branch down Franklin Blvd to Cascade Park. He stated that expanding these two pipes would alleviate the flooding down St. Augustine Branch.

There was no further discussion. **The motion carried unanimously 11-0.**

Commissioner Gillum stated that he would like to recognize Amanda Gonzalez, Florida State University Service Scholars and all those with her to observe the meeting.

Commissioner Thaell stated that he would like to discuss Item #4, Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update. He stated that Blueprint had put $565,000 of aquatic plants in this stormwater pond many of which had been consumed by snails. McGlynn Laboratories has had great success in removing the channeled apple snails, however there were three steps that needed to continue in order to prevent re-infestation of the snails. Commissioner Thaell stated that with the investment and the benefit to the public, the Board should continue the funding of these efforts.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had identified this as a regional and statewide problem. He stated that since this is a statewide or regional issue, he had attempted to enlist the help of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the Northwest Florida Water Management District and other larger state entities to come up with a full time big picture solution, however, it is not moving forward. He further stated that there was a working group, however there was not a large agency to take charge and come up with a solution. Mr. Davis stated that the Board had authorized Blueprint 2000 to spend money to clean up the pond and all the money that was allocated has been spent. He stated that the pond will be transferred to the County in the near future because Blueprint 2000 does not retain ownership and there will be a park built around this pond. He stated that if the direction of the Board was for Blueprint to continue the efforts of removing the snails for the next year that his staff would continue to take the lead on that.

**Commissioner Thaell moved to have Blueprint to enter into negotiations with the vendor to continue the efforts to remove the snails from the pond at a cost not to exceed $7,000.** Commissioner Lightsey asked when the County government would be taking control of the pond. Mr. Tony Park stated that it was on the County’s agenda for the first meeting in October
2008. Mr. Davis stated that the operating permit was ready to be issued and the pond will transfer from FDOT to the County because Blueprint was acting as a liaison for the construction of the project. The pond should be transferred to the County in October and shortly thereafter they will begin the construction of the park around the pond. He further stated that he would recommend an upward limit of not more than $7,000. **Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion.** Mayor Marks asked if this problem was like kudzu. Mr. Davis stated that it was because each time there is a storm it washes additional snails from upstream into the pond. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that he would like to know the performance of the Capital Cascade ponds and its impact on the properties downstream and upstream. Mr. Davis stated that the pond performed very well relatively speaking (during T.S. Fay); however the pond’s performance should be based storm intensity and duration with the worst case being 4” in two hours and not 8” in 24 hours. He stated that he didn’t believe that South Monroe St. flooded at all or very little, the culvert that was installed functioned well and Myers Industrial Park did not flood, however Franklin Blvd. did flood.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS – 6:00 PM**

Commissioner Gillum stated that Blueprint 2000 has performed very well and that there has been amazing progress; however there are financial cutbacks because of the economy. He stated that it is his understanding that as new revenue is generated these projects will be put back on the table. Commissioner Gillum stated that the Board would hear public comment before they discussed the Budget items.

Mr. Nathan Bailey introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that in a meeting that he and his father, Jim Bailey, had with Blueprint staff he was told that if lawyers were not involved, there would be more money for the neighbors. He stated that he and his wife decided not to involve an attorney and they relayed the information to the other owners. He further stated that Blueprint and other government agencies give property owners 30% to 40% above appraisal. He further stated that he would take 20% above appraisal. Mr. Bailey stated that he knows that the option had been pulled off the table, however Tanglewood does flood. He stated that for Blueprint to buy property on the north side of the swamp and nothing on the south side of the swamp was a gamble. He further stated Tanglewood was on a buyout list for the County. Mr. Bailey stated that he heard someone at Blueprint say that they did not want to give money to Tanglewood because they didn’t want to give money to a bunch of drug addicts. He stated that he resented that statement because drugs are in every neighborhood.

Mr. Stephen Bailey introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that he would like to speak to the Board regarding Tanglewood Estates and that the ditches are improperly built and this was the reason that Leon County supported Tanglewood being one of the properties purchased for a floodplain mitigation by Blueprint. Mr. Bailey showed a map of the area and pictures during a flood event. He stated that water goes into the neighborhood from two directions. He stated that the property should not have been dropped as a possible mitigation site.
Mr. James Bailey introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that the county built a weir to manipulate water levels and that during a rain event he witnessed the water running back uphill into the neighborhood. He further stated that someone at Blueprint mentioned that there was a turbulence problem in that area.

Mayor Marks asked Mr. Davis if Blueprint was supposed to purchase the Tanglewood Estates property.

Mr. Davis stated that the County had provided several properties as possible mitigation locations for Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest. He stated that during the course of due diligence they determined that it did not satisfy their requirements for the mitigation sites and subsequently they looked at other parcels that did satisfy the various requirements.

Mayor Marks clarified that the County had stated that these were properties that were in a floodplain and that it should be acquired because they flood.

Mr. Davis stated that they had recommended this property and several others for review to determine if they met the mitigation requirements for the road project. He stated that in the course of doing due diligence it was determined that Tanglewood did not meet the requirements.

Mayor Marks asked if there was any obligation on the part of the County or Blueprint to purchase the property. Mr. Davis stated that there was no obligation on the part of Blueprint or the County.

Commissioner Katz asked if the County or the City were going to do anything about the flooding situation in the area, knowing that each government has set priorities. He also asked if the fact that a property floods played any part in determining whether the property should be purchased for a project since it would solve an additional problem. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint follows a very prescribed process and that the Federal Highway Administration and other agencies dictate the criteria for mitigation sites. He stated that the cost for acquiring the Tanglewood properties was going to be very expensive because it would include more than just the cost of the property, it would also include extensive relocation costs for all of the families. He stated that the estimate for the relocation cost would be more than $1 million. Mr. Ray Youmans stated that if Blueprint purchased Tanglewood which did not meet the mitigation needs, they would still have to purchase the other parcels to meet the mitigation needs.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he knew that the County had its own flood mitigation program and he asked if the County had made an offer to purchase the property prior to Blueprint coming on board. Mr. Tony Park indicated that the County had not. Commissioner Desloge asked if Blueprint had represented in any formal manner that these would be purchased. Mr. Davis stated that they had absolutely not made any formal offers to the property owners. He stated that through due diligence they were up front and didn’t sneak around. They went into the neighborhood to do surveys and appraisals of the property and they let the property owners know that they were there to do an assessment to determine if it was a possible site for mitigation. He reiterated that no offers were made.
Commissioner Rackleff stated that about five or six years ago a list was compiled of properties for buyout and there was a source of funding that provided about $1 million dollars per year. He stated that the County purchased 35 of the 200 properties that were on the list. He stated that because of the property tax cuts there is no longer any funding for the program even though the list is still in existence. He further stated that the list must be prioritized and many things factor into the cost of the property, such as willing sellers and the cost of the property.

Mr. Charles Stratton, Attorney, introduced himself and provided his address. Mr. Stratton stated that Blueprint had entered into agreements with FDOT which required it to follow state and federal regulations when acquiring properties for right of way. He stated that Blueprint was not following the state manuals and that they have stated that they do not have to comply with the manuals. He further stated that FDOT had sent Blueprint letters which told them that they have to comply with state regulations and that they could lose $50 million of state and federal money. Mr. Stratton stated that Blueprint was trying to get around the regulations and jerking the owners around.

Maribel Nicholson-Choice stated that the issues raised by Mr. Stratton are under litigation and that it would not be appropriate to discuss them. Mr. Stratton stated that these issues were not in litigation, however other matters were in litigation.

Commissioner Katz asked Mr. Stratton what issues other than the way owners are approached and dealt with concerned him and in what areas Blueprint was not complying with the regulations. Mr. Stratton stated that he was an eminent domain attorney and he worked for the FDOT for 7 years acquiring properties and complying with the manual. He stated that he was familiar with it and that this was the area that he was most concerned about. He further stated that he thought that there were other issues regarding areas that he is not exactly versed in.

Mayor Marks stated that there was some type of controversy with whether Blueprint was in compliance and the potential of losing funding. He stated that the Board needed to rely on legal counsel to determine if Blueprint was in compliance. Commissioner Gillum asked Mr. Davis to address the memo that he had sent to the commissioners regarding the method that Blueprint uses to acquire property.

Mr. Jeff Hunter introduced himself and provided his address. Mr. Hunter stated that he was at the last IA meeting and that he had been waiting about 3 ½ months for an answer to his question regarding the money for the bike/pedestrian issues. He referred the Board to the minutes of that meeting so that they could refresh their memories. Commissioner Gillum stated that the CAC chairman had addressed this issue earlier in the evening and that over 40% of the funding was going to bike/pedestrian program without regard to what the City and County were doing outside of the process. Mr. Hunter stated that he had not heard the statement because he had arrived after 5:30 pm. Commissioner Gillum stated that he would provide Mr. Hunter with a copy of Mr. Conger’s statement. Mr. Hunter stated that the City had funded the advertisements for the Blueprint 2000 program and that the City and County extracted money to be used for the bike/pedestrian program and he wanted to know why the money was not being used for that purpose.

Mr. Larry Hendricks introduced himself. He stated that he found the whole program to be disingenuous because the City is talking about discontinuing school crossing guards and that
some people in community want sidewalks. He read the Sales Tax Extension ballot language to the Board and stated that he felt that Blueprint was using the majority of the program’s money to build freeways for St. Joe. He mentioned new schools and the Orange Avenue widening and stated that they were only benefits to St. Joe and SouthWood instead of the community as a whole.

18. Adoption of the FY 2009 Blueprint Operating Budget and Resolution

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt the FY 2009 Operating Budget and related Budget Resolution.

Commissioner Katz moved to adopt the FY 2009 Operating Budget and related Budget Resolution. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. Mr. Davis stated that staff had presented the same budget as before with the exception of the request for an additional $50,000 for a new position for an Attorney I. He introduced George Reynolds who was currently working at Blueprint 2000 as a law clerk and who also had taken the bar and was awaiting the results. The motion carried unanimously 11-0.

19. Adoption of FY 2009-FY 2013 Capital Budget and Resolution

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the Revised Master Plan & FY 2009-2013 Capital Budget as presented and appropriate Fiscal Year 2009 of the Capital Budget and Related Budget Resolution.

Commissioner Katz moved to adopt the FY 2009-FY 2013 Capital Budget and Resolution. Commissioner Rackleff stated that given the flooding that has occurred recently, he was disturbed by the reduction in stormwater programs. He stated that there were four neighborhoods where emergency roads were needed so that residents could leave their neighborhoods. Mr. Davis stated that the Board’s guidance was very clear to staff when they stated that Capital Cascade was a stormwater project and to put remaining money towards stormwater issues and not the amenities. He stated that staff had looked at all possibilities and had eliminated or curtailed as much as possible and there were not a whole lot of options. He further stated that as money becomes available and if leveraging is effective then the money will be reallocated and prioritized by the Board on an annual basis.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that timing was everything and the effects of the economy were not predictable, therefore the projects that are left undone are the projects that get cut. She stated that the Board reprioritized the projects as best that could be done, recognizing that Blueprint was not the be all and end all for the needed projects of the community, and that the program should not be expected to fund everything. She stated that the City and County would need to look at their own stormwater budgets to fund the existing community projects.

Commissioner Katz stated that he would like to echo what Commissioner Rackleff said about needing more money because of the stormwater projects. He stated that the Board needed to recognize that the flooding of the previous weeks was extraordinary and that the Board was making the best decisions based on the circumstances.
Commissioner DePuy stated that he would like to recognize the $90+ million of leveraging money and he stated that Blueprint was meeting what was promised to the voters. He further stated that the road projects included bike lanes, pedestrian walkways and the retrofit ponds which have gone unnoticed. He stated that as the revenues return the priorities will be adjusted.

Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously 11-0.**

**VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

**VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Commissioner Gillum stated that the Board members had received a memorandum from Mr. Davis regarding the incentive program and issues around whether or not taxpayers’ money was being wasted in the way that they have purchased property. He stated that the memo gave a side-by-side comparison of the traditional right-of-way approach and using the incentive program and the difference was very substantial. Mr. Davis stated that the memo had to do with the incentive offer program which is an approved program authorized by the Federal Highway Administration and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). FDOT did a ten year study and in the course of the study they determined that they were paying 155% of the appraised value of parcels and they were paying an additional 20% in fees and expenses. Based upon that study, they determined that if they offered an incentive above the appraised value of the property that there was a great potential in savings of time and money and increased property owner satisfaction. He stated that the baseline was the appraised value and that based on the numbers that Blueprint 2000 has paid for the parcels which they have purchased, the cost would have been $16.9 million using the FDOT traditional method, however using the incentive program the cost for the parcels was $13.2 million. He further stated that the fees and expenses for the parcels would have been $3.4 million, however using the incentive program, these costs were $540,000 which is an 85% reduction in costs and fees. He stated that the incentive program is one that is saving the taxpayers money, and the property owners are getting the money and they are being paid more than the appraised value. He stated that this program does follow the FDOT standards and that FDOT had done a survey of 11 parcels for the E-2 project. Mr. Davis stated that he had received a letter stating that the program was in compliance with the FDOT policy. He stated that there were three shortcomings, (1.) Using the wrong form (2.) Did not have the right form in the file (3.) Did not round up the incentive offer to the nearest $10. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had purchased around 45 parcels at a cost of about $26 million. He stated that early in the program during the E-1 project that a mistake was made in the calculation of the incentive on a couple of properties. He stated that in these cases the property owner received more than the appraised value and they accepted the offer under the advice of their legal counsel.

Commissioner Gillum asked if the Board would object to the City Auditor (if there was room in his schedule) to conduct a third party audit the program. Mr. Davis stated that the City does a general financial audit of the operating budget. He stated that there are safe-guards in place on the right-of-way policy, such as appraiser and a review appraisal by FDOT.
Commissioner Lightsey stated that she has no objection to the suggestion by Commissioner Gillum, however she would suggest that only a sample of properties would be done of the 44 parcels, that would be chosen by the auditor. She stated that she did not want the auditor to reprioritize his current audit schedule.

Mayor Marks stated that he did not want a motion to have this done.

Mr. Davis stated that right-of-way acquisition is a very complicated career field and Mr. McCall will be starting at ground zero to do an audit, therefore he will have to be educated on the process. He suggested that they approach the FDOT Right-of-Way Manager at the central office to handle the audit. Commissioner Gillum stated that he would like to approach both the City Auditor and the FDOT Right-of-Way Manager.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Gillum adjourned the meeting at 7:00 pm.

APPROVED:  ATTEST:

Andrew Gillum  Shelonda Meeks
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA

The CAC Chairman’s report is attached as a part of the record.
#8 Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road Landscaping Plans
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road Landscaping Plans

Date: February 23, 2009
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Snyder
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to solicit approval from the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) for Blueprint 2000 to use the services of the City of Tallahassee’s Landscape Architect for the preparation of landscaping plans on this project. The landscaping plans will be prepared as a separate stand-alone set of plans with actual installation of the landscaping performed either as a supplemental agreement or under separate contract after the Capital Circle Southeast roadway reconstruction is complete.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road is a $15 million Stimulus Package project. When stimulus dollars are assigned to this project, Blueprint will contract with a design/build team to complete the roadway design and construct this 1.5 mile section of Capital Circle Southeast. As the roadway design nears completion, Blueprint 2000 will develop a scope of work and fee with the COT Landscape Architect. A work order will be generated by Blueprint for COT Landscape Architect personnel to prepare the landscape design, plans and permits. A supplemental agreement will be negotiated with the Design/Build Team for this work or a separate landscaping contract will be issued after the Capital Circle Southeast roadway reconstruction is complete.

Advantages of using COT landscaping personnel for this project are:
1. COT will prepare the plans at a cost savings
2. Desired plants and landscaping element will be detailed on the plans
3. Plan reviews and time-consuming revisions will be eliminated
4. COT will have more control of landscaping/maintenance requirements

Disadvantages of using COT landscaping personnel for this project are:
1. Timely completion of the design and plans should workload for COT landscaping personnel increase
2. Taking work away from private sector landscape architects
3. Can not contract for a package project with Design/Build Team
OPTION 1:

a. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to contract with the City of Tallahassee’s Landscape Architect within the Department of Public Works to prepare the landscape design, plans and permits necessary for the Capital Circle Southeast Roadway Reconstruction Project between Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Road.

b. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to either negotiate with the Design/Build Team for this landscaping work or solicit for a separate landscape contractor to install the landscaping along this section of Capital Circle SE after roadway reconstruction is complete.

OPTION 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

a. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to contract with the City of Tallahassee’s Landscape Architect within the Department of Public Works to prepare the landscape design, plans and permits necessary for the Capital Circle Southeast Roadway Reconstruction Project between Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Road.

b. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to either negotiate with the Design/Build Team for this landscaping work or solicit for a separate landscape contractor to install the landscaping along this section of Capital Circle SE after roadway reconstruction is complete.

ATTACHMENTS: None.
#9
Acceptance of FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2008 Operating Fund Balance

Date: February 23, 2009
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Phil Maher/Rick Feldman
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests acceptance of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Blueprint program, for the year ended September 30, 2008, and the appropriation of FY 2008 Blueprint 2000 encumbrances and unexpended operating budget funds.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Annual Financial Report of the Blueprint 2000 program for the year ended September 30, 2008 has been completed and is being presented to the Intergovernmental Agency’s Board of Directors. Included are the opinion of the external auditors related to the statements presented, their management letter, and the auditors’ reports on compliance and internal controls. It should be noted, as in previous years, the Agency has received an unqualified opinion. Carr Riggs and Ingram, external auditors for both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County, performed the audit. The Board of Directors is requested to accept the FY 2008 CAFR for the Intergovernmental Agency Blueprint 2000 program.

At the end of the fiscal year, $41,804,106 remained unexpended. $48,935 is encumbered for contracts, and $41,755,171 is available for appropriation. Staff is requesting the Board to approve an increase in the FY 2009 adopted budget of $48,935 for outstanding encumbrances and $41,755,171 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund as shown below.

$30,401,545   Approved FY 2009 Operating Budget
  48,935       FY 2008 Carryover for encumbrances
 41,755,171    FY 2008 Unexpended Balance transfer to Capital Projects Fund
$72,205,651   Total FY 2009 Amended Budget

Options
Option 1: Accept the FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2009 Operating Budget of $48,935 for encumbrances and $41,755,171 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund.

Option 2: Provide alternate direction to staff.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Accept the FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2009 Operating Budget of $48,935 for encumbrances and $41,755,171 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund.

ACTION BY CAC:
The CAC approved the recommended action.

ATTACHMENTS:
FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) (To be provided when available)
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PREPARED BY:
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Letter of Transmittal
Government Finance Officers Association Certificate of Achievement
Organizational Chart
List of Directors and Managers
February 9, 2009

To the Chairman and members of the Board of the
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of
the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (the
Agency) for the fiscal year ended September 30,
2008, is hereby submitted pursuant to Florida
Statutes, Chapter 11, Section 45, and Chapters
10.550 and 10.600 Rules of the Auditor General
of the State of Florida.

Management assumes full responsibility for the
completeness and reliability of the information
contained in this report, based upon a
comprehensive framework of internal control that it
has established for this purpose. Because the cost
of internal control should not exceed anticipated
benefits, the objective is to provide reasonable,
rather than absolute, assurance that the financial
statements are free of any material misstatements.

The certified public accounting firm of Carr, Riggs
& Ingram, LLC has issued an unqualified opinion
on the Agency’s financial statements for the year
ended September 30, 2008. The independent
auditors’ report is located at the front of the
financial section of this report.

Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD & A)
immediately follows the independent auditors’ report
and provides a narrative introduction, overview,
and analysis of the basic financial statements. This
letter of transmittal is designed to complement the
MD & A and should be read in conjunction with it.

PROFILE OF THE AGENCY

Pursuant to Section 163.01(7), Florida Statutes,
Leon County, Florida, and the City of Tallahassee,
Florida, created the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency to govern the project
management structure for the project planning and
the construction of the Blueprint 2000 projects.
The Board of County Commissioners and the City
Commission constitute the Board of Directors for
the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency.

The County Administrator and the City Manager
approve staffing for this Agency. Various
committees provide professional advice and serve
in advisory capacities.

Tallahassee, the capital city of Florida, was
incorporated in 1825, twenty years before Florida
was admitted to the Union. The City is governed
by a Mayor and four Commissioners elected at-
large. The City Commission appoints the City
Manager, the City Treasurer-Clerk, the City
Auditor, and the City Attorney. Collectively the
appointed officials are responsible for all
administrative aspects of the government, with
most falling under the purview of the City
Manager.

The Leon County Board of County Commissioners
consists of seven members, five of whom are
elected within districts, with the remaining two elected at-large. Each Commissioner is elected to a four year term with the position of Chairperson selected annually on a rotating basis. A County Administrator administers all county offices not governed by elected County officials.

In 1989 the voters of Leon County approved an additional one-cent sales tax, increasing the sales tax total to seven and one half cents. The additional penny tax, levied through the year 2004, was used for capital projects in the areas of transportation and law enforcement.

In November of 2000, voters approved a 15 year extension of the penny sales tax, with 80% of the proceeds to be used for a variety of transportation, stormwater, and environmental projects identified in Blueprint 2000, a study produced by a citizens group representing business and environmental interests, to help guide the community’s future growth.

The Agency is required to adopt a final budget prior to the close of the fiscal year. This annual budget serves as the foundation for the Agency’s financial planning and control. The annual budget process involves input and collaboration between the Blueprint 2000 Agency Executive Director, members of the Intergovernmental Agency, and input and review from the various committees.

FACTORS AFFECTING FINANCIAL CONDITION

The economy of Leon County is strongly oriented toward governmental and educational activities. The presence of the State Capital and two major universities help to shape Leon County’s population as relatively young, well educated, and affluent.

The 2007 American Community Survey results shows a racially diverse community, with minorities accounting for 42.9% of the population, with African-American comprising 35.8% of the City of Tallahassee. The population is young, with a median age of 26.9. Leon County residents have historically attained a very high level of education. According to the 2007 American Community Survey, 41.8% of area residents aged 25 or older have completed at least four years of college, compared to 25.8% of the state on average.

The 2007 median family income in Leon County is $70,818 is comparable to the national median. Of the workers in Leon County, 45.3% are in management or professional occupations compared to 34.6% nationally.

The level of governmental employment has a stabilizing effect on the economy and helps to minimize unemployment. In September 2008, unemployment was 5.2% in the Tallahassee Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The State’s unemployment was 7.1% in the same month. The percentage of employees employed by local, state, and federal government is approximately 36% of the workforce. The unemployment rate is one of many economic indicators utilized to evaluate the condition of the economy.

Population growth trends are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tallahassee</th>
<th>Unincorporated</th>
<th>Leon County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>27,237</td>
<td>24,353</td>
<td>51,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>48,174</td>
<td>26,051</td>
<td>74,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>71,897</td>
<td>31,150</td>
<td>103,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>81,548</td>
<td>67,107</td>
<td>148,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>124,773</td>
<td>67,720</td>
<td>192,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>150,624</td>
<td>88,828</td>
<td>239,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 estimated</td>
<td>177,852</td>
<td>97,040</td>
<td>274,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 projected</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>98,200</td>
<td>279,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 projected</td>
<td>205,300</td>
<td>107,100</td>
<td>312,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 projected</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>114,800</td>
<td>340,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously indicated, the Agency is primarily funded via a penny sales tax collection which is predicated on retail sales; the following chart indicates the trend in retail sales (in thousands) for Leon County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4,725,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4,916,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,268,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,613,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,603,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,655,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,154,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,594,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,154,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7,358,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,265,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Trends**

**Residential Construction**

Another factor that is a strong indicator of the local economy and influences the City and County’s financial condition is the issuance of building permits for residential construction. Due to the condition of the national, state, and local economy, single-family residential building permits in Leon County decreased 51% in fiscal year 2008 as compared to the prior year’s 21% decrease. Permits for multi-family units were down 50% in fiscal year 2008 following a 7% increase in fiscal year 2007. This decline in the housing market and dwindling repair and replacement costs that result from hurricane damage has negatively affected sales tax collections.

**Commercial Development**

In fiscal year 2008, $126 million of new construction was permitted in Leon County, an increase of 16% over fiscal year 2007. Private office buildings and hotels accounted for approximately 45% of the commercial permitting activity in fiscal year 2007. The City of Tallahassee is continuing implementation of a number of strategies to provide a positive business climate and help create an “18-hour”, multi-use downtown district. Some of these initiatives include the creation of a Downtown Community Redevelopment Area, continued infrastructure and streetscape improvements, marketing sites for redevelopment, providing incentives for historic preservation, the creation of a Cultural Plan, and the addition of new attractions.

**Long-term Financial Planning**

The Agency has prepared a Master Plan of the Blueprint 2000 projects that is reviewed and updated three times per year. Financing for these projects is continually evaluated in terms of pay-as-you-go financing (either sales tax collections or grants, when available) or long-term financing. The current state of the economy and the future outlook of sales tax collections have compelled the Agency to scrutinize the Master Plan and reduce long range projects accordingly.

**Awards and Acknowledgments**

The Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) awarded a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting to Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency for its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2007. The Certificate of achievement is a prestigious national award that recognizes conformance with the highest standards for preparation of government financial reports. In order to be awarded a Certificate of Achievement, the Agency must publish a comprehensive annual financial report; whose contents satisfy both generally accepted accounting principles and applicable legal requirements. A Certificate of Achievement is valid for a period of one year only. We believe our current report continues to conform to Certificate of Achievement Program requirements, and we are submitting it to the GFOA to determine its eligibility.
for a new certificate. The preparation of this report on a timely basis could not be accomplished without the efficient and dedicated services of the staff of the City of Tallahassee’s Accounting Services Division, who compiled this report. We would also like to thank the members of the City and County Commissions for their interest and support in planning and conducting the financial operations of the Agency in a responsible and progressive manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Davis
Executive Director
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting

Presented to

Blueprint 2000
Intergovernmental Agency
Florida

For its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
for the Fiscal Year Ended
September 30, 2007

A Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting is presented by the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada to government units and public employee retirement systems whose comprehensive annual financial reports (CAFRs) achieve the highest standards in government accounting and financial reporting.
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Board of Directors
Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
Tallahassee, Florida

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities and each major fund of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (the Agency), as of and for the year ended September 30, 2008, which collectively comprise the Agency's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Agency’s management. Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinions.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the governmental activities and each major fund of the Agency, as of September 30, 2008, and the respective changes in financial position for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated February 9, 2009, on our consideration of the Agency's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.
The management’s discussion and analysis and budgetary comparison information, as listed in the table of contents, are not a required part of the basic financial statements but are supplementary information required by accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Agency’s basic financial statements. The introductory section and statistical section, as listed in the table of contents, are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of state financial assistance is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. The schedule of expenditures of state financial assistance has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The introductory and statistical sections have not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, accordingly, we express no opinion on them.

Cam, Riggs & Oengus, LLC
Tallahassee, Florida
February 9, 2009
BLUEPRINT 2000

Management’s Discussion and Analysis

This section of Blueprint 2000’s annual financial report is designed to provide the reader with a better understanding of the financial activity for the fiscal year that ended September 30, 2008. It should be read in conjunction with the Transmittal Letter at the front of this report and the financial statements, which follow this section. Notes mentioned below are Notes to the Financial Statements, which follow the statements.

FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS

- Total assets at September 30, 2008 totaled $308.4 million, representing an increase of $34 million primarily due to an increase in construction in progress paid for by grant funds received and bond money.

- Liabilities at September 30, 2008 totaled $198.1 million, representing a decrease of $7.4 million primarily resulting from a decrease in obligations under securities lent.

- Total net assets increased by $41.4 million during fiscal year 2008 due to the utilization of bond money and loans to finance projects.

- Revenues increased by $10.7 million due primarily to increased grants and contributions received during the year and increased investment earnings resulting from the 2007 bond proceeds being invested for the entire current year but only for 2 weeks in fiscal year 2007. Expenses of $10.2 million were $3.7 million more than fiscal year 2007, primarily due to higher interest expenses associated with the 2007 bonds.

An Overview of the Financial Statements

Required Components of Blueprint 2000’s Annual Financial Report

- Management’s Discussion and Analysis
- Basic Financial Statements
  - Government-wide Financial Statements
  - Fund Financial Statements
- Notes to the Financial Statements
- Required Supplementary Information
The focus of the financial statements is on both Blueprint 2000’s overall financial status and the major individual funds. The following briefly describes the component parts.

**GOVERNMENT-WIDE STATEMENTS**

The government-wide financial statements are designed to report information about Blueprint 2000 as a whole using accounting methods similar to those used by private-sector companies. The Statement of Net Assets combines all of Blueprint 2000’s current financial resources with capital assets and long-term obligations. Net assets, the difference between Blueprint 2000’s assets and liabilities, are one way to measure its financial health.

Blueprint 2000 is considered a single-function government with all activities classified as governmental rather than business-type. Consequently, the government-wide financial statements include only governmental activities. These are services that are financed primarily from shared revenues. Business-type activities by definition include services for which specific fees are charged, which are meant to cover the cost of providing those services.

**FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. All of Blueprint’s funds are considered to be Governmental funds. Blueprint maintains three individual funds - a general fund, a special revenue fund and a debt service fund; all of which are considered major funds. The following chart describes the fund requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Includes Blueprint’s revenues from bond sales, shared revenues, investment income, operational expenditures, and approved community projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required financial statements</strong></td>
<td>Balance Sheet, Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting basis and measurement focus</strong></td>
<td>Modified accrual accounting and current financial resources focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of asset / liability information</strong></td>
<td>Only assets expected to be used up and liabilities that come due during the year or soon thereafter, no capital assets are included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of inflow / outflow information</strong></td>
<td>Revenues for which cash is received during or soon after the end of the year; expenditures when goods or services have been received and payment is due during the year or soon thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The following table reflects the condensed Statement of Net Assets compared to the prior year. As indicated in the table, Blueprint’s net assets increased by $41.4 million in fiscal year 2008. Total assets increased by $34 million primarily due to increases in capital assets resulting from Blueprint’s continued road construction program. Total liabilities decreased by $7.4 million primarily due to decreased obligations under securities lent. These obligations are a function of investment balances which decreased substantially in the current year.

Table 1
Statement of Net Assets
As of September 30
Governmental Activities
(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>$141,011</td>
<td>$146,255</td>
<td>$(5,244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent assets</td>
<td>167,355</td>
<td>128,088</td>
<td>39,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>308,366</td>
<td>274,343</td>
<td>34,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>36,074</td>
<td>36,646</td>
<td>(572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>162,068</td>
<td>168,922</td>
<td>(6,854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>198,142</td>
<td>205,568</td>
<td>(7,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in capital assets, net of related debt</td>
<td>56,171</td>
<td>23,160</td>
<td>33,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>54,053</td>
<td>45,615</td>
<td>8,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$110,224</td>
<td>$68,775</td>
<td>$41,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Net Assets

Blueprint’s total revenues were $51.7 million in fiscal year 2008, comprised primarily of shared revenues of $29.6 million, capital grants and contributions of $15.2 million, and investment income of $6.9 million, representing an increase of $10.7 million compared to 2007; the increase was primarily due to Blueprint’s aggressive solicitation of federal and state grants for the Blueprint projects and a large increase in investment income resulting from the 2007 bond proceeds being invested for the entire current year but only for 2 weeks in the fiscal year 2007. Expenses were $10.2 million during that same period, $3.7 million more than the previous year primarily as a result of higher interest expenses associated with the 2007 bonds. The following chart shows revenues and expenses by sources and programs and the resulting change in net assets.
GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

All activities are classified as governmental because expenditures are funded by shared revenues, grants, and income on invested funds. The cost of all activities in fiscal year 2008 was $10.2 million, while revenues were $51.7 million. The increase in net assets was $41.4 million.

Revenue Impacts:

• Collection of shared revenues during FY 2008 were $1,396,000 less than FY 2007, reflecting the downturn in the State of Florida economy.

Expense Impacts:

• Expenses in fiscal year 2008 are for interest on the bonds and loans and for personnel and operating costs of administering the Blueprint program.

• Expenses also include contractual and professional services and other expenses related to approved Blueprint projects, which do not meet the definition of a capital asset.

Table 2
Changes in Net Assets
Governmental Activities
(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants and contributions</td>
<td>$15,173</td>
<td>$7,755</td>
<td>$7,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared revenues</td>
<td>29,593</td>
<td>30,989</td>
<td>(1,396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment revenue</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>4,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>(193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>51,694</td>
<td>40,994</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>(213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on long-term debt</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>3,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation to City</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>10,245</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>3,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Net Assets</td>
<td>$41,449</td>
<td>$34,459</td>
<td>$6,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of September 30, 2008, Blueprint reported combined ending fund balances of $117.8 million, which is only $299,000 lower than last year. Of this amount, $43.9 million constitutes unreserved fund balance, which is available for spending. The remainder of fund balance is reserved for the following purposes: 1) to liquidate contracts and purchase orders ($20.5 million), 2) to complete approved projects ($43.2 million), and 3) to pay future debt service ($10.2 million).

### General Fund Budgetary Highlights

As indicated on the schedule comparing the original budget in Blueprint’s General Fund to the final budget, which is included in the required supplementary information to the financial statements, there were no differences between the original and final revenue and expenditure budgets in total. Relative to the differences between final budgets and actual results, shared revenues were $4.1 million below estimates reflecting the downturn in the State economy; in addition transfers to other funds were $43.9 million below the appropriation amount as Blueprint was able to utilize 2007 bond money, loans and grant money to finance capital projects rather than using cash from shared revenues which would have been transferred from the general fund.

### Capital Assets

Blueprint’s capital assets, consisting primarily of construction in progress on road projects, were $165.8 million as of September 30, 2008. This represents an increase of $39.4 million over September 30, 2007. For more details about capital assets, please see the Notes to the Financial Statements, Notes I(D)3 and III(B).

Major capital asset transactions during the current fiscal year included the following:

- Construction work continued on the widening and expanding of Capital Circle Southeast; construction in progress as of the close of the fiscal year had reached $59 million.
- Construction work also continued on the widening and expanding of Capital Circle Northwest; construction in progress as of the close of the fiscal year had reached $89.6 million.
**LONG-TERM DEBT**

At September 30, 2008, Blueprint had $167.7 million in long-term debt outstanding. Of this amount, $126.1 million represents tax-exempt bonds secured by sales tax collections and $41.6 million represents loans from the State Infrastructure Bank maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation. These loans are issued at below market rates of interest. During the year, Blueprint’s total debt decreased by a net amount of $2 million, due to the net effect of $6.5 million new loan debt and bond principal reduction of $8.5 million. For more information about Blueprint’s Long-Term Debt, see the Notes to the Financial Statements, NoteIII(D).

**ECONOMIC AND OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY IMPACT BLUEPRINT’S FINANCIAL POSITION**

Blueprint’s funding from the local option one-cent sales tax is impacted by the local economy. A number of initiatives have begun that will have a positive impact on Tallahassee and Leon County’s economy. These include the creation of a Community Redevelopment Agency, revising regulations to encourage more redevelopment, obtaining federal and state funds to assist in redevelopment and affordable housing, and making needed transportation and stormwater improvements. In addition, the City is in the process of a $50 million neighborhood infrastructure program aimed at providing the necessary infrastructure to revitalize residential neighborhoods.

The renewal of the local option sales tax began in December 2004 and continues for 15 years. During the planning and budgeting process projections of the state and local economy were used to estimate the tax revenues for those years and estimate the amount that would be available for approved projects. Current projections of these revenues indicate a reduction in the original estimated growth rate due to a softening of the state economy; the impact of this potential reduction in revenue would be to have less monies available in future years to complete the Blueprint projects.

**FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET**

Blueprint 2000’s General Fund Budget for fiscal year 2009 totals $72.2 million, consisting of $1.2 million for administration, an $20.3 million transfer to the Debt Service Fund, and a $50.7 million transfer to the Construction Fund for projects. Funding for the budget is based upon a fund balance carry forward of $41.8 million and $30.4 million of shared revenues.

**FINANCIAL CONTACT**

This financial report is designed to provide citizens, taxpayers, customers, and creditors with a general overview of Blueprint 2000’s finances and to demonstrate the Agency’s accountability for the money it receives. If you have questions about the report or need additional financial information, contact the City of Tallahassee’s Accounting Services Manager at Mailbox A 29, 300 South Adams Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1731 or via the web at rick.feldman@talgov.com.
BASIC
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

These basic financial statements provide a summary overview of the financial position as well as the operating results of Blueprint 2000. They also serve as an introduction to the more detailed statements and schedules that follow in subsequent sections:

Government-wide Financial Statements
Blueprint 2000 Fund Financial Statements
Notes to Financial Statements
### BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY
#### STATEMENT OF NET ASSETS

**September 30, 2008**

*(in thousands)*

#### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$38,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Lending Collateral</td>
<td>7,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Other Governments</td>
<td>4,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents- Restricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments-Restricted</td>
<td>9,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Lending Collateral-Restricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Other Governments-Restricted</td>
<td>6,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest-Restricted</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>$141,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncurrent Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized Bond Issue Costs</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Construction in Progress</td>
<td>165,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Net of Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Noncurrent Assets</strong></td>
<td>$167,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$308,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligations Under Securities Lending</td>
<td>$7,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated Absences</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligations Under Securities Lending-Payable from Restricted Assets</td>
<td>12,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable-Payable from Restricted Assets</td>
<td>2,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned Revenue</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest Payable</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and Loans Payable</td>
<td>12,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$36,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncurrent Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated Absences</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB Obligation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and Loans Payable</td>
<td>154,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized Bond Premium</td>
<td>7,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Noncurrent Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$162,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$198,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in Capital Assets, Net of Related Debt</td>
<td>56,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted For:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>7,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>46,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$110,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$308,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
### Total Fund Balances per the Governmental Fund Financial Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balances per the Governmental Fund Financial Statements</td>
<td>117,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds payable are not due and payable in the current period, and therefore</td>
<td>(126,090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond premiums are not due and payable in the current period and therefore</td>
<td>(7,196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond issue costs are not available to pay current period expenditures and</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore are not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank Loans are not due and payable in the current</td>
<td>(41,577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period and therefore are not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Leave liability is not due and payable in the current period and</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore is not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation is not due and payable in the current period and</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore is not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets used in governmental activities are not current financial</td>
<td>165,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources and therefore are not reported in the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Assets per the Government-wide Statement of Net Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets per the Government-wide Statement of Net Assets</td>
<td>110,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
Net Changes in Fund Balances per the Governmental Fund Financial Statements $ (299)

Amounts reported for governmental activities in the Statement of Activities are different because:

Governmental Funds report capital outlays as expenditures. However, in the Statement of Activities, the cost of those assets is allocated over their estimated useful lives and reported as depreciation expense. This is the amount by which capital outlays exceeded depreciation of $14,000 in the current period. 39,366

The change in compensated absences which is reported in the Statement of Activities does not require the use of current financial resources and therefore is not reported as an expenditure in governmental funds. (13)

The change in Net OPEB obligation which is reported in the Statement of Activities does not require the use of current financial resources and therefore is not reported as an expenditure in governmental funds. (17)

Proceeds from the State Infrastructure Bank Loan are current financial resources in the fund statement but are recorded as a liability in the Statement of Net Assets (6,448)

Repayment of bond principal is reported as an expenditure in governmental funds. Principal payments reduce the liability in the Statement of Net Assets and do not result in an expenditure in the Statement of Activities. 8,475

Amortization of bond issue costs are not current financial uses and therefore are not reported in the funds. (99)

Amortization of bond premiums are not current financial resources and therefore are not reported in the funds. 484

Change in Net Assets per the Government-wide Statement of Activities $ 41,449

The notes to the financial statements are an integral part of these financial statements.
NOTES TO THE
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

NOTE I  –  Summary of Significant Accounting Policies
NOTE II –  Stewardship, Compliance, and Accountability
NOTE III –  Detail Notes - All Funds
NOTE IV  –  Other Information
NOTE I - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

This Summary of Significant Accounting Policies is presented to assist the reader in interpreting the financial statements. The policies are considered essential and should be read in conjunction with the accompanying financial statements. The accounting policies of the Agency conform to generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) as applicable to governmental units. This report, the accounting systems and classification of accounts conform to standards of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

A. REPORTING ENTITY

In October 2000, the Agency was created through an inter-local agreement between the City of Tallahassee (City) and Leon County, Florida (County) as authorized by Section 163.01(7) Florida Statutes. It was created to provide project management for the planning and construction of various specified projects included in the inter-local agreement. The City Commission and the Board of County Commissioners constitute the Agency’s Board of Directors. The Agency is not a component unit of the County, the City, or any other entity. In addition, the Agency has not identified any other entities for which the Agency has operational or financial relationships that would require them to be included as component units of the Agency.

The primary source of revenue to fund the projects included in the inter-local agreement is collection of a 1% local government infrastructure sales surtax, approved by the voters of Leon County, which began December 1, 2004 and will end December 31, 2019. The Agency receives 80% of the collection of the tax to fund its projects and the remaining 20% is split evenly between the City and the County.

B. GOVERNMENT-WIDE AND FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The government-wide financial statements report information on all of the activities of the Agency. The effect of interfund activity has been removed from the government-wide statements. These statements include the Statement of Net Assets and the Statement of Activities.

Separate fund financial statements are also provided for the individual governmental funds of the Agency. The Agency has no other types of funds. All funds are treated as major funds and are therefore presented in separate columns in the fund financial statements. The fund financial statements include the Balance Sheet and the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances.
NOTE I (CONTINUED)

The Statement of Activities demonstrates the degree to which the direct expenses of a given function or segment are offset by program revenues. Direct expenses are those that are clearly identifiable with a specific function or segment. Program revenues are revenues that derive directly from the program itself or from parties outside the reporting government’s taxpayers or citizenry. Program revenues reduce the net cost of the function to be financed from the government revenues. Program revenues in the current year consisted of grant revenues from the Florida Department of Transportation, the Florida Department of Community Affairs, and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission that were all used for land purchases and the construction of projects.

C. MEASUREMENT FOCUS, BASIS OF ACCOUNTING, AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT PRESENTATION

Basis of accounting refers to when revenues and expenditures are recognized in the accounts and reported in the financial statements regardless of the measurement focus applied.

The government-wide financial statements are reported using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of related cash flows.

Governmental fund financial statements are reported using the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized as soon as they are both measurable and available. Revenues are considered to be available when they are collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to pay liabilities of the current period. For this purpose, the government considers revenues to be available if they are collected within 60 days of the end of the current fiscal period. Expenditures generally are recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting.

When an expense or expenditure is incurred for purposes for which both restricted and unrestricted net assets are available, it is the Agency’s policy to use restricted resources first, and then unrestricted resources as they are needed.
NOTE I (CONTINUED)

Investment revenues associated with the current fiscal period are considered to be susceptible to accrual and have been recognized as revenues of the current fiscal period. All other revenue items are considered to be measurable and available by the Agency.

The Agency reports the following major governmental funds:

• The General Fund is the Agency’s primary operating fund. It accounts for all financial resources of the Agency, except those required to be accounted for in another fund.

• The Special Revenue Fund accounts for bond proceeds, loan proceeds, and various grant revenues expended for Agency projects.

• The Debt Service Fund is used for the accumulation of resources for the payment of interest and principal on the bonds and State Infrastructure Bank loans.

D. ASSETS, LIABILITIES, AND NET ASSETS

1. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS/INVESTMENTS - The Agency considers cash on hand and demand deposits with an original maturity of 90 days or less to be cash and cash equivalents. The Agency’s investments are stated at fair value based on quoted market values. The investments are in the Florida Department of Treasury Special Purpose Investment Account. This investment account has an AA-f rating from Standard and Poor’s.

2. RESTRICTED ASSETS – Certain proceeds of the Agency’s revenue bonds, certain resources set aside for their repayment, and certain other amounts, are classified as restricted assets on the Statement of Net Assets because their use is limited by applicable bond covenants or are otherwise restricted for use by the Agency.

3. CAPITAL ASSETS - Capital assets include land, equipment and infrastructure assets. Infrastructure assets are defined as public domain assets and include items such as roads, bridges, curbs and gutters, streets and sidewalks, and drainage systems that are immovable and of value only to the government. Capital assets, other than infrastructure assets, are capitalized when they have an initial, individual cost of at least $1,000 and an estimated useful life greater than one year; infrastructure assets are capitalized when they have an expected cost of at least $100,000. Capital assets are recorded at cost when purchased. Donated capital assets, which generally consist of land and easements, are recorded at the estimated fair market value at the date of the donation based on appraisals or donor’s cost. Equipment is depreciated using the straight-line method over an estimated useful life of 5 to 10 years. The cost of normal maintenance and repairs that do not add to the value of the asset or materially extend asset lives are not capitalized.
Included within the Agency’s construction in progress is the construction and/or acquisition of infrastructure assets for the City, the County, and the State of Florida. The Agency accumulates these costs while it manages the particular project. Upon completion of the project, the assets (e.g., land, right-of-way, facilities, etc.) are transferred from the Agency to the appropriate government and such government is thereafter responsible for maintaining the transferred assets.

4. **Compensated Absences** - Employees earn vacation and sick leave starting with the first day of employment. Vacation leave is earned based on creditable service hours worked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Hours</th>
<th>Creditable Leave earned per hour</th>
<th>Creditable Leave earned per hour</th>
<th>Creditable Leave earned per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2,079</td>
<td>0.057693</td>
<td>0.057693</td>
<td>0.057693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,080 - 10,400</td>
<td>0.080770</td>
<td>0.080770</td>
<td>0.069231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,401 - 20,800</td>
<td>0.092308</td>
<td>0.092308</td>
<td>0.080770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 20,800</td>
<td>0.103847</td>
<td>0.103847</td>
<td>0.092308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A maximum of 344 hours of vacation leave time may be carried over from one calendar year to the next for executive employees and a maximum of 264 hours for senior management and general employees. An employee who terminates employment with the Agency is paid for any unused vacation leave accumulated to the time of termination.

Sick leave is earned at the rate of .023077 hours for each hour of service with no maximum limit on the number of hours which may be accumulated.

An employee who terminates from the Agency for any reason other than termination for cause will be paid one-half of the total amount of sick leave (without regard to catastrophic illness leave) accumulated by him or her on the effective date of termination. If the employee dies, the sick leave amount will be paid to the employee’s beneficiary or estate. Retiring employees can elect the option of using the accumulated sick leave amount to purchase single coverage health insurance in lieu of receiving payment for such accumulated sick leave.

Accumulated current and long-term vacation and sick leave amounts are accrued when earned in the government-wide financial statements. A liability for the accumulated vacation and sick leave is reported in the governmental funds only if it is expected to be paid as a result of employee resignation or retirement as of September 30, 2008.
NOTE I (CONTINUED)

5. **BOND PREMIUM AND ISSUANCE COSTS** - In the government-wide financial statements, long-term debt and other long-term obligations are reported as liabilities in the applicable governmental activities. Bond premium and issuance costs are deferred and will be amortized over the life of the bonds at the rate at which the principal payments are made which approximates the effective interest method.

6. **NET ASSETS AND FUND BALANCE** - In the government-wide financial statements, net assets represent amounts invested in capital assets (net of related debt), amounts restricted for debt service payments, and amounts restricted for capital projects as required by enabling legislation. In the governmental fund financial statements, fund balances represent unreserved balances, amounts reserved for encumbrances outstanding at year end, amounts appropriated for projects that have not been encumbered, and amounts set aside for debt service payments.
NOTE II - STEWARDSHIP, COMPLIANCE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

A. BUDGETARY INFORMATION

Annual budgets are adopted on a budgetary basis for the general fund. The difference between budgetary revenues and expenditures and modified accrual basis revenues and expenditures as reported in the fund financial statements are explained in the budgetary comparison schedule notes in the Required Supplementary Information of this report. The Board of Directors must approve any revision that alters the total expenditures of the Agency’s operating budget. At year-end, unencumbered appropriations are carried forward for use in future years.

Encumbrance accounting, under which requisitions, purchase orders, contracts, and other commitments for the expenditures of resources are recorded to reserve that portion of the applicable appropriation, is employed as an extension of formal budgetary integration. Encumbrances outstanding at year-end are reported as reservations of fund balance, and do not constitute expenditures or liabilities because the commitments will be re-appropriated and honored during the subsequent year.

B. COMPLIANCE WITH FINANCE-RELATED LEGAL AND CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS

The Agency had no material violations of finance-related legal and contractual provisions.
NOTE III - DETAIL NOTES - ALL FUNDS

A. DEPOSITS, INVESTMENTS, AND SECURITIES LENDING TRANSACTIONS

The Agency has adopted the City’s investment policy and participates in the City of Tallahassee’s cash and investment pool. Each fund’s portion of this pool is reported in “Cash and Cash Equivalents/Investments.” Interest earned by this pool is distributed to each fund monthly based on average daily balances.

1. DEPOSITS – The Federal Depository Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insures up to $100,000 of the Agency’s deposits. On October 3, 2008, the FDIC temporarily raised the limit to $250,000. Additionally, the State of Florida’s Public Deposit Act (the Act) insures the amount in excess of the FDIC coverage. Provisions of the Act require that public deposits may only be made at qualified public depositories. The Act requires each qualified public depository to deposit with the State Treasurer eligible collateral equal to or in excess of the required collateral as determined by the provisions of the Act. In the event of a failure by a qualified public depository, losses, in excess of federal depository insurance and proceeds from the sale of the securities pledged by the defaulting depository, are assessed against the other qualified public depositories of the same type as the depository in default. When other qualified public depositories are assessed additional amounts, they are assessed on a pro-rata basis.

2. INVESTMENTS – As discussed above, the Agency participates in the City’s investment pool, therefore, the investment policies used by the Agency are the investment policies of the City.

The City’s policy specifies the investments that are authorized for purchase and identifies various portfolio parameters addressing issuer diversification, term to maturity and liquidity, and requirement of “purchase versus delivery” perfection for securities held by a third party on behalf of and in the name of the City.

Authorized investment instruments for the City’s investment pool include the following:

- Repurchase Agreements
- Certificates of Deposit
- Commercial Paper Rated A1/P1 (or comparable rating) by at least two nationally recognized rating agencies
- U. S. Treasury Bills, Bonds, Notes and Stripped Securities
- U. S. Government Agencies Bonds, Notes and Stripped Securities
- Florida Dept. of Treasury Special Purpose Investment Account
- Fixed Income Securities rated at least A1/A+ for corporate securities and A for municipal securities (or comparable rating) by at least two nationally recognized rating agencies
- Fixed Income Mutual Funds and Money Managers
- Investment Agreements and Guaranteed Investment Contracts
- Florida State Board of Administration Local Governments Surplus Funds Investment Pool
- and other authorized government-sponsored pools
NOTE III (CONTINUED)

In addition to the Agency’s share of the City’s investment pool at September 30, 2008, the Agency had a direct investment of $61,277,000 in the Florida Department of Treasury Special Purpose Investment Account. The market value of this investment was $59,273,000. This investment account has an AA-f rating from Standard & Poor’s. Total accrued interest for the Agency at September 30, 2008 was $514,000.

For further information concerning the City’s investment pool, see the City of Tallahassee’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

3. SECURITIES LENDING TRANSACTIONS – The Agency participates in securities lending transactions through its participation in the City’s cash and investment pool. In accordance with Section 51 of the City Charter, the City Treasurer-Clerk or his designee may authorize investment transactions that he considers prudent. Accordingly, the City participates in securities lending transactions via a Securities Lending Agreement with Dresdner Bank AG, New York Branch (Bank) that authorizes the banking institution to lend the City’s securities to approved broker-dealers and banks in order to generate additional income. Gross income from securities lending transactions and the fees paid to the Bank are reported in the Agency’s statements. Asset and liabilities include the value of the collateral held.

During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008, the Bank lent, at the direction of the City’s Treasurer-Clerk, securities and received cash, securities issued or guaranteed by the United States government, and irrevocable bank letters of credit as collateral. The Bank did not have the ability to pledge or sell collateral securities delivered absent a borrower default. Borrowers were required to deliver cash collateral for each loan equal to at least 100% of the market value of the loaned securities or U.S. Government Securities equal to 102% of the market value of the securities.

There are no restrictions on the amount of securities that may be loaned. The Agreement requires the Bank to indemnify the City for losses attributable to violations by the Bank of the Standard of Care set out in the Agreement. There were no such violations during the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008. Moreover, there were no losses during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 resulting from a default of any borrower.

During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008, the City and each borrower maintained the right to terminate all securities lending transactions on demand. The cash collateral received on each loan of securities, together with the cash collateral of other qualified tax-exempt plan lenders, were invested in a collective investment pool with the Bank. The average duration of the investment pool as of September 30, 2008 was 18 days with an average weighted maturity of 174 days. Because the loans are terminable at will, their duration did not generally match the duration of the investments made with the cash collateral.
On September 30, 2008, the City had no credit risk exposure to borrowers.

The Agency’s share of the collateral held and the market value of securities on loan through the Bank as of September 30, 2008 were $19,775,000 and $19,450,000, respectively.

A summary of the fair market value of the securities lent as of September 30, 2008 follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>6,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government Treasury Notes</td>
<td>12,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. CAPITAL ASSETS**

Capital asset activity for the year ended September 30, 2008 was as follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities:</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Increases</th>
<th>Decreases</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Depreciable Assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$13,998</td>
<td>$19,118</td>
<td>$(2,331)</td>
<td>$30,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Progress</td>
<td>112,407</td>
<td>22,586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciable Assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$126,473</td>
<td>41,711</td>
<td>(2,331)</td>
<td>165,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less Accumulated Depreciation for: | | | |
| Equipment                        | (43) | (9) | - | (52) |
| Vehicles                         | (4)  | (5) | - | (9)  |
| **Capital Assets, net**          | $126,426 | $41,697 | $(2,331) | $165,792 |

Depreciation expense of $14,000 was charged to the transportation function of the Agency during the year ended September 30, 2008.
C. UNAMORTIZED BOND ISSUE COSTS

The Agency has incurred bond issuance costs of $1,028,000 and $797,000 for its 2003 and 2007 bond issues, respectively. These costs are being amortized over the life of the bonds at the rate at which the principal payments are being made, which approximates the effective interest method. Amortization expense for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 was $99,000.

D. LEASE COMMITMENTS

The Agency leases office space under an operating lease expiring December 31, 2010. The remaining future minimum lease obligations are as follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>September 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total rental expense for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 was $91,000.

E. LONG-TERM DEBT

The following is a summary of the changes in Long-Term Debt of the Agency for the year ended September 30, 2008 (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
<th>Due Within One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$59,280</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,740</td>
<td>$55,540</td>
<td>$3,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>75,285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>70,550</td>
<td>5,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank Loan #1</td>
<td>16,690</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,719</td>
<td>1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank Loan #2</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,670</td>
<td>1,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank Loan #3</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated Absences</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB Obligation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>$169,754</td>
<td>$6,521</td>
<td>$8,518</td>
<td>$167,757</td>
<td>$12,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensated absences are generally liquidated by the general fund.
NOTE III (CONTINUED)

The following is the schedule of debt service requirements as of September 30, 2008 (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total Debt Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$12,829</td>
<td>$6,743</td>
<td>$19,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13,156</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>19,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13,096</td>
<td>5,829</td>
<td>18,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13,652</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>18,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14,198</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>18,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>80,417</td>
<td>14,223</td>
<td>94,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>20,319</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>21,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$167,667</td>
<td>$43,978</td>
<td>$211,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$70,000,000 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds - Series 2003, due in annual installments of $3,930,000 to $6,245,000 from October 1, 2009 to October 1, 2019, interest rates range from 2% to 5% depending on maturity date. The bonds are limited obligations of the Agency and are paid exclusively from pledged revenues consisting of sales tax revenues (80% of the 1% local government infrastructure surtax revenues), monies on deposit in the funds and accounts established by the Bond Resolution, and investment earnings.

$75,285,000 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds - Series 2007 – issued on September 18, 2007, due in annual installments of $5,080,000 to $8,060,000 from October 1, 2009 to October 1, 2019, interest rates range from 4% to 5.25% depending on maturity date. The bonds are limited obligations of the Agency and are paid exclusively from pledged revenues consisting of sales tax revenues (80% of the 1% local government infrastructure surtax revenues), monies on deposit in the funds and accounts established by the Bond Resolution, and investment earnings.

State Infrastructure Bank Loan #1 - On October 20, 2004, the Agency obtained a loan from the State Infrastructure Bank maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to Section 339.55, Florida Statutes. The loan amount is for a maximum of $22,618,568. In 2005, the Agency and the FDOT entered into a Joint Project Agreement amending the original loan terms. Under the new terms, the FDOT completes and pays for the construction work approved under this loan. As the work is completed, the Agency recognizes the expenditures to the extent of the costs incurred by FDOT and records a loan payable to reflect the amount to be repaid to the FDOT. Work is expected to be completed by September 30, 2010. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 expenditures related to this loan of $1,029,000 were incurred. The loan accrues interest at 2%. At September 30, 2008, the remaining amount to be borrowed was $52,638. Repayments are due in annual installments (principal and interest) of $1,736,685 from October 15, 2008 to October 15, 2018, with a final payment (principal and interest) of $903,757 due on October 15, 2019.
NOTE III (CONTINUED)

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANK LOAN #2 - On November 8, 2005, the Agency obtained a loan from the State Infrastructure Bank maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to Section 339.55, Florida Statutes. The loan amount is for a maximum of $26,692,338. Work is expected to be completed by September 30, 2010. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 expenditures related to this loan of $5,020,000 were incurred. The loan accrues interest at 2%. As of September 30, 2008 this loan was fully drawn down. Repayments are due in annual installments (principal and interest) of $2,205,000 from October 15, 2008 to October 15, 2018, with a final payment (principal and interest) of $1,332,370 due on October 15, 2019.

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANK LOAN #3 - On February 27, 2007, the Agency obtained a loan from the State Infrastructure Bank maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to Section 339.55, Florida Statutes. The loan amount was for a maximum of $10,000,000. During 2008, the terms of this loan were renegotiated and the new maximum loan amount is currently $3,600,000. Work should be completed by September 30, 2012. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 expenditures related to this loan of $399,000 were incurred. The loan accrues interest at 2%. At September 30, 2008, the remaining amount to be borrowed was $2,411,931. Repayments are due in annual installments (principal and interest) of $642,000 from October 15, 2008 to October 15, 2009, with final payment (principal and interest) of $564,096 due on October 15, 2009.

F. INTERFUND TRANSFERS

At September 30, 2008, interfund transfers were as follows (in thousands):

| Transfer in from General Fund | $ 23,501 |
| Transfer to Special Revenue for project costs | $(5,337) |
| Transfer to Debt Service for required bond payments | $(18,164) |
| **Net Transfers** | **$ -** |

G. NET ASSETS

At September 30, 2008, net assets invested in capital assets (net of related debt) is intended to reflect the portion of net assets which are associated with non-liquid, capital assets less outstanding capital asset related debt. Related debt includes the outstanding balance of sales tax revenue bonds and other borrowings attributable to the acquisition of Capital Assets. At September 30, 2008, net assets invested in capital assets (net of related debt) is as follows:

| Capital assets, net | $ 165,792 |
| Capital assets related debt | $(109,621) |
| **Invested in capital assets, net of related debt** | **$ 56,171** |
NOTE IV - OTHER INFORMATION

A. RISK MANAGEMENT

The Agency is exposed to various risks of loss related to torts; theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; automobile liability; forgery and alteration; and fraud for which the Agency carries commercial insurance. The primary coverage limits include bodily injury and property damage of $1,000,000 per occurrence, $2,000,000 aggregate; Employee Benefits Liability of $1,000,000 per person, $2,000,000 aggregate; Public Officials Liability of $1,000,000; Employee Related Practices of $1,000,000; and Auto Liability of $1,000,000.

Liabilities for losses would be recorded when a loss occurs and the amount can be reasonably estimated. There are no such losses as of September 30, 2008. In the past four years, there have been no claims.

B. PENSION PLAN OBLIGATIONS

Staff of the Agency has the option of participating in either the City or the County benefits program. If an employee elects to participate in the County program, they are eligible to participate in the Florida Retirement System, a cost sharing multiple employer defined benefit public employee retirement system administered by the State of Florida. If the employee elects to participate in the City program, they are eligible to participate in the City’s Pension Plan, a single employer defined benefit plan. Currently, all employees of the Agency participate in the City’s Pension Plan. The City’s Pension Plan (the “Plan”) was established by Chapter 14 of the City Code of Ordinances and is administered by the City. Under the Plan, the City provides a single employer defined benefit provision covering City general and Agency employees (Article II), police officers (Article III) and firefighters (Article IV), and a defined contribution provision (Article V - Matched Annuity Plan - MAP) covering all City and Agency employees. The Defined Benefit and Defined Contribution provisions are combined and reported as one plan in the City’s financial statements. The City does not issue a stand-alone financial report on the Pension Plan. The provisions of the Plan are “qualified” under the Internal Revenue Service Code, which makes employee contributions tax deferred.

1. DEFINED BENEFIT PROVISION - Established through Chapter 14 of the City Code of Ordinances Parts A, B, and C in Articles II, III, and IV. Parts A and B of the Plan are closed to further participation while part C provides coverage to all new employees. All members of the Plan are covered by one of these parts depending upon employment date. These parts provide a detail description of the various defined benefit provisions. These provisions include the types of employees covered, benefit provisions, employee eligibility requirements for normal, early, and/or vested retirements.

The contributions required to support the benefits under Article II, III and IV, other than pre-retirement death benefits, are determined based on a level funding approach and consist of a normal contribution
and an accrued liability contribution. The normal contribution is determined using the entry age actuarial cost method. Under this method, a calculation is made to determine the uniform and constant percentage rate of contribution, which if applied to the compensation of the average new member during the entire period of their anticipated covered service, would be required to meet the cost of all benefits payable on their behalf.

The unfunded actuarial accrued liability contribution is funded when necessary using the entry age actuarial cost method with amortization period of 12 years for Agency employees. All required contributions are made by the Agency. Agency contributions and percentages of contributions made to the Defined Benefits Plan for the current year and previous four years were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount Contributed</th>
<th>Amount Contributed as Percentage of Required Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contributed amounts were actuarially determined as described above and were based on an actuarial valuation as of September 30, 2005. The significant actuarial assumptions used to compute the actuarially determined contribution requirements include (a) an interest rate of 7.75% per annum compounded annually, (b) projected salary increases for inflation and merit of 6.00% per annum compounded annually, (c) inflation rate at 4.00%, and (d) post retirement benefit increases including a 3% cost of living adjustment and a health care supplement.

2. Defined Contribution Provision - All employees may elect to contribute a portion of their salary to the Matched Annuity Plan (MAP). Employees can contribute up to, but not exceed, the maximum amount allowed by the Internal Revenue Service. The Agency contributes 5% to each employee’s MAP account. Upon reaching normal retirement age or retiring, a participant shall be paid his contributions, together with accrued earnings. If an employee uses the contributions and accrued earnings to purchase an annuity contract, the Plan will increase the amount of funds (only on the Agency’s 5%, employee flex matched contribution and employees’ contribution up to the 5%) used by the participant by a factor of 50 percent. Employee contributions (including the Agency’s 5% contribution to each employee’s MAP account) plus accrued earnings thereon are 100% refundable if the employee elects to terminate his or her vesting rights or is not vested at the date of employment termination.
NOTE IV (CONTINUED)

Employer contributions required to support the benefits under Article V (MAP Program) are determined following a level funding aggregate approach. The present value of prospective employer contributions is determined by subtracting the present value of prospective member contributions and present assets from the total present value of benefits expected to be paid from the program. Contributions during fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 totaling $79,000 ($40,000 employer contributions representing 7.6% of total covered payroll and $39,000 voluntary employee contributions representing 7.5% of total covered payroll), were made in accordance with contribution requirements determined through an actuarial valuation performed as of September 30, 2005. Total covered payroll for fiscal year ending September 30, 2008 was $523,000. Contributions are based on rates of covered payroll of 7.55% (5% employer contribution and 2.55% actuarial contribution) for the Agency.

The City of Tallahassee Retirement Plan is described in more detail in the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. That report may be obtained by writing to Accounting Services Division, 300 South Adams Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301 or by calling 850-891-8520.

C. OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

As previously indicated, staff of the Agency have the option of participating in either the County’s or the City’s benefit programs. Currently all staff are participating in the City’s programs. The Agency, through the City, provides health insurance and prescription drug coverage to its active and retired employees (the OPEB Plan). Pursuant to Section 112.0801, Florida Statutes, the Agency is required to permit participation in the health insurance program by retirees and their eligible dependents at a cost to the retiree that is no greater than the cost at which coverage is available for active employees. In addition, the Agency, via its participation in the City’s program, has elected to provide a partial subsidy to its retirees to offset the cost of such health insurance. As of September 30, 2008, there were no retired employees of the Agency receiving benefits under the OPEB Plan.

The contribution required to support the OPEB Plan is calculated based on the annual required contribution (ARC), an amount determined in accordance with GASB Statement 45. The ARC represents a level of funding that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover normal cost each year, calculated using the entry age actuarial cost method, and to amortize the unfunded actuarial liability over a period not to exceed thirty years.
NOTE IV (CONTINUED)

The following table shows the components of the Agency’s share of the annual OPEB cost for the year, the amount actually contributed, and the change in the Agency’s net OPEB obligation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual required contribution</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions made</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net OPEB obligation</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation - October 1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation - September 30</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agency’s annual OPEB cost, the percentage of the annual OPEB cost contributed to the plan, and the net OPEB obligation as of September 30 follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Annual OPEB Cost</th>
<th>Percentage of Annual OPEB Cost</th>
<th>Net OPEB Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>40.75%</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Tallahassee Other Post Employment Benefit Plan is described in more detail in the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. That report may be obtained by writing to Accounting Services Division, 300 South Adams Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301 or by calling 850-891-8520.

D. OTHER COMMITMENTS

1. OUTSTANDING CONTRACTS-The Agency has outstanding commitments on various contracts for design and construction of Agency projects. As of September 30, 2008, these commitments totaled $19,310,000 and are scheduled for completion between October 2008 and September 2011. Eighty-three percent of the outstanding commitments are on two outstanding design build contracts for Capital Circle Southwest U.S. 90 to Orange Avenue and Capital Circle Southeast Woodville Highway to Tram Road. The Agency expects these two contracts to be completed by September 2009 and April 2010, respectively.
NOTE IV (CONTINUED)

2. TRANSPORTATION REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM—The Agency has entered into various Joint Participation Agreements (JPAs) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) under the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP). Under these JPAs, the cost of right of way acquisition and construction costs related to state road projects will be split evenly between the Agency and FDOT. The estimated total costs of these activities as of September 30, 2008 is $27,813,954, hence, the Agency will receive up to $13,906,977 from the FDOT as the activities are completed. As of September 30, 2008, $13,427,278 has been expended on these projects.

3. STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEMS PROGRAM—On June 9, 2006, the Agency signed an agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for the right of way acquisition on SR 263 (Capital Circle) from SR 371 (Orange Avenue) to SR 10 (US90). Under this agreement, the FDOT will contribute up to $42,624,000 using funds from the Strategic Intermodal Systems (SIS) Program. Any costs exceeding this contribution, will be borne by the Agency. The Agency will pay for the project upfront and will then invoice the FDOT for reimbursement on a monthly basis. The estimated completion date for the project related to this agreement is September 30, 2010. As of September 30, 2008, $11,236,628 has been expended on this project.

E. ADVANCE FUNDING OF STATE OF FLORIDA ROADWAY PROJECTS

Prior to fiscal year 2005, the Agency had advanced $24,048,000 in two advances for $22,548,000 and $1,500,000 to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for roadway improvements. The advances were recorded as transportation expenditures. Reimbursement of these advances is totally subject to state legislative approval and appropriation in the fiscal years of reimbursement indicated in each contract; accordingly, the advance monies were treated as a gain contingency and are not reflected as Due From Other Governments in the Agency’s financial statements. There were no additional advances made in the current year.

F. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Periodically the Agency provides construction management services to the City. For these services the Agency enters into Joint Project Agreements (JPAs) with the City whereby the City agrees to pay an administrative fee of 3% to the Agency. During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 the Agency did not receive any money.

During the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008 the Agency donated land to the City of Tallahassee in the amount of $443,000.
NOTE IV (CONTINUED)

G. SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

On December 12, 2008, the Agency entered into a Local Funding Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in accordance with a commitment made to the FDOT at the June 4, 2007 Intergovernmental Agency meeting. At this meeting, the Agency agreed to pay up to $10,000,000 of FDOT project 219843-1, S.R. 10 from Dempsey Mayo Road to Walden Road with the stipulation that the money would be returned if the State did not obtain the balance of $29,300,000 needed to complete the project. $9,600,000 was to be paid to the FDOT by December 31, 2008 and $400,000 will be paid to Leon County to contribute to the permit mitigation cost for this project. On December 18, the Agency paid $9,600,000 to the FDOT. The $400,000 due to Leon County will be paid once the County awards the permit mitigation work after the project has been final accepted by FDOT. As of September 30, 2008, this $10,000,000 commitment had already been appropriated by the Agency.
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## Required Supplementary Information

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule

**General Fund**

**For the Year Ended September 30, 2008**

(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgetary Fund Balance - October 1</th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Budgetary Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>34,896</td>
<td>34,896</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources**

- Taxes............................................................. 33,738 33,738 29,593 (4,145)
- Interest Earned.............................................. -- -- 1,837 (1,837)

**Amounts Available for Appropriations.....**

68,634 68,634 66,326 (2,308)

**Charges to Appropriations**

- Transportation............................................... 1,184 1,184 1,019 165
- Transfers to Other Funds.............................. 67,450 67,450 23,502 43,948

**Total Expenditures......................................**

68,634 68,634 24,521 44,113

**Budgetary Fund Balance - September 30**

$ -- $ -- $ 41,805 $ 41,805

In the current fiscal year, there were no expenditures in excess of appropriations.
Note A - Explanation of Differences between Budgetary Inflows and Outflows and GAAP Revenues/Transfers In and Expenditures/Transfers Out

Inflows of Resources
Actual amounts (budgetary basis) available for appropriation from the budgetary comparison schedule. $ 66,326

Differences - budget to GAAP
The fund balance at the beginning of the year is a budgetary resource but is not a current year revenue for financial reporting purposes. (34,896)

The decrease in the fair market value of investments is a decrease in revenue for financial reporting purposes but is not considered a budgetary inflow. (812)

Miscellaneous items treated as budgetary inflows but not as revenues for financial reporting purposes. 389

Total Revenues/Transfers In as reported on the statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances. $ 31,007

Outflows of Resources
Actual amounts (budgetary basis) total charges to appropriations from the budgetary comparison schedule. $ 24,521

Differences - budget to GAAP
Miscellaneous items treated as expenditures for financial reporting purposes, but not as budgetary outflows. 376

Total Expenditures as reported on the statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances. $ 24,897
STATISTICAL SECTION

This part of the Agency’s comprehensive annual financial report presents detailed information as a context for understanding what the information in the financial statements, notes disclosures, and required supplementary information says about the Agency’s overall financial health. Since the Agency was created in October 2000 and began operations in fiscal year 2002, 10 year trend information is not available.
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### Governmental Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invested in Capital Assets, Net of Related Debt</td>
<td>$56,171</td>
<td>$23,160</td>
<td>$3,778</td>
<td>$(6,319)</td>
<td>$(8,915)</td>
<td>$(10,625)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>54,053</td>
<td>45,615</td>
<td>30,538</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Governmental Activities Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$110,224</td>
<td>$68,775</td>
<td>$34,316</td>
<td>$12,316</td>
<td>$(6,345)</td>
<td>$(2,241)</td>
<td>$(83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of Bond Issue Costs</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation to City</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>10,245</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>15,322</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants and Contributions</td>
<td>15,173</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Revenues</td>
<td>29,593</td>
<td>30,989</td>
<td>31,620</td>
<td>24,205</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>7,941</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in FMV of Investments</td>
<td>(1,013)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>(201)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>51,694</td>
<td>40,994</td>
<td>37,322</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Net Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Net Assets</td>
<td>$41,449</td>
<td>$34,459</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$18,661</td>
<td>$(4,104)</td>
<td>$(2,158)</td>
<td>$(83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fund Balances

**Last Seven Fiscal years**

**(modified accrual basis of accounting)**

**(in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved</td>
<td>43,866</td>
<td>37,773</td>
<td>30,295</td>
<td>18,487</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Revenue Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>63,679</td>
<td>72,446</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>38,586</td>
<td>6,138</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32,596</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>10,228</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$117,822</td>
<td>$118,121</td>
<td>$30,642</td>
<td>$20,641</td>
<td>$41,182</td>
<td>$47,118</td>
<td>$3,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Fund Balances

**Last Seven Fiscal Years**

**(modified accrual basis of accounting)**

**(in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$44,766</td>
<td>$37,753</td>
<td>$32,406</td>
<td>$24,205</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fees</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in FMV of Investments</td>
<td>(1,013)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>(201)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$53,363</td>
<td>$41,660</td>
<td>$33,453</td>
<td>$24,581</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>42,699</td>
<td>36,872</td>
<td>39,292</td>
<td>38,686</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>25,544</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Lending Expense</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Fees</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>7,267</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>8,475</td>
<td>10,803</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Issue Costs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$60,110</td>
<td>$52,726</td>
<td>$47,533</td>
<td>$45,190</td>
<td>$6,402</td>
<td>$31,689</td>
<td>$153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Financing Sources (Uses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of Debt</td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>19,849</td>
<td>24,081</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds Issued</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>75,285</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Premium</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,041</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)</strong></td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>98,545</td>
<td>24,081</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>75,041</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$(299)</td>
<td>$87,479</td>
<td>$10,001</td>
<td>$(20,541)</td>
<td>$(5,936)</td>
<td>$43,735</td>
<td>$3,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt service as a percentage of noncapital expenditures</strong></td>
<td>316%</td>
<td>315%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>196%</td>
<td>203%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Retail Sales and Tax Collection History

## Last Seven Fiscal Years

**(in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Retail Sales (1)</th>
<th>Infrastructure Sales Tax Revenue (2)</th>
<th>Agency's Share of Sales Tax Revenue (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$5,603,000</td>
<td>$--</td>
<td>$--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,656,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,154,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,595,000</td>
<td>30,256</td>
<td>24,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,155,000</td>
<td>39,525</td>
<td>31,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7,390,000</td>
<td>38,736</td>
<td>30,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,266,000</td>
<td>36,991</td>
<td>29,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Florida Department of Revenue-Leon County Gross and Taxable Sales

(2) Collection of the 2004 Infrastructure Sales Surtax began on December 1, 2004, therefore, there was no revenue reported prior to fiscal year 2005.

Note: The agency receives 80% of the sales tax collected in Leon County under the 15 year 1% Infrastructure Sales Surtax which began on December 1, 2004. The sales tax is collected on all retail sales of tangible personal property subject to certain exceptions and exemptions and certain dealer allowances.

## Ratios of Outstanding Debt by Type

### Last Six Fiscal Years

**(in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ended</th>
<th>Sales Tax Revenue Bonds</th>
<th>State Infrastructure Bank Loans</th>
<th>Total Debt Outstanding</th>
<th>Leon County Population (1)</th>
<th>Per Capita As Restated</th>
<th>Percentage of Personal Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$--</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>256,000</td>
<td>$273.44</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>264,000</td>
<td>265.15</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66,510</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66,578</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>245.68</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>62,950</td>
<td>22,412</td>
<td>85,362</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>313.83</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>134,565</td>
<td>35,129</td>
<td>169,694</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>621.59</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>126,090</td>
<td>41,577</td>
<td>167,667</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>609.70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


N/A - Data not available.
## Pledged Revenue Coverage
### Last Six Fiscal Years
(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenues (80% of existing Infrastructure Sales Tax)</td>
<td>$29,593</td>
<td>$30,989</td>
<td>$31,620</td>
<td>$24,205</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Debt Service on Sales Tax Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$14,985</td>
<td>$6,507</td>
<td>$6,504</td>
<td>$6,504</td>
<td>$3,014</td>
<td>$1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Coverage on Sales Tax Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Debt Service on Sales Tax Revenue Bonds and State Infrastructure Bank Loans</td>
<td>$15,742</td>
<td>$14,391</td>
<td>$8,241</td>
<td>$6,504</td>
<td>$3,014</td>
<td>$1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Coverage on Sales Tax Revenue Bonds and State Infrastructure Bank Loans</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 2003 and 2004 debt service was paid from capitalized interest included in bond proceeds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population(1)</th>
<th>Retail (2) Sales (000's)</th>
<th>Personal Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income(3)</th>
<th>School Enrollment(4)</th>
<th>Leon County</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>237,637</td>
<td>$4,916,757</td>
<td>$6,593,951</td>
<td>$27,748</td>
<td>29,641</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>239,452</td>
<td>5,268,440</td>
<td>6,240,359</td>
<td>26,061</td>
<td>29,979</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>244,208</td>
<td>5,613,704</td>
<td>6,673,472</td>
<td>27,327</td>
<td>30,064</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>248,039</td>
<td>5,603,261</td>
<td>6,891,268</td>
<td>27,783</td>
<td>30,070</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>5,655,887</td>
<td>7,218,386</td>
<td>28,252</td>
<td>35,515</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>263,896</td>
<td>6,154,172</td>
<td>7,906,060</td>
<td>29,959</td>
<td>35,483</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>271,111</td>
<td>6,594,799</td>
<td>8,093,206</td>
<td>29,852</td>
<td>35,951</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>272,497</td>
<td>7,154,823</td>
<td>8,505,994</td>
<td>31,215</td>
<td>34,994</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>272,896</td>
<td>7,389,838</td>
<td>9,064,514</td>
<td>33,216</td>
<td>37,525</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>274,892</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32,472</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A - Data not available

Source: City Records except as noted below:

(2) Florida Department of Revenue - Leon County Gross and Taxable Sales
(3) U. S. Census Bureau 1999 through 2007 and University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research for current year.
(4) Leon County Public School Board 1999 through 2007 and Statistical Brief, Florida Dept. of Education, Fall 2007 for current year.
All of the Agency employees work on the single Agency function, Transportation.

CAPITAL ASSETS STATISTICS BY FUNCTION
Last Seven Fiscal Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Capital Assets by Year (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$165,792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Costs are recorded as Construction in Progress while roads are being worked on. When the work is completed, the roads will be transferred to the Governmental unit that will fund the future road maintenance. See Note I.D.3.
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Management Letter
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER 
FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS 
BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED 
IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

Board of Directors 
Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency 
Tallahassee, Florida

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities and each major fund of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (the Agency) as of and for the year ended September 30, 2008, which collectively comprise the Agency’s basic financial statements and have issued our report thereon dated February 9, 2009. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Accounting Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Agency’s internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Agency’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Agency’s internal control over financial reporting.

A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the Agency’s ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the Agency’s financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the Agency’s internal control.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statements will not be prevented or detected by the Agency’s internal control.
Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Agency’s financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

We have noted no other matters pursuant to the Rules of the Auditor General, Chapter 10.550 that we were required to report to the management of the Agency in a separate management letter dated February 9, 2009.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Agency’s Board of Directors, management, and the Auditor General of the State of Florida and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than those specified parties.

Tallahassee, Florida
February 9, 2009

[Signature]
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH
REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO EACH MAJOR STATE PROJECT
AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE
WITH THE FLORIDA SINGLE AUDIT ACT

Board of Directors
Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
Tallahassee, Florida

Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000
Intergovernmental Agency (the Agency) with the types of compliance requirements
described in the State of Florida, Executive Office of the Governor’s State Projects
Compliance Supplement, that are applicable to its major state projects for the year ended
September 30, 2008. The Agency’s major state projects are identified in the summary of
auditors’ results section of the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.
Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to
each of its major state projects is the responsibility of the Agency’s management. Our
responsibility is to express an opinion on the Agency’s compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the
United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in
Government Accounting Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United
States, and Chapter 550, Rules of the Auditor General. Those standards and Chapter 550,
Rules of the Auditor General require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain
reasonable assurance about whether non-compliance with the types of compliance
requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major state
project occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the
Agency’s compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we
considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a
reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on the
Agency’s compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, the Agency complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred
to above that are applicable to its major state projects for the year ended September 30,
2008.

Internal Control over Compliance

The management of the Agency is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective
internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and
grants applicable to state projects. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the
Agency’s internal control over compliance with the requirements that could have a direct
and material effect on a major state project in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance but not for the purposes of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Agency’s internal control over compliance.

A control deficiency in an entity’s internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state project on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to administer a state project such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state project that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a state project will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

Our consideration of the internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Agency's Board of Directors, management, and the Auditor General of the State of Florida and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than those specified parties.

Tallahassee, Florida
February 9, 2009
## BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY
### Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance
#### For the Year Ended September 30, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Agency and State Project</th>
<th>CSFA Number</th>
<th>Contract/Grant Number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through Northwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>37.022</td>
<td>05-074</td>
<td>$732,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Florida Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>732,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Programs</td>
<td>55.014</td>
<td>FM# 415782-3-48-01</td>
<td>6,973,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank*</td>
<td>55.020</td>
<td>AO515</td>
<td>1,028,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank*</td>
<td>55.020</td>
<td>AO515</td>
<td>5,020,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank*</td>
<td>55.020</td>
<td>422727-1-58-01</td>
<td>398,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Regional Incentive Program</td>
<td>55.026</td>
<td>AOE12-54801</td>
<td>3,720,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Regional Incentive Program</td>
<td>55.026</td>
<td>AOM97</td>
<td>2,376,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Highway Beautification Council</td>
<td>55.003</td>
<td>AOQ99/422811-1-74-01</td>
<td>(298,467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,220,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total State Financial Assistance |  |  | $19,952,719 |

* The expenditures scheduled above were made pursuant to State Infrastructure Bank Loan agreements.

### NOTES
The Schedule of Expenditures of State Financial Assistance was prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The information in this schedule is in accordance with The Florida Single Audit Act. Therefore, some amounts presented in this schedule may differ from amounts presented in, or used in, the preparation of the basic financial statements.

The Agency does not use sub recipients.

No state financial assistance was expended in non-cash assistance.
Section 1 – Summary of Auditors’ Results

Financial Statements

Type of auditors’ report issued: Unqualified

Internal control over financial reporting:
  Material weakness(es) identified? No
  Significant deficiency(ies) identified not considered to be material weaknesses? No
  Noncompliance material to the financial statements noted? No

State Financial Assistance

Internal control over major programs:
  Material weakness(es) identified? No
  Significant deficiency(ies) identified not considered to be material weaknesses? No

Type of auditors’ report issued on compliance for major state projects? Unqualified

Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with Rules of the Auditor General, Rule 10.557? No

Identification of major state projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSFA Number</th>
<th>Name of State Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.014</td>
<td>Intermodal Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.026</td>
<td>Transportation Regional Incentive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.022</td>
<td>Water Management Districts – Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs: $405,131
Section II – Financial Statement Findings

We noted no financial statement findings that are required to be reported in accordance with Rules of the Auditor General, Chapter 10.554(1)(i)4.

Section III – State Financial Assistance Findings and Questioned Costs

We noted no matters involving noncompliance that are required to be reported in accordance with Rules of the Auditor General, Chapter 10.554(1)(i)4.
Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings – State Projects
For the Year Ended September 30, 2008

State Projects – None
(2007)
MANAGEMENT LETTER PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10.550, RULES OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY AUDITS

Board of Directors
Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
Tallahassee, Florida

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities and each major fund of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, as of and for the year ended September 30, 2008, which collectively comprise the Agency’s basic financial statements and have issued our report thereon dated February 9, 2009.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations. We have issued our Independent Auditors’ Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters, Independent Auditors’ Report on Compliance and Internal Control over Compliance Applicable to Each Major State Project, and Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. Disclosures in those reports and schedule, which are dated February 9, 2009, should be considered in conjunction with this management letter.

Additionally, our audit was conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General, which govern the conduct of local government entity audits performed in the State of Florida and, unless otherwise required to be reported in the report on compliance and internal controls or schedule of findings and questioned costs, this letter is required to include the following information.

Section 10.554(1)(i)1., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we determine whether or not corrective actions have been taken to address significant findings and recommendations made in the preceding annual financial audit report. Corrective actions have been taken to address findings and recommendations made in the preceding annual financial audit report as follows:

**State Infrastructure Bank Loans (Prior Year Reference 2007-1)**

In the prior year, we noted that debt service payments for the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) loans were not correctly allocated in the general ledger between loan principal and interest expense. Accounting staff used the original estimated debt service schedule included in the note agreements to record the principal and interest. Although there was no error in cash payments made and the risk that an error would occur in future cash payments is remote, the allocation of principal and interest of current debt service payments was incorrect resulting in an overstatement of the loan balances for 2007 by $660,629 and would have resulted in an overstatement of the total interest expense over the life of the notes by $950,992 if allowed to remain uncorrected.
To ensure that there is not a material misstatement of the financial statements, we recommended that the Agency confirm loan balances annually with FDOT prior to closing the books to ensure accurate accounting and reporting.

2008 Status: The Agency now confirms all draw downs and allocation of principal and interest with FDOT at the end of each fiscal year so they can properly record the yearly activity.

Review of Grant Reporting (Prior Year Reference 2007-2)

In the prior year, we noted that, given the small size of the Agency’s staff, the Agency’s Financial Manager prepared all grant reporting and reimbursement requests for the Agency with no independent review of those documents and reimbursement requests. There is an increased likelihood that errors in reporting and noncompliance with grant contracts would not be detected and communicated. To ensure that there is not a material misstatement of the financial statements and to ensure compliance with laws, regulations, and grant contracts, we recommended that all documents prepared for reporting to grantors be carefully reviewed by someone other than the preparer and all reimbursement requests should be reviewed by the City’s accounting services division for accuracy and compliance.

2008 Status: The Agency now sends all requests for reimbursement to the City’s accounting services division for review prior to invoicing the grantor for reimbursement.

Section 10.554(1)(i)2., Rules of the Auditor General, requires our audit to include a review of the provisions of Section 218.415, Florida Statutes, regarding the investment of public funds. In connection with our audit, we determined that the Agency complied with Section 218.415, Florida Statutes.

Section 10.554(1)(i)3., Rules of the Auditor General, require that we address in the management letter any recommendations to improve financial management. In connection with our audit, we noted no matters required to be disclosed.

Section 10.554(1)(i)4., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we address violations of laws, regulations, contracts or grant agreements or abuse that have occurred, or are likely to have occurred, that have an effect on the determination of financial statement amounts that is less than material but more than inconsequential. In connection with our audit, we did not have any such findings.

Section 10.554(1)(i)5., Rules of the Auditor General, provides that the auditor may, based on professional judgment, report of the following matters that are inconsequential to the determination of financial statement amounts, considering both quantitative and qualitative factors: (1) violations of laws, regulations, contracts or grant agreements, or abuse that have occurred, or were likely to have occurred, and (2) control deficiencies that are not significant deficiencies, including, but not limited to; (a) improper or inadequate accounting procedures (e.g. the omission of required disclosures from annual financial statements) (b) failures to properly record financial transactions; and (c) other inaccuracies, shortages, defalcations, and instances of fraud discovered by, or that come to the attention of, the auditor. In connection with our audit, we did not have any such findings.
Section 10.554(1)(i)6., *Rules of the Auditor General*, requires that the name or official title and legal authority for the primary government and each component unit of the reporting entity be disclosed in this management letter, unless disclosed in the notes to the financial statements. This information was disclosed in Note 1 to the financial statements. There were no component units of the Agency.

Section 10.554(1)(i)7.a., *Rules of the Auditor General*, requires a statement be included as to whether or not the local government entity has met one or more of the conditions described in Section 218.503(1), Florida Statutes, and identification of the specific condition(s) met. In connection with our audit, we determined that the Agency did not meet any of the conditions described in Section 218.503(1), Florida Statutes.

Section 10.554(1)(i)7.b., *Rules of the Auditor General*, requires that we determine whether the annual financial report for the Agency for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008, filed with the Florida Department of Financial Services pursuant to Section 218.32(1)(a), Florida Statutes, is in agreement with the annual financial audit report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008. In connection with our audit, we determined that these two reports were in agreement.

Pursuant to Sections 10.554(1)(i)7.c. and 10.556(7), *Rules of the Auditor General*, we applied financial condition assessment procedures. In connection with our audit, we applied financial condition assessment procedures. It is management’s responsibility to monitor the Agency’s financial condition, and our financial condition assessment was based in part on representations made by management and the review of the financial information provided the same.

This management letter is intended solely for the information and use of the Agency’s Board of Directors, management, the State of Florida Auditor General, and others within the Agency and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Tallahassee, Florida
February 9, 2009
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Transfer of Delta Industrial Park Concurrency Trips
Agenda Item

**SUBJECT/TITLE:** Assignment to City of Tallahassee of Any/All of Blueprint’s Vested Rights in Delta Industrial Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>February 23, 2009</th>
<th>Requested By:</th>
<th>City of Tallahassee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>James Davis</td>
<td>Type of Item:</td>
<td>Consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
The City of Tallahassee (City) has requested that Blueprint assign any and all interest it has in certain unused transportation trips acquired by Blueprint when it purchased the Delta Industrial Park site for stormwater management related to the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest road improvement project. The City has determined there are 1,532 unused trips available for transfer, which if assigned to the City will be used by it to promote new development at the airport.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**
On December 29, 2006, Blueprint purchased 113 acres within Delta Industrial Park, which is located on the east side of Capital Circle Southwest, south of SR 20. This property will be used by Blueprint to construct a stormwater management facility in conjunction with the construction of improvements to Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest.

This property is a portion of several lots that make up Delta Industrial Park, which was issued a certification of vested status (Application No. VR0020T) on October 22, 1990. These vested rights were confirmed in a 1993 Settlement Agreement between the City of Tallahassee and Florida Title Group, Inc., et al., Case No. 91-3335, Circuit Court of the Second Judicial Circuit, Leon County, Florida.

The vested rights certificate for Delta Industrial Park, a pre-Comprehensive Plan project, vested it for construction of a large commercial/industrial complex. The large project was never constructed and now the property will be used by Blueprint for stormwater management. Blueprint does not plan to improve the property for any other purpose. Since Delta Industrial Park will not be constructed there are 2,710 unused transportation credits: 1,178 that belong to the City and 1,532 that Blueprint acquired when it purchased the site. The vested trips are not necessary for construction of stormwater facilities, and, under current City policies, cannot be transferred to any other site.
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION (cont.):

As a result there are 2,710 unused transportation trips in the immediate vicinity of the Tallahassee Regional Airport, which the City owns and operates for public use and as a commercial service airport. The Airport is regulated as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) under a development order approved by the City Commission and development within the Airport boundaries must be consistent with the DRI development order as well as with the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan.

The City believes the Airport is a prime area for economic development opportunities and is consistently promoted by the City for economic development. As a result of the current economic climate of the City, County, State and U.S., the Tallahassee Economic Development Council has requested that the City get one to three parcels within the Airport DRI shovel-ready for development in an effort to improve the local economy and encourage development.

As part of this proposal, the City is proposing to adopt a resolution to transfer its 1,178 vested trips from the Delta Park site to the Airport to enable development of one to three shovel-ready parcels. To encourage development that will create jobs, both during construction and after, the City is asking Blueprint to do the same with its Delta Park vested trips. With a total of 2,710 transportation trips, the one to three Airport sites to be used to spur economic development will meet the City’s concurrency requirements and will not be required to provide additional mitigation. Since transportation mitigation costs sometimes amount to significant sums, it is expected that having sufficient trips in the area to meet concurrency requirements will provide an extraordinary incentive for potential developers.

Since the current economic climate demands extraordinary efforts from governmental entities to provide jobs and help Leon County residents provide for their families, Blueprint believes that the assignment of its unused transportation credits is a reasonable and prudent use of these credits that can be used by the City in developing a viable economic development program at the Airport.

OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve the assignment to the City of any and all interest Blueprint has in the unused vested rights (1,532 transportation trips) created pursuant to the Certification of Vested Status of Delta Industrial Park (Application No. VR0020T) issued October 22, 1990.

Option 2: Board Guidance
RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the assignment to the City of any and all interest Blueprint has in the unused vested rights (1,532 transportation trips) created pursuant to the Certification of Vested Status of Delta Industrial Park (Application No. VR0020T) issued October 22, 1990.

ATTACHMENTS:

2. Summary of City of Tallahassee’s Position Regarding Blueprint’s Assignment of Transportation Credits
CERTIFICATION OF VESTED STATUS

This certificate of vested status is issued for the development or property herein described and confirms the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department has determined said development or property is exempt from the consistency and concurrency provisions of the Tallahassee-Leon County 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

This certificate of Vested Status does not preclude enforcement actions brought pursuant to a violation of any applicable federal, state or local laws.

DESCRIPTION

The property as described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto (being legal descriptions presented by the applicant on August 3, 1990) containing 140.86 acres, more or less is vested for the following density and intensity of development:

Commercial/Industrial: Up to 3,245,963 Gross Square Feet

Mark L. Gumula
Director of Planning

October 22, 1990
DATE

City Hall • 300 South Adams Street • Tallahassee, Florida 32301 • (904) 599-8600

ATTACHMENT 1
Summary of City of Tallahassee’s Position Regarding Blueprint’s Assignment of Transportation Credits

The City of Tallahassee owns and operates the Tallahassee Regional Airport (Airport) for public use and as a commercial service airport. The Airport is regulated as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) under a development order approved by the City Commission, and development within the Airport boundaries must be consistent with the DRI development order as well as with the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan.

The Airport is a prime area for economic development opportunities, and is consistently promoted by the City for economic development. The City Commission has acted affirmatively to include the Airport in the boundaries of the Tallahassee/Leon County Enterprise Zone to enhance economic development activities and opportunities. The current economic climate of the City of Tallahassee, Leon County, the State of Florida, and the United States of America is in a state of serious decline not experienced in decades. In an effort to improve the local economy and encourage development, the Tallahassee Economic Development Council has requested that the City get one to three parcels within the Airport DRI shovel-ready for development. Such a site would be available for immediate development by potential purchasers.

As part of its effort to provide shovel-ready sites at the Airport, the City must meet all land development regulations, including addressing transportation impacts and meeting concurrency regulations for the sites. The concurrency regulations present a serious impediment to providing a shovel-ready site, but the City has proposed a
solution to the dilemma. The solution, however, requires the cooperation of Blueprint 2000.

There are currently 2,710 unused transportation trips in the immediate vicinity of the Airport: 1,178 that belong to the City and 1,532 that belong to Blueprint 2000. Blueprint 2000’s 1,532 trips were acquired when it purchased a site known as Delta Industrial Park for stormwater management related to Capital Circle Southwest construction. Delta Industrial Park was a pre-Comprehensive Plan project, vested for construction of a large commercial/industrial complex. The large project, however, was never constructed; and because Blueprint 2000 purchased the property for stormwater management, the commercial/industrial project will not be constructed. Blueprint 2000 does not plan to improve the property for any other purpose. The vested trips are not necessary for construction of stormwater facilities, and, under current City policies, cannot be transferred to any other site.

Due to the depressed economic climate, the City is developing an economic development proposal to provide one to three shovel-ready sites at the Airport. As part of its proposal, the City will adopt a resolution to transfer its 1,178 vested trips from the Delta Industrial Park site to the Airport to enable development of the one to three shovel-ready parcels. To encourage development that will create jobs, both during construction and after, the City has requested Blueprint 2000 to do the same with its Delta Industrial Park vested trips. If Blueprint 2000 agrees to assign its 1,532 trips to the City, the City will include those in the resolution for a total of 2,710 trips.

With a total of 2,710 transportation trips, the one to three Airport sites to be used to spur economic development will meet the City’s concurrency requirements and will
not be required to provide additional mitigation. Since transportation mitigation costs
sometimes amount to significant sums, it is expected that having sufficient trips in the
area to meet concurrency requirements will provide an extraordinary incentive for
potential developers.

The current economic climate demands extraordinary efforts from governmental
entities to provide jobs and help Leon County residents provide for their families. The
City encourages Blueprint 2000 to become its partner in developing this economic
development program at the Airport.
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Blueprint Participation in Lafayette Heritage Trail Park/Bridge Project
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Blueprint Participation in Lafayette Heritage Trail Park/Bridge Project

Date: February 23, 2009  
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright  
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
Blueprint is proposing to partner with the City Department of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Affairs to construct a pedestrian bridge over the CSX rail line in Lafayette Heritage Trail Park. This item seeks Board approval to reallocate $500,000 from the Lake Jackson Basin/Fred George Budget Line Item to the Lafayette Floodplain Budget Line Item. 

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Lafayette Heritage Trail Park is located on the banks of Lake Lafayette and Piney Z Lake, adjacent to Tom Brown Park and the J.R. Alford Greenway. The suspension bridge would span the entire 120-foot CSX right-of-way and offer a scenic route through mature native vegetation as well as a unique vieswhed of the lake.

Although trails are not officially designated across the CSX tracks, users frequently cross the railroad at the proposed location to access J.R. Alford Greenway, Pedrick Road, and ultimately the Miccosukee Greenway. The railroad crossing is void of safety facilities and sight distance along the track is limited. Seven or more trains pass through the park each day.

The project is consistent with local plans and documents:
- The Blueprint 2000 “Project Definitions Report” includes the project as follows:
  - Map 6: Lake Lafayette Basin: Greenways - “Trail connections should be developed between the Alford Arm properties and the Lafayette Heritage Trail (to Tom Brown Park).”
  - “Special Considerations: Coordinate with the CSX Railroad regarding an at-grade crossing between the Piney Z and Alford properties or design and fund a pedestrian bridge that will meet CSX Railroad clearance and applicable Americans With Disabilities Act requirements.”
- The Blueprint Interlocal Agreement includes the following Tier 1 Project:
- Lafayette Heritage Trails are a critical element in the Tallahassee-Leon County Greenways Master Plan. The plan explicitly states that an at-grade crossing, or pedestrian bridge over the railroad, be constructed to facilitate safe pedestrian movement and connectivity.
The funding partnership, ability to leverage funds, and the scope of the project are consistent with Blueprint’s philosophy and the tenants of the “Project Definitions Report.”

The proposed bridge would serve as a destination for Tallahassee residents. The design is functional, but also visually impressive. The bridge would be readily accessible to Pedrick Road and the Alford Arm parking lot and a short walk from the Lafayette Heritage Trail Park parking area. Educational amenities will be included where appropriate to briefly describe the vegetation and history of the vicinity.

**Project Status and Funding:** The Bridge project is currently under design by Inovia Consulting Group under contract with the City; design is expected to be complete by fall 2009. Construction cost estimates range from $600,000 to $1 million.

- The City’s FY 2008 Capital Improvement Plan includes the following Project funding: Lafayette Heritage Trail Development Project Number 06088. Total budget is $1,000,000, but $400,000 of that amount is already designated for a Land and Water Conservation Fund Project. Following design and permitting, it is expected that $400,000 will remain for construction.
- The City is planning to submit a $250,000 Recreational Trails Program Grant Application to FDEP by March 31st.
- Blueprint proposes to provide up to $500,000 toward the project. Blueprint might also be able to offer project management support such as plans review and other project support services.

**Blueprint funds:** Early Blueprint Master Plans included funding for (undefined) projects in the Lake Lafayette Basin (FYs 2007-2015). The majority of Lake Lafayette Basin funds (FYs 2007-2013) were removed/reallocated during recent Master Plan revisions required due to reductions in sales tax receipts and based on the fact that no projects had been identified up to that point. $892,237 in Lake Lafayette Basin funds remain, in FY 2014 and FY 2015. It is proposed to fund the Bridge from the Lake Jackson Basin Line Item in the Master Plan. The Lake Jackson Line Item currently has a balance of $3,542,429 (FY 2008), with $2,770,000 of that allocated to the Fred George Basin as a match to an approved Florida Communities Trust grant.

**OPTIONS:**
**Option 1:** Endorse Blueprint’s participation in the Bridge project and authorize up to $500,000 in Blueprint funds to be transferred from the Lake Jackson Basin/Fred George to be used for the project.

**Option 2:** Board Guidance

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
**Option 1:** Endorse Blueprint’s participation in the Bridge project and authorize up to $500,000 in Blueprint funds to be transferred from the Lake Jackson Basin/Fred George to be used for the project.
Action by TCC and CAC:
Not presented to the TCC.
The CAC concurred in the Recommended Action.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Location Map
Attachment 2: Bridge Concept Rendering
Lafayette Heritage Trail Park
Proposed Pedestrian Bridge

Legend
- Lakes
- Railroad
- Loblolly Trail
- Streets
- Multiuse Trail
- Existing Unauthorized Trail Crossing
- Cadillac Mountain Bike Trail
- Lafayette Passage Paddle Trail
Lafayette Heritage Trail Pedestrian Bridge
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Capital Cascade Trail - Segments 3 and 4 Design Update
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this item is to provide the IA with a design update for Capital Cascade Trail – Segments 3 and 4. It also requests direction on the design of several elements and advises the Board of a possible grant opportunity.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
**Myers Industrial Park:** Blueprint 2000, in conjunction with COT, was actively pursuing the purchase of Myers Industrial Park (Attachment 1). As part of the right-of-way acquisition process, a level II contamination assessment was performed on this property and on-site contamination was discovered. The purchase agreement stipulated that contamination remediation/removal was a Blueprint responsibility. Due to the on-site contamination concerns, the Myers Industrial Park property will not be purchased and has been removed from the approved Segment 3 Concept Plan. Blueprint 2000 staff has identified and will investigate further a potential replacement pond located along Van Buren Street (Attachment 2) that provides comparable storage and treatment volumes.

**Phase 1:** The Capital Cascade Trail - Segments 3 and 4 Design (Phase 1) was authorized on May 29, 2008. The primary purpose of Phase 1 is for the consultant (Kimley-Horn and Associates) to do all work necessary to develop an existing conditions model for the St. Augustine Branch (SAB) Ditch and Central Drainage Ditch (CDD). Additional elements of the Phase 1 effort include the design survey, potential utility conflicts and preliminary environmental investigations. The consultant is on schedule to complete this task by March 2009.

**Phase 2 Interim Improvements:** The next step in the process is to authorize the final design and permitting of Phase 2 Interim Improvements for Segments 3 and 4. Based on previous Board guidance, Blueprint 2000 staff is focusing on improvements that provide the most value for the money. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends proceeding with the design of the Phase 2 Interim Improvements listed below in order to be positioned to move to construction if federal or state stimulus or grant funds become available.

**Improvement 1:** Design a Stormwater Management Facility (SWMF) at the Master Plan Pond 5 Site, Segment 4 - Master Plan Pond 5 (Attachment 3) is a wet pond at the southern end of the Central Drainage Ditch (CDD) immediately above the confluence with the Lake Bradford/Black Swamp ditch. The main focus of this wet pond will be to
provide improved water quality before discharging to Lake Henryetta and Munson Slough. Bank stabilization will be necessary to eliminate bank erosion and sluffing due to the sandy nature of the soils. Little or no amenities will be designed at this time, but consideration of their future requirements, in conjunction with the pond site layout design will be addressed. The main parcel required for the construction of this pond is owned by Leon County. This project is currently considered to have the greatest cost/benefit ratio and is a recommended candidate for stimulus funding. The pond will be designed to maximize flood attenuation and treatment volumes within the right-of-way limits with a curvilinear shape and littoral vegetation. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends proceeding with a 60% design effort in anticipation of federal stimulus funding for a future design/build contract and would allow starting the acquisition process of the two adjoining properties identified in the Master Plan.

**Improvement 2: Design the channel lining of the SAB from Bronough St. to South Monroe Street** - The flooding at South Monroe Street, due to the constriction of the box culvert, has been reduced by the enclosure of the SAB upstream of (east of) South Monroe Street. The higher velocity discharge resulting from this enclosure has stressed the downstream ditch segment creating erosion in the ditch. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends lining the segment of SAB between Monroe Street and Bronough Street ([Attachment 4](#)) to address the erosion and also improve the ditch conveyance. Lining the channel will eliminate the erosion and reduce the routine maintenance effort required in the vegetated channel. Possible alternate ditch lining concepts that provide the desired improvement include a concrete gunite lining or a gabion basket lining and will be investigated further. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends proceeding with 100% design and permitting contract and if feasible, adding this improvement to the CCT - Segment 2 construction letting.

**Improvement 3: Design an Off-line SWMF at Coal Chute Park** - A water quality treatment and flood attenuation facility is recommended for Coal Chute Park site ([Attachment 5](#)) shown in the Master Plan concept in Segment 3. An off-line treatment option is recommended for this location because it will target the initial runoff of untreated waters from a 16-acre watershed located north of the CSX Railroad and also Railroad Square. This watershed which currently flows directly into the SAB through a 36” pipe, which will be redirected to the proposed facility. The main parcel in Coal Chute Park is owned by the City of Tallahassee; a second parcel is owned by Leon County; and, a third parcel has been acquired by Blueprint 2000. Seven other relatively minor acquisitions will be necessary for a pond at this location.

The City Economic and Community Development Department is proposing to submit a grant application through the Federal Economic Development Administration’s (EDA) “Disaster Relief Opportunity” program. Per the Federal Announcement, “This investment assistance will help devise long-term economic redevelopment strategies and carry out implementation activities and public works projects to address economic development challenges in regions impacted by hurricanes, floods and other natural disasters during 2008 and covered by a major disaster declaration...” The proposed $2 million in grant funding would be used to construct the Coal Chute Park pond as part of the flood relief/ water quality element of the Cascade Trail project (Segment 3) and is key
to the economic revitalization efforts related to Gaines Street and the FAMU Way Extension. The pond is to be located immediately west of Railroad Square and would also assist in those redevelopment plans. Blueprint is assisting the City in preparation of the grant and would partner with the City in the construction of the pond. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends proceeding with a 100% design and permitting contract in anticipation of EDA grant funds.

OPTIONS
Option 1: Approve Staff recommendation to proceed with the design of the following three improvements:

- Master Plan Segment 4 – Pond 5 (60% design)
- Master Plan Segment 3 – Ditch Conveyance Improvements from South Monroe to Bronough Overpass (100% design and permitting)
- Master Plan Segment 3 – Coal Chute Park Pond (100% design and permitting)

Option 2: Board direction

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve Staff recommendation to proceed with the design of the following three improvements:

- Master Plan Segment 4 – Pond 5 (60% design)
- Master Plan Segment 3 – Ditch Conveyance Improvements from South Monroe to Bronough Overpass (100% design and permitting)
- Master Plan Segment 3 – Coal Chute Park Pond (100% design and permitting)

Action by TCC and CAC:
Provided for information only.
The TCC suggested completing the stormwater modeling for the entire Segments 3 and 4 Master Plan improvements before proceeding with constructing specific stormwater elements. The CAC agreed with the Blueprint 2000 staff recommendations.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Segment 3, Myers Industrial Pond
Attachment 2: Segment 3, Van Buren Street Stormwater Management Facility
Attachment 3: Segment 4: Pond 5 Stormwater Management Facility
Attachment 4: Segment 3: SAB Lining: Bronough Street to South Monroe Street
Attachment 5: Segment 3: Coal Chute Park Stormwater Management Facility
Off-line Treatment (Preferred) – Dry & Wet Detention

Attachment 1: Myers Industrial Park
Van Buren Street Stormwater Pond: 5.2 AC
Attachement 3: Black Swamp Nature Park

- Wet Pond
- Stabilize Bank
- South of Orange Ave.
Attachment 4: Monroe Street to Bronough Street

- 1000 Ft Gunite
- Gabion
- Lined Ditch Options
- Improve Ditch Conveyance and Protection

Improve Ditch Conveyance and Protection

Attachment 4: Monroe Street to Bronough Street
- More Effective Treatment
- Off-line Treatment (Preferred)

Attachment 5: Coal Chute Park
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Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road - Design/Build Project
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to secure Intergovernmental Agency (IA) approval of actions needed for a Design/Build Team to implement an interim 4-lane improvement on Capital Circle SE between Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Road. This design/build project will be funded in its entirety by the Federal Government’s Economic Stimulus Package.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The adopted strategy for this segment of Capital Circle was to prepare plans for the 1.53 miles between Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Road to the 60% complete stage with further design efforts deferred until external funds became available. The 60% plans for a 7-lane roadway were finished in 2008 and have been shelved awaiting funding. A Typical Section sheet detailing the 4-lane interim and 7-lane roadway is attached. The intent of this strategy was to be able to move quickly should funds become available.

FDOT has placed this $15 million project on their approved projects list. This project meets the goals of the Economic Stimulus Package and we are hopeful that this funding will be secured. A prerequisite for funding any project from Economic Stimulus Package dollars is that a construction contract must be signed within 120 days of funds distribution. This requirement has accelerated Blueprint’s actions regarding the solicitation of qualified contractors and design consultants for this project.

Design/Build Team Procurement: A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued on January 18, 2009 to the construction industry for Design/Build teams to compete for the project. One week prior to releasing the RFQ, we issued a Public Notice detailing the project and potential funding opportunities from the Federal Economic Stimulus Package. A copy of the Public Notice is attached. Responses to our RFQ from Design/Build teams were received on February 5, 2009. Subject to IA approval, Blueprint will shortlist three (3) Design/Build teams from the RFQs received to compete for the design and construction of the interim 4-lane improvements on Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road.

If and when funding is secured via the Federal Stimulus Package, the shortlisted teams will be asked to prepare a technical proposal and provide construction bids to build the project. Again, a contract with the winning Design/Build team must be signed within 120 days of receipt of
Economic Stimulus funds. If funds are awarded in February 2009, Blueprint anticipates an executed contract in late May 2009.

**Construction Engineering and Inspection Consultant:** Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) services will be required for this project. Several opportunities to expedite the selection and award of a CE&I contract currently exist. They are as follows:

1. Extend the current CE&I contract with the CE&I contractor (PB America) currently working on the construction of the adjacent segment of Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Tram Road.
2. Use the #2 firm, Greenhorne and O’Mara, from the recent CE&I selection for the Capital Circle NW/SW Reconstruction Project from West Tennessee Street to Orange Avenue.
3. Use the contractor selected (the #1 firm, PBS&J) from the Capital Circle NW/SW Reconstruction Project on the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road segment if construction of the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road project begins first.

**OPTION 1:**

a. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to solicit a Design/Build contract to construct the interim 4-lane improvements on Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road. Included in this solicitation is a stipend not to exceed $25k for unsuccessful firms.

b. Authorize Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) to negotiate and award a Design/Build contract to construct the interim 4-lane improvements on Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road.

c. Approve budget and budget appropriations equal to the amount provided by the Economic Stimulus Package and incorporate the project funding into the Blueprint Master Plan and the FY 2009 Capital Budget.

d. Authorize the IMC to select the Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) consultant for this project

**OPTION 2:** Board Guidance

**RECOMMENDATION: OPTION 1**

a. Authorize Blueprint 2000 to solicit a Design/Build contract to construct the interim 4-lane improvements on Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road. Included in this solicitation is a stipend not to exceed $25k for unsuccessful firms.

b. Authorize Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) to negotiate and award a Design/Build contract to construct the interim 4-lane improvements on Capital Circle SE from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road.

c. Approve budget and budget appropriations equal to the amount provided by the Economic Stimulus Package and incorporate the project funding into the Blueprint Master Plan and the FY 2009 Capital Budget.
d. Authorize the IMC to select the Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) consultant for this project

Action by TCC and CAC:
Presented as information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Four-lane interim and seven-lane typical sections
PUBLIC NOTICE

The purpose of this notice is to inform potentially interested parties that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency may soon be soliciting Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the Design-Build of Capital Circle from west of Woodville Highway to east of Crawfordville Road. This project will expand the existing two traffic lanes to an interim four lanes. Blueprint 2000 currently has 60 percent plans for a seven-lane improvement. These plans will be provided as part of any forthcoming RFP. The roadway portion of the plans may be accessed now at the Blueprint FTP site: ftp://66.194.26.60; Username: bp2000; Password: bp2k-2008.

This notice is issued in anticipation of necessary funding becoming available as part of a potential Federal Economic Stimulus Package. The Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors has not yet approved the issuance of a Request for Qualifications for this project. Interested parties are hereby notified that the necessary funding for this project is not currently available and the project will not be awarded without the additional funding.

We are issuing this notice based on current known parameters for projects to be eligible for funding. Existing parameters dictate that the project will be under contract within 120 calendar days of a date to be determined (anticipated to be around February 1, 2009). This short timeframe necessitates this preliminary and unofficial notification to all interested parties to provide the maximum planning time prior to the issuance of the RFQ. Interested parties are advised to review previously issued Design-Build Request for Qualification documents issued by Blueprint 2000 in anticipation that future RFQs will be similar.

Prior to the issuance of the RFQ questions can be addressed to David Snyder, Program Manager, 850-701-2740. Post issuance of the RFQ, normal procurement policy will apply.

To reiterate: this Request for Qualifications has not been approved by the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors; it is currently unfunded; is dependent upon funding becoming available and a contract being awarded within the parameters established by the stimulus program.
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Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Construction Project Limits
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the IA of the current construction funding situation for the Capital Circle NW/SW Project. This item is for presentation only. No discussion is required.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Improvements to Capital Circle NW/SW are high MPO and Intergovernmental Agency (IA) priorities. Based on previous IA discussions, the IA concurred that the Capital Circle segment from Tennessee Street to Orange Avenue should be addressed as soon as possible to improve access to Tallahassee Regional Airport, and to support further economic development on the south side. This project is currently in the final design stage with Final Construction Plans and Permits scheduled to be completed by May/June 2009.

Current Funding Situation/Facts:

- Current FY09 Construction Budget: $46.5 million
- Construction Engineering and Inspection: $2.5 million
- Contingency: $4.0 million
- Actual Funds Available for Construction: $40.0 million

Based on current revenue projections, further reductions to the Master Plan may be required, which may result in the reduction of available funding for the Capital Circle NW/SW project. In the event that reductions to this project are required, the following three options are currently being considered for construction of the project.

**Option 1:** Construct Project from South of US 90 to North of SR 20
Estimated Construction Cost: $34.4 million

**Option 2:** Construct Project from South of US 90 to South of SR 20
Estimated Construction Cost: $46.9 million

**Option 3:** Construct Project from South of US 90 to South of Orange Avenue
Estimated Construction Cost: $55.2 million
Blueprint will continue with right-of-way acquisition and the design of the entire project, as planned, in order to be in a position to move forward with construction of the full project (Option 3) as Blueprint pursues alternative funding sources, such as future Stimulus or SIS funding.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

No action required. This item is presented as information only.

**Action by TCC and CAC:**
Presented as information only.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
None
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Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Resolutions
**Agenda Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE:</th>
<th>Capital Circle NW/SW: U.S. 90 to Orange Avenue Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Resolutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>February 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested By:</td>
<td>Blueprint 2000 Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Debra Schiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Item:</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
The IA previously approved resolutions involving acquisition of parcels identified for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street. Pursuant to changes to Florida Statutes during the 2006 Legislative Session, a separate resolution must now be approved for each individual property/parcel to be acquired through eminent domain. This item provides the required documentation and asks the IA to again approve the acquisition of the subject parcels, which have not yet been acquired by Blueprint.

**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 stating the public purpose of a project and the necessity of acquiring parcels needed to construct the project, which are identified in the resolution. Each resolution provides that the acquisition of the necessary parcels can be in the form of a negotiated settlement or through condemnation.

Typically in the past one resolution was used for the acquisition of multiple parcels necessary for a project. However, pursuant to changes made to §§ 127.02 and 166.410, Florida Statutes it is now a requirement that before a local governing body may exercise its power of eminent domain it must adopt “a resolution authorizing the acquisition of a property.” (Emphasis added.) Subsequent judicial interpretation of this requirement has held that a separate, specific and individual resolution is required in order to proceed with condemnation. It appears the judicial interpretation is consistent with legislative intent as manifested in Senate Committee Staff Analysis reports issued and circulated with the legislation, which Blueprint Staff has reviewed.

The 34 fee parcels, 11 temporary construction easements, and one permanent drainage easement that must still be acquired from property owners in order to complete the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest, Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street, were
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION (cont.):

previously included in resolutions involving multiple parcels. However, to avoid potential project delays Blueprint Staff is now seeking approval of individual resolutions to comply with the statutory changes and recent judicial interpretation of those changes. Each property/parcel is described in the attached resolutions. Funding for the right-of-way for this project consists of $42 Million of SIS funds.

OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve the individual resolutions allowing the acquisition of fee parcels numbered 101, 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 146, 161, 163, 166, 170, 239, 241, 242, 244, 251, temporary construction easements numbered 701, 703, 705, 706, 711, 712, 717, 718, 719, 720, 722, and Parcel 801, a permanent drainage easement. These parcels are all 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 individual resolutions allowing the acquisition of fee parcels numbered 101, 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 146, 161, 163, 166, 170, 239, 241, 242, 244, 251, temporary construction easements numbered 701, 703, 705, 706, 711, 712, 717, 718, 719, 720, 722, and Parcel 801, a permanent drainage easement. These parcels are all 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: Attachments provided separately.

1. 46 individual resolutions that each include an Exhibit “A” describing the boundaries of the fee parcels and easements to be acquired. (IA Only)
2. Location map(s) identifying the needed parcels. (IA Only)
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EECC Presentation Regarding Capital Circle Southwest
SUBJECT/TITLE: EECC Presentation to IA Regarding Capital Circle SW

Date: February 23, 2009 Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright/Kathy Archibald Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This is a presentation from the EECC on issues regarding Capital Circle SW.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
During the “Items from Members of the Committee” portion of the December 4, 2008, CAC meeting, Kathy Archibald indicated that the EECC would like time on the next IA agenda to remind the Board of the original purpose of the realignment of Capital Circle SW.

OPTIONS
For information only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Not presented to TCC. Kathy Archibald made a brief presentation to the CAC explaining the original EECC vision for this corridor. No action was taken.

ATTACHMENTS:
None
#17

Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study – Recommended Corridor Segment Solutions
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study – Recommended Corridor Segment Solutions

Date: February 23, 2009
Requested By: Blueprint 2000
Contact Person: Jim Davis/Latesa Turner
Type of Item: Presentation/Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to request Board approval of Staff’s recommended solutions for the Capital Circle SW corridor segments (See Attachment 1). The approved corridor segment solutions will be combined to develop the Existing Alignment Alternative and the Realignment Alternative for further evaluation in the Capital Circle SW PD&E study.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Staff concurs with the recommendations for the corridor segment solutions as provided by the PD&E Consultant, Kimley-Horn and Associates (See Attachment 2). The recommended solutions for each of the four corridor segments are as follows:

- **Segment 1** - Existing Capital Circle, generally from Crawfordville Road to Near Springhill Road
  Recommended Solution: Widen Right

- **Segment 2** - Existing Capital Circle, generally from Springhill Road to South of SR 20
  Recommended Solution: Hybrid Solution

- **Segment 3/3c** - Realignment, generally from the Capital Circle/Springhill Road Intersection to the Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection
  Recommended Solution: 3c – Center Alignment

- **Segment 4** - Realignment, generally from the Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection to south of SR 20
  Recommended Solution: 4b1-North Alignment

Following IA approval of the recommended segment solutions, Segments 1 and 2 will be combined to form an Existing Alignment Alternative and Segments 1, 3 and 4 will be combined to form a Realignment Alternative.

The Existing Alignment Alternative and the Realignment Alternative will be carried forward for final evaluation and comparison with the “No-Build” alternative. The results of the evaluations for the two build alternatives and the “No-Build” alternative will be presented to the public at the Preferred Alternatives Public Meeting tentatively scheduled for May 5, 2009.
OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve Staff recommendation for the corridor segment solutions:
   a. Segment 1: Widen Right
   b. Segment 2: Hybrid Solution
   c. Segment 3/3c: 3c – Center Alignment
   d. Segment 4: 4b1-North Alignment

Option 2: Board direction.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve Staff recommendation for the corridor segment solutions:
   a. Segment 1: Widen Right
   b. Segment 2: Hybrid Solution
   c. Segment 3/3c: 3c – Center Alignment
   d. Segment 4: 4b1-North Alignment

Action by TCC and CAC:
TCC: Provided for information only, no action was taken.
CAC: The CAC approved the recommended action. The CAC, which includes four original EECC members, encouraged the Commissions and the FSU Administration to have a vision for economic development for the area.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Map Showing Corridor Segments
2. CCSW Segment Recommendations and Background Information
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Introduction

The purpose of this document is to present the recommendations for the Capital Circle Southwest Corridor Segment solutions which will be used to define an Existing Alignment Alternative and Realignment Alternative for further evaluation in the Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study. This document summarizes the analysis conducted by the PD&E Consultant (Kimley-Horn & Associates). The recommended segment solutions are the product of the consultant’s analysis and input received from Blueprint 2000’s Community Representatives and the public, during the November 13, 2008 Alternatives Meeting.

During the last fifteen months citizens and the Blueprint/consulting team have worked together to define and evaluate reasonable alternatives for the alignment of Capital Circle Southwest. A Public Alternatives Meeting was held last November so that citizens could discuss the evaluation of alternative concepts for each of the four corridor segments (see Figure 1). The best solution for segments 1 and 2 will be combined to form an existing alignment alternative. The best solutions in segments 1, 3 and 4 will be combined to form a realignment alternative. The existing alignment alternative and the realignment alternative will be compared to the No-Build alternative and presented at the Preferred Alternative Public Meeting which is tentatively scheduled for May 2009.

Alternatives for each segment were compared using a Decision Matrix. The matrix for each segment only includes those evaluation categories such as wetlands, cost, and residential impacts that are substantially different among the respective segment alternatives. This helps simplify the process of identifying the best segment alternative. A Decision Matrix for each segment is attached. The full IA-approved weighted Evaluation Matrix will be applied to the full existing and realignment alternatives once they are identified.

The following sections state the recommended alternatives for each segment, and provide information on key issues and Community Representative discussions.
Figure 1. Corridor Segment Alternatives
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Capital Circle Southwest
Proposed Alternatives Based on the Concepts Charrette
Segment 1

Existing Capital Circle from Crawfordville Road to south of Springhill Road

**Recommendation**

Widen Right. All right-of-way would be acquired from the right (north) side.

**Background:**

This is the lowest impact, lowest cost alternative. This was the citizen’s recommendation from the Alternatives Meeting.
### Segment 1 Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Importance based upon IA approved weighting:</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low, Moderate, High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic

6. Cost

- **Moderate**
- **Medium**
  - $47.4 million.
- **Lowest**
  - $46.1 million.
- **High**
  - $49.9 million.

Summary: Costs are compared to the lowest cost alternative.

#### Social

12a. Residential Neighborhoods: (Right-of-Way Impacts)

- **High**
- **Medium**
  - Impacts 13 residential parcels, relocates 18 households on 11 parcels.
- **Lowest**
  - Impacts 8 residential parcels (relocates 11 households on 4 parcels).
- **Low**
  - Impacts 7 residential parcels (relocates 13 households on 6 parcels).

Summary: The range of impacts from lowest to highest is small. However, the left alignment doubles the number of residential parcels with household relocations.

13. Business Community

- **Low**
  - Impacts 7 parcels and relocates 7 businesses.
- **Lowest**
  - Impacts 6 parcels and relocates 6 businesses.
- **Medium**
  - Impacts 12 parcels and relocates 8 businesses.

Summary: Segment 1 alternatives will result in moderate impacts to existing businesses along CCSW.
Segment 2

Existing Capital Circle from south of Springhill Road to south of SR 20 (Blountstown Highway)

Recommendation

Hybrid solution. This is a combination solution that was developed as a result of constructive citizen input at the Alternatives Meeting and a Community Representatives Meeting. At the south end of Segment 2, the existing left (south) right-of-way line is held and widening would occur to the right (north). In the vicinity of the developed portions of the Tallahassee Regional Airport, all right-of-way would be acquired from the right but the median width would be reduced to 22 feet and the roadway footprint would be shifted closer to the left right-of-way line. This would allow a 50-foot area of the forest uplands on the north side within the right of way to remain undisturbed at this time. Use of that 50-foot strip for transit or other uses in the future would require FHWA approval. North of the developed Airport area, the roadway would shift to the left (west) and all right-of-way would be obtained from the Airport.

Background

This solution minimizes the upland impact to the forest land while maintaining a segment cost of $110 million, which is $26 million less than the widen-left alternative cost. Although citizens at the Alternatives Meeting preferred the widen-left alternative because it avoided upland impacts to the forest property, the alternative would have major impacts to the Airport and increase costs by $26 million. The Community Representatives helped refine the Hybrid solution and most of the Community Representatives believe that the recommended Hybrid solution does the best job possible of balancing the upland impacts and cost while avoiding major Airport impacts. Coordination will continue with various agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service on the selected alternative and further refinements made as necessary.
Segment 2-1 (South)
- Minimizes impacts to airport property
- Minimizes impacts to upland habitat, when compared with Segment 2 Right (Old)
Figure 5. Segment 2-2 Hybrid Alignment (South/Middle)

Segment 2-2 (South/Middle)
- Avoids impacts to the airport in the vicinity of the terminal and the general aviation operations
- Allows for the creation of a 50-foot buffer on the right (North/East) side of the alignment
- Minimizes upland impacts
- Minimizes cost
Segment 2-3 (North/Middle)

- Minimizes upland impacts, with no impacts to the Lake Bradford Tract
- No impacts to developed airport property
Segment 2-4 (North)

- Remains consistent with CCNW/SCW, north of the Bradford Brook.

Cascade Lake

Lake Minnehaha

Segment 2-4 - Hybrid Alignment (North)
### Segment 2 Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Habitat, Natural</td>
<td>37.4 ac. of native upland habitat</td>
<td>74.5 ac. of native upland habitat</td>
<td>40.2 ac. of native upland habitat</td>
<td>44.2 ac. of native upland habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No additional habitat fragmentation effects occur. There is a moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence for all Segment 2 alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$130.9 million</td>
<td>$111.9 million</td>
<td>$109.9 million</td>
<td>$79.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Business Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High impacts to the Tallahassee Regional Airport Relocates 1 business</td>
<td>No impacts to the Tallahassee Regional Airport Relocates 1 business</td>
<td>Moderate impacts to the Tallahassee Regional Airport Relocates 1 business</td>
<td>Minimal impacts to the Tallahassee Regional Airport Relocates 1 business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**
- Costs are compared to the lowest cost alternative.
- Business impacts primarily to Tallahassee Regional Airport. All Segment 2 alternatives relocate the Burger King at Roundabout Highway.
### Segment 2 North Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td>No additional habitat fragmentation effects occur. There is a moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence for all Segment 2 alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td>17.9 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td>17.9 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Left holds existing left-of-way adjacent to the wastewater treatment facility.

### Segment 2 Middle Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Medium" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td>No additional habitat fragmentation effects occur. There is a moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence for all Segment 2 alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 acres of native upland habitat, 1.49% of contiguous uplands.</td>
<td>30.9 acres of native upland habitat, 9.69% of contiguous uplands.</td>
<td>15.3 acres of native upland habitat, 4.9% of contiguous uplands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Segment 2 South Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Medium" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lowest" /></td>
<td>No additional habitat fragmentation effects occur. There is a moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence for all Segment 2 alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td>25.7 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td>15 acres of native upland habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment 3/3c
Realignment from Capital Circle/Springhill Road to Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection

Recommendation
Center Alignment. This solution balances wetland impacts and neighborhood impacts while minimizing cost.

Background
The citizens who evaluated this segment in the Alternatives Meeting recommended the center alignment for Segment 3 and the left alternative for Segment 3c. These two recommendations are inconsistent with each other as the impacts are not substantially different when comparing Segments 3 and 3c alternatives. The left alternative does reduce wetland impacts to Black Swamp, but it increases impacts to the adjacent neighborhood. The impact to Black Swamp would be fringe and would be offset by other enhancements to Black Swamp. The Community Representatives agree that the center alignment is the best solution for Segment 3c.
### Segment 3c Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>3c LBE East</th>
<th>3c LBE West</th>
<th>3c LBE Center</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wetlands</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The impacts to moderate quality wetlands tend to vary between Segment 3c alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.29 acres and no fragmentation.</td>
<td>3.71 acres</td>
<td>3.74 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cost</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Costs are compared to the lowest cost alternative of all Segments 3c alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$59.0 million</td>
<td>$73.6 million</td>
<td>$58.5 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. Residential Neighborhoods:</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>At Segment 3c alternatives affect a large number of households with right-of-way impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Right-of-Way Impacts)</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Impacts 5 residential parcels, (relocates 48 households on 2 parcels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts 5 residential parcels, (relocates 48 households on 2 parcels).</td>
<td>Impacts 5 residential parcels, (relocates 48 households on 2 parcels).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment 4

Realignment from Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection to south of SR 20 (Blountstown Highway)

Recommendation

Alignment 4b1-North. This alternative avoids major impacts to the adopted FSU Southwest Campus Master Plan and provides a better opportunity to develop water management ponds. It provides more exposure to land, thereby enhancing economic development opportunity. It is in conflict with FSU’s long range desires for this area. Therefore close coordination between local government and FSU will be important. See background for details. This alternative would require the relocation of the Florida Juvenile Detention Center.

Background

Many alternatives were evaluated for this segment. Some alternatives had impacts to high quality wetlands. Some alternatives had major impacts on the FSU Southwest Campus Master Plan. There were two alternatives that minimized these impacts. These were 4b1-North and 4c. The Community Representatives asked the Consulting team to look harder at the future land use opportunities afforded by the alternatives as it might relate to economic development. From this review, it was determined that the amount and location of government property along the 4b1-North alignment would give local government some unique opportunities to promote economic development in this area. Further, this alignment is preferred from a water management perspective since the ponds can be located in more favorable locations than on the 4c (Orange Avenue) alignment. Most Community Representatives favor the 4b1-North alignment. A review of the Decision Matrix shows that 4b1-North has more upland impact than 4c. However, it was the Community Representatives belief that the subject uplands were not as sensitive as those in the National Forest and that they were likely to be developed as a part of economic development. Thus they did not see uplands as a separator. Residential impacts are slightly higher for 4b1-North but the noise impacts to the remaining residences are much less. The impacts to businesses are less for 4b1-North. However, the Juvenile Detention Center would require relocation. This property would make approximately 5 more acres of land available for economic development. Costs are higher for 4b1-North than 4c due to the realignment configuration. However, the topography along the 4b1-North alignment is more favorable in the implementation of the stormwater management ponds proposed for Segment 4. FSU has indicated that they have a vision to acquire all of the land between their two parcels in the future. However, there is no funding for this acquisition, and no specific plan at this time. FSU would prefer not to have a major road through their campus. The 4b North alignment would impact the approved Phase I FSU development. The 4b1-North alignment does not affect the approved plan, but would pass through the long range FSU planning area. Inspite of these possible long term impacts, the 4b1-North alignment is still recommended over 4c as it provides more accessibility to adjacent land. This can serve to promote economic development. Alternative 4b1-North also provides enhanced opportunity for stormwater management. In order to minimize FSU impacts, local government can work with FSU to define the best combination of land uses to support FSU and Southside economic development.
Segment 4b North - FSU Master Plan

- Segment 4b North Centerline
- FSU Master Plan
- FSU Long-Range Expansion Target
Figure 13. Segment 4b1 - North FSU Master Plan
Segment 4c - FSU Master Plan

- Segment 4c Centerline
- FSU Master Plan
- PDV Long-Range Expansion Target

Figure 14. Segment 4c - FSU Master Plan
Figure 16. Segment 4c - Economic Development Opportunities
## Segment 4 Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>4b1 North</th>
<th>4c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Floodplains</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surface Water Protection</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wetlands</td>
<td>Low*</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>6. Cost</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>12a. Residential Neighborhoods (Right-of-Way Impacts)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. Residential Neighborhoods (Noise Impacts)</td>
<td>Medium*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Business Community</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relative Importance based upon IA approved weighting: Low, Moderate, High

**Red = Impact**

**Black = Enhancement**

- **Low**: Impact less than 1.05 acres
- **Medium**: Impact between 1.05 and 24.8 acres
- **Low***: Impact between 0.81 and 1.05 acres
- **Lowest**: Impact greater than 24.8 acres

### Effects:

- **Effect: Relative to lowest or highest (Low, Medium, High).**

**Figure 17. Segment 4 Decision Matrix**