INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY MEETING

June 4, 2007
3:00 pm to 5:00 pm
City Commission Chambers

Chairman: Mark Mustian

Agenda

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

II. INFORMATION ITEMS
1. Capital Circle NW Completion and Ribbon Cutting  Margie Quillman
2. Capital Circle NW/SW Access Classification  Paul Hiers
3. Capital Circle SW PD&E Update  Paul Hiers
4. Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Marketing Plan Update  Jim Davis
5. Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel  Dave Bright
6A-B. CAC Minutes (February 8, 2007 and March 15, 2007)  Dave Bright

III. CONSENT
7. IA Meeting Minutes: February 26, 2007  Chairman Mustian
8. Capital Circle NW/SW: Mitigation Parcels Acquisition And Resolution PULLED  Randy Matheny
11. Capital Cascade Trail Supplemental Services Approval  Gary Phillips
12. FY 2006 Performance Audit  Phil Maher

IV. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION
14. CAC Chairman’s Report  Terence Hinson
15. Election of Vice Chairman  Chairman Mustian
   (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)
18. Regional Stormwater Pond: Park Concept (CCNW)  Dave Bright
19. Approval of the Issuance of $72,000,000 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2007  Phil Maher/Bob Inzer
20. Proposed FY 2008 Blueprint Operating Budget  Phil Maher
V. PUBLIC HEARINGS – 4:30 pm*  
22. Fred George Basin Acquisition Funding and Moving    Dave Bright  
    Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1  
23. Mahan Drive Update-FDOT Funding and Moving    Jim Davis  
    Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1  

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

Capital Circle NW Completion and Ribbon Cutting
### SUBJECT/TITLE:
Capital Circle NW Completion and Ribbon Cutting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: June 4, 2007</th>
<th>Requested By: Jim Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Type of Item: Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
This item addresses the completion of construction on Capital Circle NW (I-10 to US 90/West Tennessee Street) and scheduling of the ribbon cutting ceremony.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**
- The Florida Department of Transportation is currently in the final stages of construction for the widening of Capital Circle Northwest from Interstate 10 to US 90.

- Construction completion date for Capital Circle Northwest is expected to be late August 2007 which is ahead of schedule.

- The Blueprint Public Information Office will be polling Commissioners for possible ribbon cutting ceremony dates in September.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
For information only.

**Action by TCC and CAC:** None
#2

Capital Circle
NW/SW Access
Classification
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle NW/SW Access Classification

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

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

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

Due to the significant amount of work already completed on this project, FDOT granted a Design Variance for a reduced speed of 45 MPH for Capital Circle NW/SW, however, to achieve the high level of traffic operations and mobility desired from an SIS facility the following commitments were made:
- Facility will be designed for Level of Service (LOS) C in the design year
- FHIS Access Management Class 3 criteria will be applied to the project

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For information only.

Action by TCC and CAC: None.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Proposed median openings based on Access Management Classification 5
2. Proposed median openings based on Access Management Classification 3
PD&E Study
Proposed Capital Circle NW/SW
Median Opening Spacing

H:\Projects_V8\1800\415 ... \spacing criteria2.ppt
Proposed Capital Circle NW/SW
Median Opening Spacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>Distance (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA 110</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 129</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 152</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 170</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 186</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 203</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 225</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 241</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 263</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPACING CRITERIA ACCESS CLASS 3**

- Full Median Opening: 2640
- Directional Median Opening: 1320
#3

Capital Circle
SW PD&E
Update
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update

Date: June 4, 2007

Contact Person: Jim Davis/Paul Hiers

REQUESTED BY: Staff

Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the IA of the progress of the Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study. As of June 2007, we are in the 10th month of this 36 month study.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The project Study Area was divided into six individual areas or districts to allow the project team to gain a clear understanding of what is important to those who live, work, or play within those individual areas. Six Facilitated Forums, one in each District, were conducted during late February and early March. A Community-wide meeting was held on April 12th to bring together the comments and provide the results of the individual District Forums to all participants.

A two-session Concepts Charrette event was held on May 10th and May 12th where members of the community were provided an opportunity to work together with the project team to draw actual alignment concepts for further study. At Session 1, participants developed corridor pathways for Capital Circle Southwest within the entire study area. During Session 2 participants identified possible alignments within the corridor pathways developed at the first session. Over the next year, the consultant will further refine and conduct in-depth analysis for the alignments identified.

The remaining study schedule is as follows:
- Alternatives Public Information Meeting April 2008
- Preferred Alternative Public Meeting December 2008
- Public Hearing June 2009

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

ATTACHMENTS:
1. List of comments received at the individual District Forums.
2. Alignments identified/developed from the Concept Charrette
The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study. Those comments that are not highlighted, though they are of value and are important, they are not being included in the study as the project team moves forward. However, they have been provided to the appropriate agency.

Mailers sent: Approximately 900  
Attendance: 73

- **Preservation of Rankin Avenue and Eisenhower Street [30 overall]**
  - Keep Rankin Avenue and Eisenhower Street for local access and have new traffic on other roadways [18]
  - Keep streets local for neighbors only [0]
  - Don’t use Rankin Avenue for FSU Complex Entrance [3]
  - Minimize/eliminate use of local roads (Rankin and Eisenhower) for access to developments (new road) [8]
  - Concerned about Traffic on Rankin Avenue because of new developments [1]

- **Development & Development Access [19 overall]**
  - Need for affordable, secure housing in this community, keeping the unique character of existing neighborhoods [12]
  - Information needs to be provided to the neighborhood about future land use in this area [3]
  - Concerned about the removal of trees from new development [1]
  - Concerned about the redevelopment of the church on Dale Street because of infill housing that is being built (higher density and resulting traffic) [1]
  - Currently planned projects need to be provided to the project team and throughout the neighborhood in order to make informed decisions [1]
  - Concerned with traffic related to new developments. Make sure there is enough capacity on main roads. [1]
  - Concerned about the accelerated rate of development adjacent to neighborhood (rezoning, intramural fields) [0]

- **Need for recreation areas, bike trails, playground [15]**
- **CCSW should be widened along existing alignment (medians with trees, 4 lanes) [9]**
- **Utilize existing vacant Florida Highway Patrol Training Building for Community Centers [5]**
- **Keep the environmental (wildlife, trees) diversity in the area [4]**
- Need for speed bumps on Eisenhower Street [3]
- **Need for better connections to sports fields** [2]
- Jackson Bluff Road and Rankin Avenue intersection needs improvements [2]
- Citizens would like bicycle and pedestrian access to National Forest [1]
- Rankin Avenue and Roswell Drive intersection needs improvement [1]
  - Traffic islands unsafe
  - How will this project affect the property values?
- Need for school improvements [0]
- Concerned about the impact of potential new/increased traffic on CCSW new alignment [0]
- Want neighborhood access to FSU Complex [0]
- Need mechanism to influence current developments; do not wait 3 years for CCSW final plan (need coordination with local planning departments) [0]
- Land up to the west of power lines – Delta Industrial Park (145 acres – under conservations easement currently for most of land) - Use high ground for consideration [0]
- Concerned about noise levels of vehicles (radios) [0]
  - Every third car is loud
  - Enforcement issue?
- Jackson Bluff Road needs to be repaved [0]
- Flooding occurs on Mabry Avenue next to Strickly Wholesale [0]
Forum Comments
District 2: Lake Bradford District
February 10, 2007

The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study. Those comments that are not highlighted, though they are of value and are important, they are not being included in the study as the project team moves forward. However, they have been provided to the appropriate agency.

Mailers sent: Approximately 235
Attendance: 33

- Understanding and protecting the Natural Environment [41 overall]
  - Make environmental enhancements a priority over design of roadway during project development [9]
  - Water flow in the chain of lakes must be studied and understood [6]
  - Think of alternatives to widening CCSW to solve transportation needs [6]
  - Pathway, trail, and/or walking trail to be developed with periodic education stations on the environment. A plan was created in 1988 that was similar to this [4]
  - Community needs to understand the many sinkholes in the area [3]
    - Educate on importance of sinkhole and geology
  - Lake Bradford and the rest of the chain of lakes are the only pristine lakes in this area of Tallahassee [0]
    - These lakes are the center of the community [3]
  - The Erosion controls used in this project must be proven successful, we must learn from past erosion control mistakes. [3]
  - Need to understand who is working on managing and cleaning up Grassy Lake [2]
    - Leon County Involvement?
    - It needs clean up, there is trash washing in
  - Recommend map improvements (during project development) [2]
    - Need waterflow/hydrology connections, the canals under CCSW, and areas of backflow/runoff
  - Signs need to be included to encourage preservation of the natural environment [1]
  - Enhance natural function of Black Swamp and Lake Munson (monitoring will occur during study) [1]
  - Show Lake Cascade on project maps [1]
  - Look for ways to keep garbage out of the environment [0]
  - Unique garbage cans
Education to address lake litter
Sink hole near intersection of CCSW and Orange Ave. should be turned into educational opportunity for public [0]
The public needs to know time of hydrologic studies-what was level of lake? [0]
Understand recent Lake Jackson erosion control failure [0]
- FSU Reservation and the Tallahassee Museum are assets to be protected and supported [8]
- Big Bend Scenic Byway is important to the area for economic development (combining natural heritage and tourism) [3]
- Public relations and the economics related to this project involve the whole community [2]
- Need for interconnections to trails and greenways [2]
- Archeological assets need to be identified – Lake Bradford Tract [1]
- Star Metro access to the airport and other destinations is needed in the project study area [1]
- Make sure past public comments are included in our study [0]
- Make use of those in area that have extensive knowledge of the area [0]
- What types of new business will be created along Orange Avenue as part of this project - this will affect water quality – stormwater management must be addressed for new businesses (standards and guidelines) [0]
- What is future of airport capacity as it relates to traffic demand? (i.e. Panama City Airport) [0]
The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [ ] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study.

Mailers sent: Approximately 100
Attendance: 8

- Transportation of all modes to this area are needed to connect this area’s economic potential to other parts of the community with access to airport [10]
  - Thomasville, Gadsden County
  - 700 people work at airport
- Need for better business access [5 overall]
  - Businesses pass up this area because of access concerns [4]
  - Interstate access [1]
- Those in the area are looking for an increase of visual and economic development appeal in area surrounding airport [3]
- Need to plan for expected growth of traffic – including heavy vehicles [0]
- Need to consider the transport of hazardous materials along this roadway [0]
- Opportunity to create a dressed up gateway to the community [0]
  - Need good way-finding to and from the attractions in the area
Forum Comments  
District 4: Black Swamp/Springhill Road District  
February 6, 2007

The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [ ] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study. Those comments that are not highlighted, though they are of value and are important, they are not being included in the study as the project team moves forward. However, they have been provided to the appropriate agency.

Mailers sent: Approximately 950  
Attendance: 43

- **Stormwater Management Concerns [13 overall]**  
  - Maintenance of stormwater facilities and hold ponds is needed [5]  
  - Need protection of drainage basins [3]  
  - Concerned about impacts to natural environment and neighborhood [3]  
  - Make sure holding ponds don’t dry up natural bodies of water [2]  
  - Holding ponds are needed [0]

- **Community Enhancement concerns [8 overall]**  
  - Must have parks that connect to network [6]  
  - Need playground in Paradise Village area [1]  
  - Need sidewalks [1]  
  - Trails should be multimodal [0]

- **Sewer Facility concerns [8 overall]**  
  - Concern and impact of odor [4]  
  - Expansion of sewer plant – Impacts [2]  
    - Can they expand?  
  - Connectivity of water and sewer to land owners not currently served [2]

- **Need to make sure there is notification of those to be impacted [5]**
- **Keep CCSW on present alignment [2]**
- **Increased noise levels are a concern [1]**
- **Create an attractive gateway to downtown [0]**
- **Need to consider the financial burden of improvement [0]**
- **Recreation [9 overall]**  
  - A nice park like Tom Brown is desirable for the area. [6]  
  - Dog park, similar to the one at Tom Brown, would be great in the area. [3]

- **Roadway and Traffic [6 overall]**  
  - There is support for the existing alignment to be widened only with proof that there will be no negative construction impacts to the chain of lakes. [3]  
  - Need for maintenance and paving of dirt roads currently not being well maintained by the county [3]
- There is a need for widening Capital Circle from Tennessee Street to Lake Jackson [0]
- New roads are needed. [0]
- Concerns related to increase in traffic volumes as a result of the FSU Intramural Fields [0]

- **Neighborhood Impacts [6 overall]**
  - Keep it peaceful and quiet [4]
  - Concerned about impacts to neighbors and residences [2]

- **Economic Development [2 overall]**
  - Too much emphasis is being placed on the airport and not enough on the industrial parks. [1]
  - Separate commercial and residential development to keep industrial businesses away from residential areas. [1]

- Restoration of Black Swamp is a concern for the community [0]
- Underground Utilities are desired [0]
- Identify and protect archaeological sites [0]
The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study. Those comments that are not highlighted, though they are of value and are important, they are not being included in the study as the project team moves forward. However, they have been provided to the appropriate agency.

Mailers sent: Approximately 45
Attendance: 7

- **Sense of community [9 overall]**
  - SW Tallahassee needs enhanced identity [5]
  - Make stormwater facilities a recreation amenity like Lake Ella [1]
  - Need for a local community center that is mixed-use that is in harmony with the existing neighborhoods [0]
  - Need shopping and entertainment in the district [0]
  - Need sidewalks and bike trails, these need to connect to existing facilities [0]

- **Mobility and Transit concerns [4 overall]**
  - Need to maximize mobility options by increased transit coverage and access [2]
  - Bus shelters are needed [0]

- **Traffic concerns [3 overall]**
  - Concerned about cut-through traffic on Lake Bradford Road and Pottsdamer Street [2]
  - Concerned about the increased traffic volumes this project may create [1]

- **Environmental concerns [3 overall]**
  - Concerned about drainage, water quality and water quantity [2]
  - Need to protect the environment [1]

- **Access and Connectivity [2 overall]**
  - Concerned over connection of this road to existing network [2]
  - Need new and direct gateway to Innovation Park [0]

- **Need good residential areas for the work force [0]**
Forum Comments  
District 6: Southeast District  
February 22, 2007

The following comments were recorded by KHA during the interactive session. At the end of the session, citizens reviewed the list and voted for their top three comments. Numbers shown in [ ] represent the number of votes an issue received. Comments have been arranged by number of votes, with related comments grouped together. Those highlighted in yellow will be considered as the project team moves forward with the study. Those comments that are not highlighted, though they are of value and are important, they are not being included in the study as the project team moves forward. However, they have been provided to the appropriate agency.

Mailers sent: Approximately 750  
Attendance: 25

- **Parks and Recreation [13 overall]**
  - Need places (parks) for young children to play with trails around the park [6]
  - Would like to see improvements made to Munson Preserve [5]
    - Playground equipment
    - Canoe trails
  - Need recreation and boating launch areas [2]
  - Need for a community center [0]

- **Visual Appeal and Appearance [7 overall]**
  - Improve the visual appeal of the area [5]
  - Need landscaping, including landscaped medians [1]
  - More street lighting along roadways [1]

- **Transit [5 overall]**
  - Need for bus shelters and safer transit [2]
  - Need for improved bus services [1]
  - Need to look for places to implement alternative transit technologies [1]
  - Park and ride for suburban commuters [0]

- **Concerned about impacts to neighbors and residences [4]**
- **Need to improve merge of CCSW westbound travel lanes at Center Drive [3]**
- **Need to protect and enhance Lake Munson and Black Swamp [3]**
- **Need to move people off septic tanks to a central sewer system [2]**
- **Provide opportunities for safe traffic circulation [1]**
- **Sidewalks and bike lanes are needed on local roads [1]**
- **Need safe roadway crossings, particularly for kids [0]**
#4

Capital
Cascade Trail
Segment 2
Marketing
Plan Update
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 - Marketing Plan Update

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Jim Davis  Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The item updates the IA on the status of the Marketing Plan for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The ZifferStansberry Advertising Public Relations Firm on behalf of Blueprint 2000 has received grant funding from the Knight Foundation to create a fundraising/marketing plan for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project. The purpose of this plan is develop a strategy to raise the necessary funds to complete unfunded park amenities such as the Meridian Monument Plaza and Stage, Interactive Water Play Area, Cascade, Boca Chuba, the Lake Hall School House and the Centennial Field Commemorative Plaza.

The plan will outline the need to have a two-pronged effort - fundraising and message management. Both initiatives are vitally important to each other if Blueprint 2000 is to meet the fundraising objective. The completed Marketing Plan will be provided to the Board at the first IA meeting after Plan completion.

Upon completion of the fundraising/marketing plan, ZifferStansberry will coordinate the planning and implementation of the first meeting of the Cascade Park Governing Council to introduce them to the project and solicit major donations to the Park.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Timeframes
Timeframes

By June 1, 2007
- Present Case Statement
- Present Honorary Co-Chair recommendations
- Provide suggested names for Cascade Governing Council (major donors/fundraising governing group)
- Provide list of suggested subcommittee specialty areas

By July 6
- Co-chairs acceptance
- Cascade Governing Council members contacted about possible participation
- Identify possible individuals to serve on subcommittees
- List of Community Groups to solicit for support
- Begin list that identifies significant donors
- Identify Media Partners and begin requests for support
- Determine date(s) for governing council meetings
- Present material to be used to invite and present at the first Governing Council meeting
- Provide list of marketing materials needed for fundraising effort

August 3
- Community Groups have been contacted and have accepted participation
- Present Fundraising Media Packages and Press Material
- Present List of possible on-site fundraising events
- Present storyboards of initial television PSA campaign
- Present list of media partners and level of participation/commitment
- Present art for print media/outdoor donated space
- Present fundraising target/project adoption dates for consideration by Campaign Chairs/Governing Council
- Identify Significant Donors list
- Disseminate information to all individuals committed to the fundraising effort informing them of their responsibilities and immediate dates of interest.

September 10
- Hold first meeting of the Governing Council and garner their commitments
- Hold media event at Cascade Park/Distribute press material and pitch fundraising effort
- Begin Public Service Campaign in area media
#5

Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel
SUBJECT/TITLE: Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel

Date: June 4, 2007
Requested By: Blueprint Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE: This issue advises the Board of a potential acquisition by Blueprint 2000 of Wood Sink and adjoining property within the Headwaters of the St. Marks River.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Blueprint Map 7 and associated funding address St. Marks River floodplain protection. In order to implement this program, Blueprint, in 2003 and 2004, convened the Sensitive Lands Working Group (SLWG) to prioritize properties within the Headwaters to acquire fee simple or for purchase of conservation easements. Additionally, in 2004, Blueprint organized the St. Marks Headwaters Consortium, to facilitate the discussion of acquisitions and easements under consideration by the several Agencies and Programs targeting preservation of sensitive lands in the Headwaters area and in Eastern Leon County.

When it was learned that the St. Joe Company was preparing to sell certain lands in the Headwaters area (south of Capitola Road and north of US 27 South), Blueprint asked the Consortium partners for assistance, particularly in preserving the Wood Sink area. In 2006, Blueprint 2000 and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) requested that the Department of Environmental Protection add the entire 1,057 Wood Sink Tract to the Upper St. Marks River Corridor Florida Forever project boundary. The boundary addition was approved by the State, and in early 2007 TNC purchased the tract from St. Joe. The Wood Sink property was ranked Priority 1 by the Sensitive Lands Working Group.

Blueprint is now working with TNC and the Leon County Division of Parks and Recreation to determine the specific area around Wood Sink to be purchased for an addition to the existing St. Marks Headwaters Greenway (Booth I, Booth II and Copeland Sink properties). It is anticipated that 100-200 acres of the site will be purchased for addition to the existing County-owned property. Acquisition costs have not been determined, however, are estimated in the range of $900,000 to $1,300,000. Blueprint plans on submitting an application to Florida Communities Trust for partial reimbursement of the acquisition costs next year. Fee-simple acquisition costs have not yet been determined.

The attached Map shows the area purchased by The Nature Conservancy and the approximate area proposed for purchase by Blueprint 2000 for Leon County ownership.
RECOMMENDED ACTION: None

Action by TCC and CAC: Presented as information only.

ATTACHMENTS:

Location Map
Wood Sink Tract

1057.35 +/- Acres
#6

CAC Minutes

February 8, 2007

&

March 15, 2007
Terence Hinson called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence Hinson</td>
<td>Michael Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Davis</td>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Norwood</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Amnott</td>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Conger</td>
<td>Tom O’Steen (awaiting IA appointment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Randy Matheny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Shelonda Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ringe</td>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Martin</td>
<td>Joan Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hodges</td>
<td>Don Lanham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Modifications

Dave Bright stated that he had additions to the leveraging update regarding possible grant submittals. Mr. Bright also noted that copies of the original Blueprint EECC report were provided to the CAC and additional information from the marketing plan for the Capital Cascade Trail was provided.

Information Items

Terence Hinson inquired to the committee if there were any Information Items (eight items noted) on the agenda that the committee would like to address. There were no comments from committee members. Mr. Hinson, however, asked for clarification on Item #6, Mahan Drive Update. Dave Bright also provided additional information on Item #4, Leveraging Update.

Item #6: Mahan Drive Update

Mr. Hinson inquired as to whether the committee could expect a push from the County to switch Mahan Drive from a Tier II to a Tier I project. Giving a brief background on the Mahan funding
issue, Jim Davis stated that as of January 2007, there was no Strategic Intermodal System money in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) work program allocated for Mahan Drive. Consequently, Mahan corridor improvements were not funded except for the $10 million Blueprint had reserved; plus $6.5 million that had been reserved by FDOT in the out-years. As a priority, the County was requesting the State Legislature allocate approximately $22.5 million to make up the shortfall in funding for the project. Mr. Davis further stated that if the $22.5 million request was successful, there should not be any additional funding requirements of Blueprint beyond the $10M in reserve. If the request failed, it was possible that the City and the County might solicit Blueprint as a funding source. Expanding on Mr. Hinson’s concern on what could be done in a preemptive manner; Mr. Davis stressed the importance of communicating with the elected officials on this subject matter.

Kevin McGorty reiterated the possibility of committed Blueprint funds being allocated to a Tier II project. Mr. McGorty stated that the issues of funding Mahan Drive had been addressed before and strongly communicated to the Intergovernmental Agency (IA). He suggested updating the previously submitted memorandum to the IA and re-sending it. Mr. McGorty concurred with Jim Davis regarding the organization of a sub-committee with the purpose of meeting with members of the IA to discuss the issue and express the Citizen Advisory Committee’s (CAC) strong support for keeping the intent of the Blueprint Tier I projects intact and the consequences of diverting such a large pool of money.

Terence Hinson called for volunteers to participate in such a sub-committee; Mike Sheridan, Kevin McGorty, Anita Davis, and Kathy Archibald volunteered.

**Item #4: Leveraging Update**

Dave Bright updated the committee on funding received via grants since the last CAC meeting. The Florida Forever Grant Program for the upper Cascade pond in the amount of $600,000 from the Northwest Florida Water Management District and the Highway Beautification Council (FDOT) grant in the amount of $300,000; to help landscape Capital Circle Southeast from Tram Road to Connie Drive.

Mr. Bright stated that there were two additional grants for which Blueprint may submit applications: the Recreational Trails Program Grant (DEP Office of Greenways and Trails) for a trail around the Regional Stormwater Pond, and the Transportation Enhancement Grant (CRTPA/FDOT for the South Monroe Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge; both may require letters of support from the CAC stating they had reviewed the grants and supported the application. Michael Sheridan inquired, if awarded either grant would it/they require matching money from Blueprint funds that was not encumbered. Mr. Bright stated that any match for the FDEP grant would come from funds currently slated for the plants to be installed in the pond, and the FDOT-Bridge project, if funded, would replace current Master Plan funding.

Anita Davis moved to authorize Blueprint to move forward with the two grant proposals and to authorize Chairman Hinson to sign the letters of support; Kathy Archibald seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.
Consent Items

Item #9: CAC Minutes: December 7, 2006

Kathy Archibald moved to approve the December 7, 2006 minutes and approve the CAFR; Michael Sheridan seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #11: Fred George Basin Project

Dave Bright stated that County staff had been directed by the Leon County Board of County Commissioners to acquire several parcels adjacent to and including the Fred George Sink. He noted that the Fred George acquisition area was listed on Blueprint Map 1 of the Blueprint Project Definitions Report, but that Map 1 was not a Tier I project and was not currently in the Blueprint Master Plan. Mr. Davis stated that the County’s recommended action was for Blueprint to fund the acquisition; County staff would apply for a FCT grant in hopes of being reimbursed. Blueprint agreed that it was a legitimate environmental project and did in fact keep with the mission for enhancement and preservation of the environment. The main issue was that it was not a Tier I project. Blueprint’s recommended action was to move $2.691 million, a 60% match to the grant, from the Lake Jackson funding source with the County supplying the remaining 40%. Kathy Archibald noted that in considering funding “sources” she disagreed with the option of using Mahan Drive funds as noted in the agenda item. She stated that it had always been the understanding that money would not be taken from transportation projects to fund environmental projects and vice versa. She felt that Mahan Drive funds should not be considered as a funding option.

Additionally, as an aside, Kathy Archibald asked the committee to bear in mind when referencing the City and County water quality money versus Blueprint’s money that it was ALL Blueprint money.

Kevin McGorty inquired to Jess Van Dyke the significance between what Blueprint was trying to accomplish with the protection of the sinks associated with the Headwaters of the St. Marks River to which this project was competing. Mr. Van Dyke stated that his information was dated; however he had recently walked the site and documented one of the largest groves of large live oaks in the county but does not know if they are still there. Mr. Van Dyke deferred to the County staff for updated information. Kathy Archibald touched on Mr. McGorty’s St. Marks River comment and stated that she did not think the project should be judged along with the St. Marks River because St. Marks has less development pressures than the Fred George Basin which was an urbanized closed basin.

Don Lanham, Leon County Housing & Grant Coordinator, stated that County staff was directed to begin the fee simple acquisition process of three properties and conservation easements on two more including the property surrounding Fred George Sink. As well as pursue Blueprint funding in support of the project. The three large parcels consisted of the Maples property, Ghazvini property, and the Cavanaugh property. The acquisition of a conservation easement over a portion of the Schwartz property, on which the sink was located, was also proposed for
protection of the sink and adjacent hillside.

Steve Hodges, of the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department, stated that County staff was preparing the application for a Florida Communities Trust (FCT) grant to fund a portion of the purchase. Mr. Hodges stated that he had attempted to structure the agenda item and acquisition strategy, such as pre-acquisition, in such a way to bring in extra points on the FCT application. He felt that it was a significant acquisition and would make a significant addition to the greenway system.

Tom O’Steen inquired if there was an exhibit that showed how the acquisition, regardless of the sinkhole protection, fit into the Greenway Master Plan. Mr. Hodges stated that there would be an exhibit in the grant application that reflected it. **Kevin McGorty moved to approve staff recommendation, Option 1: Reallocate $2.691 million from the Lake Jackson Basin that would be used for the FCT match for the acquisition of the subject properties. If the County was unsuccessful with the FCT grant, the balance would be funded from the County’s water quality funds, without review by the consultant, or from other County resources.** Jerry Conger asked that the motion include a provision that Lake Jackson remain a Tier I project. Kathy Archibald also asked that the motion be revised to delete the statement “…the County’s water quality funds, without review by the consultant…” The committee concurred and the final motion read as follows: **Reallocate $2.691 million from the Lake Jackson Basin that would be used for the FCT match for the acquisition of the subject properties. If the County was unsuccessful with the FCT grant, the balance would be funded from other County resources; Lake Jackson should remain a Tier 1 project. Nancy Miller seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.**

**Item #12: Status of the Cascade Park Marketing Plan**
Jim Davis stated that a very successful follow-up meeting to the December 7, 2006 marketing workshop was held January 17, 2007. The Ziffer-Stansberry Advertising/Public Relations Agency submitted a fund raising proposal which appeared to be quite promising. (Proposal distributed to the CAC at this meeting.) Mr. Davis stated that he forwarded the proposal to Mike Pate of the Knight Foundation and Mr. Pate was very receptive to the proposal and the possibility of the Knight Foundation being a funding partner. Loranne Ausley has also been very supportive of becoming involved in assisting in the fund-raising effort. Mr. Davis stated that although it’s early in the process, from a marketing standpoint we’re in good shape. Kevin McGorty concurred.

**Item #13: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update**
Gary Phillips began with the FDOT parking lot reconfiguration status. Since the September 18, 2006 IA meeting, staff had been working with FDOT and the Florida Department of Management Services (FDMS) to reconfigure the parking lot so it was not intrusive to the park. The reconfiguration involved 138 parking spaces; five options had evolved from the numerous meetings on how to accomplish an amicable reconfiguration: 1) Do nothing; 2) relocate all 138 spaces east of Burns Building (back of building); 3) relocate approximately 50% of the parking spaces behind the Burns Building and reconfigure the remaining 50% on the west side of Suwannee Street; 4) reconfigure the parking lot on the west side of Suwannee Street and add new parking spaces; and 5) reconfigure the parking lot on west side of Suwannee Street and add new parking spaces south
of Gaines Street. Option 5 was the preferred option recommended by staff.

Mr. Phillips continued with an overview of the upper, middle, and lower sections of the park and showcased the trails and sidewalks. Mr. Phillips also gave a brief overview on the final design for the following park features: Meridian Marker Plaza, Cascade Waterfall, Interactive Water Play Plaza, Boca Chuba Sculpture, Historical Timeline Fence, and the Doggy Park. Other park amenities discussed were the Misting Fountain/Smokey Hollow and the Centennial Field Plaza. Kevin McGorty inquired if there have been any discussion in terms of signature trees being in appropriate locations when thinking about shading. Mr. Phillips stated that discussions had just begun in that area and landscape plans were beginning to come together. Nancy Miller inquired as to the status of the projected completion of the overall design. Jim Davis stated that staff was in the process of designing the plaza, the interactive park, the cascade and the timeline fence to 100%. The grading for the entire park was at 50%. It was projected that the design would be complete in 2008 and construction beginning in late 2008 with an opening of the park tentatively scheduled for 2010.

**Item #14: Florida Forever Resolution**

Michael Sheridan moved to approve the Resolution of the Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Supporting Florida Forever and a Successor Program for the Future for consideration by the Intergovernmental; Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed unanimously.

**Item #15: Future Bond Sale**

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint’s Finance Committee met to review Blueprint’s cash flow performance. From that meeting it was determined that by late 2007 the sale of bonds would be necessary in the amount of approximately $75 million.

**Citizens To Be Heard**

There were no public speakers present.

**Items From Members Of The Committee**

In reference to the CAFR, Michael Sheridan noted to the committee that the auditors had entered a fairness opinion and reported no material weakness and no instances of non-compliance or other matters. Mr. Sheridan commented that the CAC admired and respected that position and it was reflective of what the CAC was suppose to do in its oversight. Kathy Archibald also mentioned that it was also reflective of such a great staff.

**Adjourn**

Michael Sheridan moved to adjourn the meeting; Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.
Terence Hinson called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence Hinson</td>
<td>Michael Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Davis</td>
<td>Gregg Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Norwood</td>
<td>Kathy Archibald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Amnott</td>
<td>Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Conger</td>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>Shelonda Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Maher</td>
<td>Joan Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Mark Llewellyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ringe</td>
<td>Peter Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Martin</td>
<td>Mark Thomasson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hiers</td>
<td>Echo Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Matheny</td>
<td>Joe Petrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
<td>June Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Little</td>
<td>Robert Burke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

There were no agenda modifications.

**Information Items**

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Dave Bright stated that Mr. Hinson had signed a letter of support for the Capital Cascade Connector Bridge Grant Application that would connect Segments Two and Three in Capital Cascade Trail. The estimated cost of the bridge was more than $2 million, Mr. Bright stated. Blueprint 2000 had requested $1 million in the Transportation Enhancement Grant. He further stated that the CRTPA had received three applications and would be forwarding all three to the
FDOT District 3 office for an evaluation of eligibility; they would not be ranked by the CRTPA until summer 2007. The other two applications submitted were for signage in the downtown area of Tallahassee and a greenway trail along Meridian Road. He reminded the CAC that funding, if received, would not occur until the fifth-year of the FDOT Work Program; approximately 2012 or 2013. However, that fit perfectly with the estimated time frame for construction of the bridge.

Mr. Bright thanked Jess Van Dyke for alerting Blueprint that funding was available through the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission that could potentially be used to fund the wetland plantings for the Regional Stormwater Pond on West Tennessee Street. Staff had submitted information to the FFWCC, who saw no problems with the submittal. The amount anticipated was around $565,000. Blueprint was awaiting their decision and comments on the Draft Agreement. If funding was received from FFWCC it would unencumber the funds in the contract which could potentially be used to fund the building of the park at that facility. Jim Davis stated that staff was also attempting to acquire the used car lot adjacent to the pond as well.

Mr. Davis stated that Ziffer-Stansberry Advertising had submitted a proposal for the marketing strategy for the Capital Cascade Trail amenities for approximately $40,000. The Board approved that the Plan could be funded out of Blueprint funds if necessary however, Mike Pate with the Knight Foundation had agreed to fund it. He further stated that it would possibly be handled through TPL.

Mr. Davis stated regarding Wood Sink that acquisition of it “looked promising.” It appeared that Blueprint would be able to acquire it and approximately 100-acres surrounding it as part of a 1,000-acre deal that The Nature Conservancy had made with the St. Joe Company. Cost estimates had not yet been discussed however, he repeated, that it looked promising.

**Item #2: Fred George Basin Acquisition**

Jim Davis stated that the Fred George Basin acquisition was discussed extensively at the previous CAC meeting and their discussion resulted in the approval of the acquisition by the CAC. The Board, at their February 26, 2007 meeting, also approved the acquisition and instructed staff to begin the supermajority vote process to move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1. That process required recommendations by the TCC and the CAC. Staff intended to move forward unless the CAC had any objections. However the previous vote by the CAC was to endorse that. Kathy Archibald clarified that it was for the matching portion and that the County would come up with the remaining money. Mr. Davis stated that was exactly what was approved by the Board, up to $2.77 M in Blueprint funds. There were no objections by the CAC.

**Item #3: Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Update (Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street)**

**Item #4: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update (SR 20 to Crawfordville Road)**

Jim Davis addressed items 3 and 4 together. He stated that the majority of the February 26, 2007 IA meeting was spent in discussion of the CCNW/SW projects. It resulted in the Board’s approval of the staff recommendation to move forward with the acquisition of all of the necessary right of way; which was predicated upon the alignment that had previously been
approved by the IA. There was a caveat however that basically stated that the project should be presented to the Board for final approval prior to beginning any construction. That was necessary anyway, stated Mr. Davis, for approval to solicit bids for construction.

Kevin McGorty requested clarification of comments from the Tallahassee Democrat that referenced discussion regarding CCSE. Mr. Davis stated that it was simply a mix-up by Democrat staff.

Nancy Miller questioned how much “weight” was given to the district meetings by the Board in their decision? Mr. Davis stated that he was not sure how to answer her because it varied from Commissioner to Commissioner and was dependent upon who was in attendance. He stated that the plan for CCSW that listed what staff was looking at to make the selection, in an attempt to quantify something. That compiled data, via a matrix, would be presented to the CAC, TCC, and the Board for approval. He further stated that one could not remove the subjectivity from it however staff felt that the matrix of evaluation criteria was the appropriate methodology to involve the Board with the weighting. The numbers would fall where they fell, he stated, and that would become the base line for discussions. Once staff was through the matrix process, and a recommendation was made is when the controversy would begin and Blueprint would be second-guessed on everything that had been done. Therefore, they were trying to collect as much input as possible and document it to ensure that staff / the Board could consider all the facts and available possibilities.

Jerry Conger stated that the turnout was abysmal in comparison to the number of mailers that were sent. He assumed that staff would review why that was the case and pursue options for increasing the turnout. Mr. Davis stated that the Blueprint Public Involvement Office did a phenomenal job and went the extra mile to inform the public. He was not sure however, how to deal with apathy and disinterest. The meeting notices were direct mailed to area residents, published in newsletters, as well as meetings being publicly noticed in the Democrat and on local radio and television stations.

Nancy Miller stated that it concerned her because the reason for realigning the roadway was partly environmental but also because of Innovation Park and economic development. She wanted to know if Blueprint staff had met with their management. Mr. Davis stated that Linda Nicholson was a member of the Community Representative Board for that project and was an active player in it. Innovation Park was well aware of the happenings on the project, he concluded.

**Consent Items**

**Item #5: CAC Minutes: February 8, 2007**

Kathy Archibald requested a change in the minutes on Page 5 of 5: “Mr. Sheridan commented that the Blueprint admired and respected that position and it was reflective of what Blueprint was suppose to do in its oversight.” She stated that “Blueprint” should have been “CAC.” Also in Item 6, the word “subject manner” should be “subject matter”. With those corrections Ms. Archibald moved to approve the minutes; Anita Davis seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.
Presentations/Discussion

**Item #6: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update**

Jim Davis stated that staff had given multiple presentations on the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 concept over the past week that had been very well received by the community. He stated that staff’s strategy for moving forward was to, at some point, return to the Board with a design and request permission to proceed with construction. Blueprint needed significant community support from key players that would be willing to speak at that IA meeting.

Mark Llewellyn introduced the Genesis Capital Cascade Team, Echo Gates, June Clark, Mark Thomasson, Joe Petrich and Peter Martin, with CLS. He and Mr. Martin briefed the committee on the latest design updates. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is located in the Blueprint 2000 file.) Specific elements were discussed throughout the presentation. They are summarized below.

Nancy Miller asked, during the schematic design discussion, what the cost of the “unfunded” portion would be. Mark Llewellyn stated that the team had not gotten that far as of yet.

Ms. Miller asked if there was anyway that a pedestrian bridge could be constructed where the trail crossed Lafayette Street between the two parks. Mr. Llewellyn stated that there was certainly an opportunity for that, however everything, cost included, would need to be taken into consideration. She stated that it was a long crossing and felt that a pedestrian bridge would be more inviting.

Ms. Miller asked how steep the grading was in the park area. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it would not exceed 4 to 1 slopes. He said that there will not be a lot of places to lay the blanket out, but there would be plenty of places to walk and enjoy the area.

Diana Norwood asked if we have staff from the City that will be able to maintain the unusual aspects of the park. Joe Petrich stated that they had met with City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation (TPRD) and together they created a preferred plant list; and suggested that garden clubs or special interest groups might perform special maintenance.

Michael Sheridan questioned what level of interaction had occurred between Blueprint and the Council on Culture and Arts. Mr. Llewellyn stated that at least on two different occasions they had met with the COCA. Once a schematic design had been developed the team would meet with them again to discuss the stage design. He further stated that the TPRD and others in the City were on point for coordination of events and activities in the park. Mr. Sheridan suggested that Blueprint should go beyond staging and consider content material, grants that COCA had access to as well as staff resources. Money was critical Mr. Sheridan stated, and he felt it would be helpful to Blueprint if they utilized the organization that was responsible for the collection and distribution of funds to cultural heritage and arts organizations. He further stated that he also wanted to ensure it happened in the last year of his chairmanship to ensure that COCA was committed.
Kevin McGorty suggested that the team utilize designs of the local Native American settlements; for example, the breast plate design that was discovered in the Lake Jackson mounds could be implemented into the historical fence. Peter Martin stated that the team had been involved with staff from the San Luis Mission for the design ideas.

Nancy Miller questioned if, while currently un-funded, the design would remain in place once funding became available. Jim Davis stated that was Blueprint’s intention. Furthermore, they intended to sell the amenities; the people who would be “putting up the money” would have some input on design but not much. Blueprint planned to create the park as it was being designed and to manage the continuity, control and quality of construction throughout.

Kathy Archibald questioned if the waterfall would be visible from Monroe Street. Peter Martin stated that because of elevation changes in the land form it was created to provide containment during flood conditions. Furthermore, they felt it was important to have an entrance to South Monroe to provide urban design enhancements.

A discussion of the dog park brought a question from Nancy Miller; was the dog park area in the site that was recently excavated. Mark Llewellyn stated, no, that it was the site that was covered with a clay cap; the dog park was south of the railroad track over the box culvert.

Kathy Archibald questioned if the Boca Chuba was simply a mouth that the water flowed into. Peter Martin stated that Boca Chuba was designed with a flap so that the water would pass through. The lips would have three nozzles which would shoot out water.

Nancy Miller asked if the intent was to maintain water levels in the park, or would the stream flow at all times? Mr. Llewellyn stated that the stream would maintain a base flow at all times, however due to drought, it had the potential to be quite small. He stated that they were reviewing opportunities to ensure normal water levels were maintained. Mr. Davis stated that staff disliked the idea of pumping water from the aquifer to maintain flow in the stream. One of the major water sources under review was the FDOT air conditioning chiller. However, it still would not generate enough water.

Kevin McGorty questioned if it was considered to include rusticated limestone similar to what is in the electric building detail. Peter Martin stated that a limestone veneer would be difficult and expensive to protect; brick accents would be cost effective and aesthetically pleasing.

Jim Davis stated that the intent of the briefing was to allow the CAC to experience the evolution of the park design and keep them aware of the issues at hand. He stated that while parking remained in the park the number of spaces were reduced from 307 to 138 spaces which was a significant reduction in parking. Mr. Davis recognized Gary Phillips for negotiating with DOT for the parking plan.

Michael Sheridan noted that transportation from remote parking areas, a trolley perhaps, was something that, in his opinion, should be considered for the future; as well as the possibility of including it in the City’s maintenance agreement. He encouraged the CAC, Blueprint staff, and the Genesis team to think in terms of access to the park rather than parking at the park to keep open the possibilities of remote parking areas.
Tom O’Steen questioned where parking might be expected for the amphitheater when it was at maximum capacity. Jim Davis stated that negotiations with FDOT and FDMS had led to an understanding for after hours parking in the surrounding lots and garages. There was no contract, however groundwork had been laid and Blueprint staff would continue to reinforce that.

Nancy Miller questioned if the Genesis team had considered pervious pavement as a possibility for the parking lots. Mr. Davis replied, no. Mr. Martin stated that there was a concern of people becoming injured (twisting their ankle for example). Mr. Llewellyn stated that it could also become a maintenance issue. Ms. Miller stated that she understood the maintenance issues however, she felt that it would be best to not generate additional run-off. Mr. Llewellyn stated that they would look into the possibility of using pervious cement. Mr. Davis noted some of the disadvantages to using it but agreed that staff would investigate it further.

Jess Van Dyke questioned the water quality and aesthetics of the ponds if re-use water was used to supplement the water levels and base flow during drought periods. He further stated that they would potentially need to be treated with herbicides. Jim Davis stated that by utilizing the bypass culvert design, they would be able to take both ponds off line which would potentially allow treatment via alum injection. Blueprint had proposed that the City of Tallahassee and Leon County participate with Blueprint in an Alum Injection Study ($42,000) with Blueprint tentatively installing the infrastructure. The estimated cost for installation at those facilities was approximately $800,000 plus $200,000 per year to operate and maintain the system. Mr. Davis stated however, that many options were under review. Mr. Van Dyke offered his assistance if necessary.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were no public speakers present.

Items From Members Of The Committee

No items to be discussed.

Adjourn

Jerry Conger moved to adjourn the meeting; Nancy Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.
#7

IA Meeting
Minutes:
February 26, 2007
Chairman Mark Mustian called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS
Jim Davis noted that there were two agenda modifications, Item Number 7A, Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Schematic Design and Item Number 17, Cascade Park Marketing Plan, which were distributed to the Board.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Mahan Drive Status Update

This item was presented as informational only.

2. Sales Tax Receipts Update

This item was presented as informational only.

3. Property Acquisition Update

This item was presented as informational only.

4. Capital Circle Southeast (Tram Road to Woodville Highway): Design-Build Consultant Selection

This item was presented as informational only.

5. Capital Circle Southeast (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway): Design Update

This item was presented as informational only.

6. Maintenance Costs Related to Blueprint Projects

This item was presented as informational only.

7. Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update

This item was presented as informational only.

8. Roadway Design Issues Related to Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Designation

This item was presented as informational only.

9. CAC Minutes (August 24, 2006; October 26, 2006, and December 7, 2006)

This item was presented as informational only.

III. CONSENT
10. **IA Meeting Minutes: September 18, 2006**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve minutes as presented.

11. **CAC Appointment**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the nomination of Tom O’Steen as proposed.

12. **Florida Forever Resolution**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the attached Resolution for consideration by the Intergovernmental Agency.


**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Accept the FY 2006 CAFR and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2007 Operating Budget of $15,106 for encumbrances and $27,832,864 for transfer to the Capital Project Fund.

14. **Appropriation of a Florida Communities Trust (FCT) Grant for Headwaters of the St. Marks/Booth II**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Appropriate $917,207 for FCT’s share of the Booth II acquisition.

15. **Appropriation of TRIP and Southwood DRI Mitigation Funds (E-2)**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Appropriate the TRIP funds of $9,569,477 and the $991,000 in mitigation dollars for the construction of Capital Circle Southeast from Tram Road to Woodville Highway.

*Commissioner Katz moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

**IV. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS**

16. **CAC Chairman: CAC Actions**
Michael Sheridan gave his last presentation to the Board as his term as Chair ended in November 2006. He spoke on various reports and audits as well as leveraging activities by Blueprint staff. Mayor Marks thanked Mr. Sheridan for his service to the CAC and Blueprint 2000. Commissioner Thaell echoed the Mayor’s sentiments and asked if the CAC had any thoughts or suggestions for the Board in reference to the cost of maintenance responsibilities on the various projects. Mr. Sheridan referred to the Blueprint Retreat at San Luis Mission in April 2006. He stated that the “wish list” of staff and the CAC was “to maintain all the projects.” Mr. Sheridan stated that there were no allocations for maintenance in the Blueprint program and suggested that the Board review that in a calculated fashion.

17. Status of the Cascade Park Marketing Plan

Jim Davis stated that a copy of the proposal from Ziffer-Stansberry Advertising had been distributed. He also noted that, included as an attachment to the agenda item was a summary of the Capital Cascade Marketing Workshop that was held in December 2006. He brought to their attention the participants of that meeting. He reminded the Board that it was the intention to fund some of the amenities for the Capital Cascade Trail through private funds. Blueprint staff invited four marketing firms to participate in the workshop. Gail Stansberry-Ziffer was the only representative from the invited firms to attend and as a result, Blueprint requested Ziffer-Stansberry to develop a marketing plan.

Mr. Davis stated that the proposal had been shared with Mike Pate of the Knight Foundation to see if they would fund it; Mr. Pate was receptive. He further stated that it was vital to have a strong strategy to raise the necessary funds and that, if necessary, Blueprint was prepared to fund the Marketing Plan out of the Capital Cascade Trail budget; it would cost less than $25,000. Mr. Davis noted that Blueprint staff continued to coordinate with representatives from the community, Jack Diestelhorst and the Capital Cascade Council in the development of the final designs.

Mr. Davis stated that the intent of the item was to share with the Board that staff was pursuing a marketing plan to raise $10 million for the amenities. Furthermore, he stated that he did not feel it was appropriate for Blueprint to be in the “lead” to raise the funds. They were hoping some other organization would take that position in this endeavor.

Commissioner Lightsey wondered how Blueprint or a citizens group would proceed to find a person to act in a leadership capacity. Mr. Davis stated that staff was actively pursuing someone to fill that role and that Mr. Diestelhorst of the 2010 Capital Cascade Council was as well. He further mentioned that they were also looking for Honorary Chairs, and Representative Loranne Ausley had indicated that she would be agreeable to participate in that; the Mayor and the Chairman of the County Commission would serve as well. No formal commitments had been made as of yet though. Commissioner Lightsey stated that because it would require a great deal of time and effort, she did not feel that it should be the staff’s responsibility as long as there was an on-going effort to identify the lead.
She stated regarding the marketing plan that the Knight Foundation, Mr. Pate, had been approached but that there was funding in the Capital Cascade Trail budget to fund it. Mr. Davis confirmed that was a correct statement and that staff expected a response from Mr. Pate within the week. Furthermore, the item would not need to go before the Board prior to it moving forward.

18. Acquisition of Properties in the Fred George Basin

Jim Davis stated that Leon County came across an opportunity to acquire property in the Fred George Basin and approached Blueprint to see if there were any funds that might be available to assist with the acquisition. Initially, he stated that staff did not feel that the funds were identified except that they felt fairly confident that the parcel would meet the water quality program criteria. Subsequently, staff investigated what funding was available from several of the projects they had not been pursuing quite as aggressively as others and had identified in the Master Plan a line item that had approximately $3.5 million for the Lake Jackson Basin (Map 5). In reviewing that Map in the Blueprint Project Definitions Report (Blue Book), staff clarified that the intent of the $3.5 million was for several things: 1) the widening and some intersection improvements on Meridian Road (which $3.5 million would not touch), (2) improvements for Rhoden Cove, Okeechepkee and Lexington Stormwater Pond (these three projects had previously been approved by the IA and were funded by the County’s portion of Blueprint Water Quality Funds), and (3) greenway connections (Staff’s experience had been that there was more success in leveraging funds than in finding willing sellers).

Mr. Davis stated that the Fred George parcels proposed for acquisition by the County were a Tier 2 project (Map 1) and not currently funded. It might not be the “number one choice” for acquisition, but was clearly a good number two choice. The funding was available because Blueprint/Leon County had funded some of the previously mentioned stormwater projects from other funding sources. Furthermore, it was the recommendation of the CAC, the TCC, and staff that the Board direct them to begin the supermajority vote process to raise the Fred George project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 thereby making it eligible for funding. Staff would bring it back to the Board following the prerequisite Public Hearings for their vote to move the project into Tier 1.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Move $2.775 million (plus or minus 10 percent based on actual cost) from the Lake Jackson Basin to be used for the FCT match for the acquisition of the subject properties. If the County was unsuccessful with the FCT grant, then the balance would be funded from other County resources. The CAC recommended that the Lake Jackson projects remain Tier 1 and to direct staff to initiate the process to move the Fred George project from Tier 2 to Tier 1.

Commissioner Dailey moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Thaell seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she had no objection to moving in that general direction and would support the motion. She did however have an interest in the pursuit of overtures to the property owners in the Meridian Road area that had thus far not expressed an interest in
greenways or trails. Furthermore, she requested staff to make a concerted effort to be more creative than Fee Simple transactions; possibly through conservation easements, density transfers, partial sales, or other tax advantageous situations. She stated that she would prefer not to acquiesce on the potential for development of greenways and trails in that area because there were many variables in land-ownership over time and through families or different situations.

Furthermore, Commissioner Lightsey stated, to allow for additional positive results in the future, that she would prefer not to “drain the funds” in the Lake Jackson Basin line item. The staff recommendation would leave only $750,000 in that account. She hoped that the County could contribute additional funding so that approximately half of the Lake Jackson account balance could be retained.

Commissioner Katz stated that with Option 1 it would move the money out of the Lake Jackson Basin line item to be used as matching funds for the Fred George FCT grant. He asked if the grant process was unsuccessful, would the funding be returned to the Lake Jackson Basin. Mr. Davis stated that it was the intention of the motion that staff would reserve $2.7 million plus a contingency against a $4.5 million acquisition. The County would assume the risk associated with the FCT grant. Thereby, if the FCT grant was unsuccessful the County would be responsible for the balance. It was the County’s plan, he continued, to pre-acquire the property before submitting the application for the FCT grant so the money would be committed to the Fred George project in Mr. Davis’ opinion.

Commissioner Katz inquired as to what the funding was originally intended for. Mr. Davis reiterated that some of the projects that were intended to be funded in the Lake Jackson Basin were in fact being funded with other Blueprint dollars, specifically the County’s designated Blueprint Water Quality money. Mr. Davis clarified that it was not from the County’s 10 percent funding; the County pond projects were funded out of the $25 million that was allocated to the County for Water Quality projects.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that, understanding how specific the staff recommendation was, she was offering a friendly amendment. She further stated that the intention of the agenda item was to begin the process to move the Fred George Basin project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 which would allow the Board to review dollar amounts as the County and Blueprint staff proceeded. She stated that she would prefer the motion not to list a dollar amount, but to simply begin the action. Hopefully, staff could retain more money for the Lake Jackson projects than was called for in the motion that was on the table. She stated that it was Lake Jackson money and she felt they were obligated to try to spend it in Lake Jackson. She clarified that she could support the Supermajority Vote in moving the Fred George Basin project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, but hoped that the Board would reserve judgment on how much to re-allocate until they knew if there was a way to leave more money in the line item that would flow to a Lake Jackson project subsequently.

Commissioner Rackleff asked for clarification whether it would move up to $2.77 million. Commissioner Lightsey confirmed that, yes, no more than $2.77 million. Commissioner Mustian stated that Commissioner Lightsey’s comments were accepted as an amendment to the motion. There being no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.
16. **CAC Chairman: CAC Actions - CONTINUED**

Commissioner Mustian acknowledged Terence Hinson, the incoming Chair of the CAC, and invited him to address the Board. Mr. Hinson apologized for his late arrival and thanked the Board for allowing him to participate as chair of the CAC. He also thanked the CAC for selecting him as Chair. He stated regarding the Fred George Basin, the CAC unanimously approved staff recommendation to use the funds from the Lake Jackson line item for that project. They felt strongly that the Blueprint contribution should be limited to 60 percent and supported moving the project to the Tier 1 status. The CAC was quite pleased with the acquisition of the Delta Industrial Park parcel. Regarding maintenance costs on the various projects, the CAC was unclear as to exactly how it would be funded, but hoped that the Board would remain cognizant of the issue. They strongly supported the Florida Forever Resolution.

He further stated that the CAC was concerned that pressure would be placed on Blueprint 2000 to divert funds to fund the Mahan Drive corridor project. While they agreed that it was a worthy project it was not currently a Tier 1 project; therefore, at that time they could not support the allocation of Blueprint funding beyond what had previously been placed in reserve. He stated that the members of the Board had made the citizens proud as the stewards of the funds. As the CAC Chair and as a citizen of the community he urged them to continue the good work and maintain the citizen’s trust in their endeavor not to deviate from the plan that was set forth. Commissioner Mustian stated that they looked forward to working with Mr. Hinson in the coming year.

19. **Capital Circle NW/SW Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street Right-of-Way Acquisition**

Jim Davis stated that, consistent with Blueprint’s Real Estate Policy, especially for corridor improvements, staff has routinely presented the Board with roadway alignments for their approval. If successful in gaining the Board’s approval staff would subsequently, via the design process, identify which parcels of right-of-way would need to be acquired to implement that particular alignment. He stated that staff had previously presented the alignment for Capital Circle NW/SW to the Board, which they approved, along with approval to acquire 61 parcels. However, there were an additional 77 parcels that were required and that issue was what was before them today.

Mr. Davis stated that, based on emails that had been exchanged, there was some confusion on what was to be built. He clarified that it was the sole intent of staff to implement the Board’s guidance that was provided on December 15, 2006 to design for six-lanes for the whole corridor. However, to build only four-lanes south from the point where the potential realignment could transition east toward Tyson Road. From that point, there were only four-lanes, transitioning to two-lanes south of the Orange Avenue intersection in accordance with the Board’s guidance. Furthermore, the Board had requested Blueprint acquire sensitive lands and to maximize, based upon an amendment by Commissioner Gillum, the funds that were available for those acquisitions. Mr. Davis stated that the Delta Industrial Park purchase was evidence of that, and he believed that was exactly what the Board had intended staff to do. Moreover, Blueprint had identified an additional 31-acre site owned by the Airport that would contain a 20-acre stormwater pond that would have 80 percent retrofit capacity. He stated that Commissioner
DePuy had requested staff to maximize the stormwater capacity and they had done that with those two acquisitions. Incidentally, he stated that the Delta Industrial Park would have 82-acres of stormwater ponds though they would be quite shallow and more of a swamp setting.

Mr. Davis further stated that Commissioner Lightsey had requested staff to reduce the frontage roads that were originally proposed and staff complied. The frontage road that was to be on the Delta Industrial Park site had been eliminated. Furthermore, the frontage road that was to be in the vicinity of Jackson Bluff Road had also been eliminated. It was further requested that staff minimize the impact and reduce the median widths. Staff complied by reducing the median width in the four-lane segment south of the Delta Industrial Park to 22-feet which was the FDOT minimum width. That was decreased from the proposed 36-foot wide median. Staff, based on their interpretation of the Board’s guidance, was acquiring 230-feet of right-of-way for the full length of the corridor. However, not all of it would necessarily be utilized depending on what the ultimate alignment of the corridor. Mr. Davis stated that based upon what staff had submitted to the Board, the list of parcels that Blueprint needed to acquire to implement the guidance was understood by staff. If, however, the staff misinterpreted the guidance it was certainly unintentional.

Commissioner Mustian requested clarification on what the intersection of Orange Avenue and Capital Circle would look like compared to what currently exists. Mr. Davis explained that staff had a difficult time finding an aerial photo of the current configuration however he presented a slide of the aerial of the corridor that was included in the December 15, 2006 IA Agenda of what the corridor would look like.

Mr. Davis, referencing the Power Point presentation, noted that the frontage roads had been removed from the design plans for that section. He explained that the six-lane highway would transition to four-lanes, to the Orange Avenue intersection, then transition into the current two-lane roadway south of Orange Avenue. He explained to the Board that design of the intersections were the hard part of the equation because it was the intersections that determined the success or failure of moving traffic or meeting traffic service standards. Due to SIS and FHWA funding on that corridor, Blueprint was required to meet a Level of Service D. To do that, he stated, Capital Circle southbound at the Orange Avenue intersection required two left-turn lanes. That provided for one southbound through-lane which would merge with the existing pavement at a safe distance south of the intersection.

Mr. Davis stated that conversely moving north from the Airport there would only be one lane until just south of the Orange Avenue intersection, where the roadway would widen to include one right turn lane and two northbound through-lanes. That would expand to three-lanes in the northbound direction at a point north of Orange Avenue. Based upon the FDOT required Level of Service D there would be more asphalt in that area than staff preferred. Mr. Davis explained that was necessary because of the southbound turning movements off of Orange Avenue. Mr. Davis clarified the demarcation lines on the presentation graphic to ensure the Board members were aware of the right-of-way acquisition line and the asphalt line as called for in the four-lane construction plans that were based upon Board guidance. He stated that staff was diligently trying to implement the guidance the Board gave them, yet to make the intersection improvement
it was necessary for the transition to occur on the south side of it, and staff had tightened that footprint as much as they possibly could.

Commissioner Mustian stated that, although it was difficult to see in the aerial graphic, he gathered that from the existing roadway on the west side, closest to Cascade Lake, there would be some expansion westward of pavement. Mr. Davis requested clarification from Paul Hiers, the project manager, and Hugh Williams, of H. W. Lochner, on the actual increase that would occur. Mr. Hiers stated that the right-of-way would increase by 100-feet with impervious surface/asphalt increasing by 24-30-feet.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she was apart of the previous motion, however, her understanding of it was distinctly different than the staff’s. The entire discussion, going back to the founding of the citizens committee that created Blueprint 2000, was that in that area “top priority was not to disturb or damage the lake system.” That was why, she continued, they proposed in the first report the alternative corridor that did not traverse the lake system. On the (original) motion there was discussion regarding what would happen south of State Road 20; it was her understanding she stated that staff would construct four-lanes south of Highway 20, but would keep any earth moving, raw ground, or construction north of the lake system in order for there to be ample time to complete the alternatives study. She questioned that if the eventual choice for that roadway was to move to an alternative alignment, the citizen’s-report alternative, why would Blueprint need to acquire right-of-way or construct south through Orange Avenue.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she had distributed copies to the Board of press coverage of what happened at Lake Jackson (a few days earlier) following a 4-inch rain event. She stated that the Interstate widening near Lake Jackson was “way back from the Lake” and that the proposed construction by Blueprint was much closer to Lake Cascade. She further stated that the aerial graphic on display was taken during drought conditions and noted that the “green wavy line” was the demarcation of the “normal water level” on Lake Cascade. She stated that if any work were to happen south of Cascade Drive then one significant rain event would put all of the erosion of sediment into Lake Cascade. With construction any closer to the lake than Cascade Drive, any rain event would “blow out” every state of the art erosion control that might be in place thereby damaging the lakes.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the point was to study the alternatives. A portion of what was being evaluated in the PD&E study was how to do construction near lake systems and what was the best that could be done to preserve the lake. She stated that those answers would be provided in the final PD&E. If the Board approved this action before them, she stated, it would put construction in the lakes prior to getting the final PD&E report. She stated that FDOT utilized what they thought was “state of the art erosion control” on I-10 and still Lake Jackson, even with it located at a significant distance, was still affected. There were no erosion controls that could be put into place, she stated, that would protect the lakes from construction erosion in the event of major rain event. She stated that Lake Cascade was the first lake in a 5-lake chain and the most westerly; whatever happened to that lake would affect the entire system.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she participated in the motion that was reflected in the agenda item before them. However, she stated, to her it did not mean four-lanes south of the Orange
Avenue intersection. She surely would not have supported that, she stated. She further stated that they were in a situation where there was current evidence (Lake Jackson) of what roadway construction could do to a lake. There was an on-going alternative study (PD&E) that would define what should be done regarding erosion controls, construction, and the lakes. Yet staff was proposing construction in that area prior to receiving those results. Furthermore, she reminded the Board that the original staff recommendation (in 2005) on the whole segment of the road had everything stopping at SR 20 until the completion of the PD&E Study, which would not be available for another two years. Mr. Davis concurred. The IA, led by Commissioner Tony Grippa, over-rode the staff’s recommendation, and that was why they found themselves in their current situation. She asked the Board to reflect back on the original staff recommendation, to stop the construction far north of where staff was currently recommending. She stated that if staff needed to move forward with any right-of-way acquisitions (Delta Industrial Park, the car wash property, etc) that were essential for lake protection measures… (drifted into discussion about Bartow Rainey)

Commissioner Lightsey reiterated that staff’s original recommendation would not have created the current situation and that the elected body pushed them to that. She suggested that the Board not move forward as recommended in the agenda item before them. She addressed the attached right-of-way maps and requested that members view parcel 100 noting that it extended to the culvert. She stated that when staff indicated there would be another 24-30 feet of asphalt, she did not object to the additional impervious surface, her issue was erosion during the construction phase. She stated that they could not afford to take that chance. Furthermore, she apologized for getting into the discussion so late in the game, but it was not until she saw the right-of-way maps that she did not know how the staff, and maybe the Board, had interpreted the previous action. She stated that it was not consistent and noted that she was listed as the person who seconded the original motion. She asked if anyone thought that it was clear at that time what the staff’s scenario was for that motion. She stated, “Well, I can tell you, I had not lost my mind that day.” She suggested that a substitute motion be made and hoped that staff would help her to craft it. She suggested that it be consistent with the original staff recommendation. However, she acknowledged that there had been progress made regarding the Delta Industrial Park and the car-wash facility. She stated that no matter what the outcome of the alternative corridor, it was necessary to have sufficient land on which to locate the stormwater facilities.

Commissioner Lightsey moved that the Board not allow any construction on that phase south of Cascade Drive, or a location that staff helped choose, that the roadway be tapered down south of the Highway 20 intersection as necessary, and to only acquire right-of-way south of there that would be essential for lake protection (the stormwater facilities). Commissioner Rackleff seconded the motion. She stated that if it needed to be “tweaked” she was amenable to that and would appreciate staff guidance.

Commissioner Gillum asked if Commissioner Lightsey’s motion impacted state or federal funding, given the alteration to the Level of Service. He stated that if he recalled correctly, when the item was originally presented to the Board approximately 13 months earlier that funding was part of the discussion. He recalled that there were certain criteria that had to be met in order to achieve state or federal SIS funding on that roadway. He stated that he recalled a discussion on acquisition of right-of-way and that they (the Board/Blueprint) needed to show their inclinations in that area even though there were no intentions of constructing four-lanes south through that
area. Mr. Davis apologized and stated that he could not provide Commissioner Gillum with a definitive answer on funding. There were many variables in the decision and he did not know what the correct answer was at that point in time.

Mr. Davis requested indulgence from the Board to revert back to the original staff recommendation that basically said to build the roadway in two phases. One being to construct to just south of Blountstown Highway and finish the PD&E for CCSW before moving forward with that segment; Mr. Davis stated he felt that Blueprint could probably receive approval from Federal Highway to do that. He stated that what had him concerned, and he needed to resolve, were the funding issues. FDOT had funded Blueprint $42 million for right-of-way acquisition, to Orange Avenue. Staff had already spent some of that. Furthermore, they were successful, just a few days earlier, in receiving full reimbursement for the Delta Industrial Park. That was predicated on a demonstrated need to handle the stormwater from the amount of impervious surface as was in the proposal; whether or not that would be impacted by delaying construction south of a given point, he would need to have clarified before making a recommendation to the Board. Could staff move forward with acquiring all of the right-of-way using those funds and modifying the construction design to not construct beyond a given point? Mr. Davis stated that he felt it was possible. Commissioner Lightsey asked how many parcels that would affect. Staff confirmed that it would affect four parcels.

Commissioner Mustian stated that he intended to speak against the motion, therefore he passed the gavel to Commissioner DePuy as the Vice-Chair of the Intergovernmental Agency. Commissioner Mustian stated that he had a very different recollection from Commissioner Lightsey because he made the motion and it was exactly as he understood it for the following reason. He stated that the Board agreed that they would like to consider, and hopefully the alignment for the re-worked Capital Circle would veer east at Tyson Road as they had discussed previously. Even if that was the final decision, Capital Circle needed improvements between Highway 20 and the Airport. There were many improvements planned for the Airport he stated, and from a practical standpoint he felt it did not make sense to have a two-lane road that snaked up for a mile, through an Orange Avenue intersection to eventually connect to Capital Circle. It seemed logical to him, he stated, and it did to the majority of the Board then (December 2005) that it needed some improvements. Furthermore, four-lanes rather than six made the most sense and that was reflected in the action taken.

Commissioner Mustian further stated that he was concerned that they were following the typical Tallahassee/Leon County pattern on back-tracking on decisions. He stated that the Board had not only bent over backwards, but gone to extremes to protect the chain of lakes. He did not, however, see any way to make the necessary improvements without some construction around the lakes. He would be happy to do whatever he could and would ask staff to take every precaution to protect the lakes and do a better job than what was done with Lake Jackson, understanding there was no guarantee. From a practical standpoint however, with another 2,000 people working in that area, how would the roads operate, he asked. In his opinion, four-lanes were not enough though it was the logical compromise. Furthermore, the agenda did not come as a surprise to him, he stated, it was exactly as he thought it would be.
Commissioner Mustian stated that he would encourage staff to take every action, from a design standpoint, to make the footprint of the intersection as small as possible or to move it as far from the lake as they could. The fundamental question that was proposed by Commissioner Lightsey’s motion was whether staff would construct four-lanes south of Cascade Drive to Orange Avenue. His position was whether Capital Circle was re-aligned or not, and if so, the proposed improvements were necessary and should be completed.

Commissioner DePuy requested clarification of what motions were on the floor. Commissioner Thaell stated that Commissioner Lightsey’s motion was the only motion on the floor. She stated that she was waiting to hear discussion to see if, for some technical or procedural reason, to make an amendment. She further stated that the discussion thus far had been that if the roadway was to be widened through the lake system, through Orange Avenue, it would need to be on a major bridge so that it was not built at grade. Staff had even factored in the cost of a bridge study as was done with Blair Stone Road. The discussion at hand was prior to making a decision about the alternative; they were planning to make a grade improvement that kept the same environmental risk in place. If the decision was ultimately to maintain the current alignment and continue through the lake system, the improvements would not be at grade, but would be elevated for some distance back on either side of the culvert.

Commissioner Lightsey further stated that there had been two discussions by the Board on that subject; one of alternatives and the one they were presently repeating. However, those two discussions had never come together and she asked the members of the Board to connect them in their minds. She stated that if the Board chose to bridge the lake system for the widening of Capital Circle, at great expense, why would they approve “at grade” construction prior to getting the decision on the alternatives? She stated that it made no sense to her to take the same environmental risks for the proposed improvement, four-lanes through Orange Avenue, as it would if they were to take all six-lanes through the lakes. What was proposed by staff was the potential of risking the lake twice; once for the proposed CCNW/SW construction and (potentially) a second time should they decide to maintain and widen the existing alignment with a massive, expensive bridge. If part of the alternative study was state of the art protection of the lakes during road construction, why would they now approve construction of four-lanes “into the water”?

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the Board was putting the lakes at risk with the precious motion to construct four-lanes south of Orange Avenue. She apologized and stated that she would have never seconded that motion. She stated that the alternatives study and the right-of-way issue were presented as separate agenda items and discussed separately and neither had ever been fully integrated.

Mayor Marks requested clarification of the proposed lane transitions from six to two and vice versa. Mr. Davis reiterated the configuration of the roadway from earlier. Mayor Marks asked for clarification on Commissioner Lightsey’s motion. Commissioner Lightsey stated that it was to return to the “original” staff recommendation from December 2005 to construct the roadway in two phases. Mr. Davis offered a bit of history to the Mayor. He stated that Commissioner Lightsey was absolutely correct in her statements; when the Blueprint 2000 program was originally developed they said there was a potential for an alternative alignment, and they did not
want to widen Capital Circle in an area where they thought the new alignment might make it unnecessary. Consequently, staff returned to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and explained that they only wanted to conduct the PD&E study from West Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway and build only that segment while they waited for the results of the Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study. FHWA stated that Blueprint could not do that, but must study all the way to Orange Avenue. However, FHWA stated that they would allow Blueprint to “phase construct” the project; in other words, to build from US 90 to Blountstown Highway and stop, pending the results of the CCSW PD&E. That was an oversimplification, but covered the gist of their discussions. The Board desired to get to the Airport as quickly as possible, and instructed staff to build the project to Orange Avenue in one shot, concluded Mr. Davis.

Mayor Marks asked if the Board directed staff to phase construct the project would they eventually have the same final product that was before them. Mr. Davis stated, no, not necessarily. If the Board elected to design and construct an alternative alignment that Capital Circle would, Mr. Davis speculated, veer east in the vicinity of Tyson Road and then south. In the event that happened, from that point to the Airport would become an airport access road. Mr. Davis stated that he did not know how many lanes would be necessary to make that an efficient corridor. The two existing lanes might be sufficient with the removal of the Capital Circle traffic. Again, however, that was the purpose of the PD&E study.

Commissioner Lightsey stated, as a point of personal privilege, that those Board members who had been around the table for some length of time should recognize that the Orange Avenue intersection was just re-configured a few years back by FDOT. She stated that she spoke against that work until the alternatives study was completed, but she could not prevail. She further stated that FDOT “squeezed” it in between an active sinkhole and the lake system. Intersection improvements had already been made in that area; it functioned quite well and she used it all the time, she stated.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that Mr. Davis had nicely stated the situation. Her motion did not set the Board back; in fact it kept them on track. The PD&E study was underway and, she stated that she would hope they would await the results of it prior to making such a move that would cost money and jeopardize the last existing pristine lake system in this community.

Mayor Marks asked how long until the PD&E study would be completed and how that would compare to the proposed track. Mr. Davis stated that it would be approximately two years before the PD&E was complete. He hoped to have design of the proposed improvements through Orange Avenue complete by 2008 with construction beginning late that year. The estimated construction period would be three years. Therefore, it would be under construction when the results of the PD&E would be in. Mr. Davis stated that waiting for results would delay anything in that vicinity.

The Mayor asked Mr. Davis to speculate if the study result might suggest they follow the existing alignment. Mr. Davis stated that was a possibility. Commissioner Lightsey stated that if that were the case, there would be six-lanes and it would bridge over the lake connection, which was not what staff was proposing for the current project. Mr. Davis noted that Commissioner Lightsey’s comment was a very valid point. Mayor Marks asked why Blueprint didn’t simply
pursue the option of bridging the lake system. Mr. Davis stated that there was a significant amount of passion in the community to not use the existing alignment.

Commissioner Proctor requested clarification on funding and the PD&E study. Mr. Davis explained that there were two PD&E studies ongoing, one for CCSW (Orange Avenue south to Crawfordville Highway), which had funding implications if the current alignment was not included, and one for CCNW/SW (Orange Avenue north to Tennessee Street). Commissioner Proctor stated that he was trying to get to the situation behind the reason for the access point for development at FSU. Mr. Davis stated that the impetus in the original Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report for the consideration of an alternative alignment was economic development of the southwest quadrant of Tallahassee/Leon County to include Innovation Park. The alignment was not driven by any development at FSU.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the three factors that needed to be discussed were: (1) could they help with economic development, (2) the environment, and (3) did they want to spend the money supporting development with quick, direct access to the Airport. He felt that the Board was tasked with either reconciling economic development efforts or facilitating access to the Airport. He supported Commissioner Mustian’s rationale, yet he requested comment from Commissioner Sauls as it was her district. Commissioner Sauls acknowledged there were speakers ahead of her and stated she would take her turn on the list.

Commissioner Gillum asked if the alternative alignment study anticipated connecting back into Orange Avenue. Mr. Davis stated, not necessarily however it appeared to be a possibility. Mr. Davis further stated that he would be hesitant to say that it would connect anywhere because it would pre-suppose that staff had made a decision as to where the roadway would go. Clearly, they had not; therefore he could not answer Commissioner Gillum’s question. Commissioner Gillum asked with the improvements on CCNW/SW, if Mr. Davis anticipated a spur in economic development in the wooded region. Mr. Davis stated that they did not because the majority of that region was the recently acquired Delta Industrial Park; Blueprint would not allow its development.

Mr. Davis stated that the primary emphasis for that particular corridor from the Board was for access to the Airport, to maximize its economic development. There was however, additional economic development ongoing in that general area. It was not a stated desire, as he recalled. However, with the potential realignment of the CCSW corridor, a stated value was economic development of that sector.

Commissioner Gillum stated that it was always his understanding that getting to the Airport meant getting to Orange Avenue. From Orange Avenue toward the Airport, an access road made sense. Furthermore, he was not sure what impact phase constructing the roadway would have overall. There was some discussion of the graphic, right of way boundaries, roadway boundaries, and the water line for Lake Cascade and stormwater ponds between Commissioner Gillum and Mr. Davis. He stated that he was prepared to support the staff recommendation. Commissioner Gillum stated that he did not know if the Board would be taking any action beyond it than to approve the staff to move forward with right-of-way acquisition; was that not the question before them? Mr. Davis confirmed that it was.
Commissioner Gillum offered his previous statement as a substitute motion. There was discussion amongst the members regarding the motion that was on the floor and what would qualify as a substitute motion.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Approve the Resolution allowing right-of-way acquisition to begin on Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Commissioner Gillum moved staff recommendation as a substitute to Commissioner Lightsey’s previous motion. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion.

Commissioner Thaell stated that he would be speaking against the substitute motion. The important acquisitions were the two parcels for the stormwater facilities. He felt that without the results of the PD&E study they were “putting the cart before the horse” by continuing to widen along the current alignment. Blueprint was sold to the voters as a way to build critically needed infrastructure in a way that enhanced the environment, he stated. By putting themselves in a situation where even a small likelihood of environmental damage could occur, they were not honoring the promise and premise of Blueprint. He did not feel the issue of construction of that segment was very critical at that point in time.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that he was opposed to the substitute motion as well. The notion that the so-called improvements could be far from the lake were incorrect. The Board adopted the philosophy of having a well-planned series of infrastructure projects that would not harm the environment. The substitute motion put the lake system at risk and negated the benefit of ultimately re-routing Capital Circle. It did not make sense to pursue that option without the results of the PD&E study.

Commissioner Sauls stated that she too was opposed to the substitute motion. She recalled a tour of the lakes for Commissioners and promises they made to residents of that area and cited the recent events at Lake Jackson as reasons for her opinion.

Commissioner Katz requested clarification on federal funding on the project. If they agreed to acquire the right-of-way was there any sequencing of parcels or was the plan based on availability. Mr. Davis stated that there was no sequencing currently in place however, it could be prioritized. The Board had already granted permission for staff to begin acquiring the initial 61 parcels which was ongoing. (north of the area shown on the graphics available at the meeting)

Mr. Davis clarified that there were two distinct PD&E studies that were ongoing. The issue that was at hand was the CCNW/SW project, Orange Avenue north to Tennessee Street. The fact that the transition (south of Orange Avenue) was predicated solely on the fact that the intersection required improvements for it to work through the design year. That was not to be confused with the PD&E that was to study the (alternative) route for Capital Circle. That was the CCSW PD&E study. It was that study for CCSW that the FDOT District Secretary required.
Blueprint to study the existing alignment or risk losing federal funding. Both were related, he stated, but were distinctly different.

Commissioner Katz questioned if the Board approved the acquisition of the right-of-way that they would not necessarily have the current alignment of Capital Circle. Mr. Davis stated that yes approval of the right-of-way would maintain the current alignment for the next 15 years or until funding were to become available for a new alignment for Capital Circle SW. Commissioner Katz requested Mr. Davis to speculate potential alignments of CCSW and how that would affect the Airport. Mr. Davis explained that with any potential realignment of Capital Circle the current alignment would become simply an Airport access road with its two existing lanes.

Commissioner Katz further stated that Commissioner Mustian spoke of some form of mitigation as it related to increasing lake protection. Was that a realistic possibility, he asked. He stated that, if staff moved forward with the construction and depending on how the Board voted, he would like to see if that was a viable option. Mr. Davis stated that staff studied the alignment from several different ways and explained several of them along with the associated pros and cons. Commissioner Katz asked if the current roadway was bridged and if staff contemplated that it would need to be bridged. Mr. Davis stated that it was not currently bridged nor would it need to be under the scenario that was reflected in the agenda item. He stated that staff would incorporate enhancements for the treatment of the stormwater and reiterated what Commissioner Mustian stated, that there were no guarantees.

Mr. Davis stated, referring back to Commissioner Katz’s earlier question of mitigation related to lake protection measures that what staff anticipated for construction and noted that the issues would be addressed during the contracting phase. H. W. Lochner, the consultant on the project, was researching what erosion control methodologies could be put in place. What staff envisioned, Mr. Davis stated, was that in the contract for the construction of that segment of the roadway staff would go to extraordinary measures to ensure that as much lake protection as could reasonably be done would be done, to the point of a full-time Environmental Enforcement person as a member of the Construction Team and a Technical Evaluation section in the RFP to discuss erosion control.

Commissioner Katz stated that he shared Commissioner Lightsey’s concerns as related to Lake Cascade. He felt that the question was if they waited for the PD&E Study to be completed and the results reflected that the existing alignment was the best option, nothing would have changed. Therefore they had to decide to move forward or wait. The reality was, he stated, concerns that were valid then would be just as valid in two years. He further stated that, like Commissioner Mustian, the Board was past the issue, there may have been a genuine misunderstanding, however he did not feel that there was any malevolence on anyone’s part.

Commissioner Gillum asked if Capital Circle were realigned would it change staff’s opinion about the need for the improvements towards the Airport. Mr. Davis stated that it would depend on the traffic forecasts for the Airport; therefore he could not answer Commissioner Gillum definitively. He stated that it would depend on the intersection as to whether or not it would change the recommendation, but he felt that it probably would.
Commissioner Dailey stated that he was speaking against the substitute motion and intended to support the original motion on the floor. He stated that he had first-hand knowledge of effects of the recent rain event at Lake Jackson. Furthermore, he had every confidence that when they moved forward, if it was the correct decision, that the construction team would do everything in its power to provide as much environmental protection of the lake as possible. He stated that the same was tried by the construction team on the I-10 project; however, “things happen.” His point, he stated, was that there seemed to be many unanswered questions that are result of the alternatives study that he did not feel comfortable moving forward at that time. He would prefer to see the PD&E study come to fruition first.

Commissioner Proctor stated that he thought that Blueprint 2000 originally promised the voters that access to the Airport would be improved. An economic engine existed, and there should be a four-lane roadway to the Airport. Part of the existing economic engine were the jobs provided by the State of Florida (in Southwood). He questioned how citizens from Gadsden and western Leon County would travel to their jobs by using Capital Circle if the Board agreed to make it a “mere access road.” He stated that what he felt was most important and the right thing to do was to improve the Capital Circle corridor.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the Citizens Committee that brought Blueprint 2000 into existence proposed the alternative route and stated that it served all the employment generators in the area, specifically the Airport and Innovation Park. The purpose as they described it was to complete the Circle but to also protect the asset, which is the lake. They found that an alternative route could be used for Capital Circle with the current route relegated to an Airport access road. She stated that Mr. Davis and the CAC/EECC were correct in that, with Capital Circle widened along the alternative route and Orange Avenue widened to four-lanes (which was the eventual plan) and with the Airport access road, the three combined would be quite serviceable and not require any additional improvement.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that Lake Cascade was larger than Lake Bradford, not as deep, but larger. Furthermore, it was the source of all the clean water that came into the lake system from the National Forest. It was essential to keep the headwaters clean if the other lakes were to survive. She stated that there was no current erosion device that could withstand the volume and velocity of runoff from significant rain events; as evidenced at Lake Jackson. The roadway was only eight to ten feet above the lake; if the pavement was located within 75-100 feet of the water, runoff from a heavy rain event would blow out every single erosion device that was currently available in the industry. The damage that occurred at Lake Jackson was from a four-inch rain event however, the article in the Tallahassee Democrat stated that the erosion control devices failed at one-inch. She stated that major destruction would occur to Lake Cascade if there was a significant rain event at anytime during construction activities. Additionally, she stated that there was not a distance in which a series of erosion control devices could be located.

She further stated that part of what they were asking of staff was, “what would you do that was beyond what was currently available to prevent damage to the lake during the construction phase?” She stated that if they did not stop further north of the lake and there was a rain event of any magnitude the damage would be done. That did not have to happen. The project could be
constructed in phases, as staff originally recommended, and funding would not be in jeopardy, she stated.

Mr. Davis clarified that he could not state infallibly, at that point in time, that funding would not be in jeopardy if changes were made to the project.

Mayor Marks stated that it was vital to protect the environment and that they would do everything possible to do that. Blueprint 2000, as he understood it, was not only designed for that purpose, but also to stimulate economic development. It was necessary to strike a balance between economic development and the environment and it was a very difficult call for everyone involved. The Airport was a primary economic generator for the community; that had to be considered, not ignored. Nor could they ignore the impacts that this would have on the environment surrounding that area. The motion as he understood it was to acquire the property, not to build the roadway, for the actual alignment was unknown at this time.

Mr. Davis clarified that the motion was to acquire the right-of-way based upon the alignment presented to the Board. Commissioner Katz questioned if the Mayor was correct in that no construction would occur without it being presented to the Board again. Mr. Davis stated that was not the intent. The intent of the agenda item, he stated, was to acquire the right-of-way to implement the presented alignment. Commissioner Katz reiterated his question; did that mean nothing would be built on that alignment until they (staff) came back to the Board? Mr. Davis stated that was not the intent, but that it certainly could mean that.

Mayor Marks continued by saying that results of the PD&E study would not be available for two years and that was troublesome to him. He felt it was necessary to do something prior to that. He recognized that there was a great deal at stake, not only environmentally, but economically as well. He stated that he reluctantly supported the substitute motion by Commissioner Gillum. He further stated that he wished staff could acquire the property, but wait to see whether or not the presented alignment would continue to be the preferred (temporary) alignment. Commissioner Gillum stated that he would be willing to accept that as a condition on the motion. He also asked how much time before construction could potentially begin. Mr. Davis stated that staff would hope to advertise construction for the contract in early to the middle of 2008. Commissioner Gillum amended the motion stating that if it passes staff would return to the Board for them to assess wherever they were on the PD&E Study to determine if it had any impact or bearing on it before moving forward. Commissioner Mustian, as the second, accepted the amendment.

Mayor Marks stated that such an amendment would help his decision considerably. He further stated that the community was moving with initiatives that might be overwhelming some, though it was necessary to move forward. He stated that he realized they needed to do so cautiously with regard to the environment, and he was in favor of that though there were other driving issues as well. The Board needed to be cognizant of those other issues otherwise they would jeopardize economic development opportunities.

Commissioner Thaell offered a point of information on the friendly amendment. The amendment stated that the Board would authorize the expenditure of public money to acquire the
right-of-way, but they might not construct the roadway. He questioned if he understood it accurately. **Commissioner Gillum clarified that prior to staff advertising the construction contract they would return to the Board.**

Mr. Davis stated that the amendment presented a problem for Blueprint. They could not exercise the powers of eminent domain without an approved design. Therefore, if the Board approved staff’s recommendation then they could proceed in acquiring the property. If, however, without approval of the presented design, staff would not have the authority via eminent domain to acquire the parcels.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that everything that had been presented could be redesigned if they chose the alignment that was approved by the voters which was to re-route Capital Circle to the north and east of Lake Bradford. “Getting to the Airport” was not part of the Blueprint 2000 vision, he stated. He stated that they were prepared to spend money on land they might not need and a design that would be negated when the results of the PD&E were in. He stated that he simply could not support the substitute motion.

**The motion passed seven to five (weighted: 42-27). With Commissioners Rackleff, Sauls, Lightsey, Dailey, and Thaell casting the dissenting votes.**

20. **Preparation of Bond Documents for Summer FY 2007 Bond Sale**

Mr. Davis stated that the Board had previously authorized staff to begin the process to sell additional bonds. He stated that they were fortunate in that over that last several years they were able to leverage their funds and therefore did not have to follow through on that process. In recent review of the cash forecast it appeared that they would need to sell bonds sometime late in the year. From that standpoint staff requested approval to move forward with the development of Bond documents using the firms, attorneys, and investment bankers they previously approved, and to allow staff to bring it back to the Board at the June 4, 2007 meeting for approval.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Authorize staff to move forward in the bond sale process.

The staff recommendation was moved and seconded; it passed unanimously.

V. **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

There were no requests by citizens to speak to members of the Board.

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

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint staff had closed on the Booth II property the previous week. The Board now owned an additional 160-acres of sensitive lands.
VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Mustian adjourned the meeting at 5:07 pm.

APPROVED: ATTEST:

________________________   __________________________
Mark Mustian     Shelonda Gay
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA     Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
#8

Capital Circle NW/SW: Mitigation Parcels Acquisition & Resolution
This item was pulled from the agenda due to the plans not being complete for the mitigation sites.
#9

Capital
Cascade Trail
Segment 2
Workshop
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Workshop

Date: June 4, 2007
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the IA approve conducting a separate Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Workshop with the IA in the fall, as scheduling permits.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 design and permitting project is proceeding into the 50% design submittal and decisions on project design elements such as materials, bridge types, water quality treatment, drainage structures, landscaping and park amenities are moving forward. A workshop conducted specifically with the IA by the project design team will provide a detailed understanding of the current project design elements and ensure IA comments are effectively addressed and the project production schedule is maintained.

The Capital Cascade Trail planning and design process has included multiple community workshops and numerous presentations to neighborhood, professional and civic groups. Feedback from the community on the current design concept has been very positive. Blueprint 2000 will continue to coordinate with the community as the design progresses and the marketing plan for the amenities comes to fruition.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve conducting a separate Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Workshop with the IA in the fall, as scheduling permits.

Option 2: Do not conduct a Workshop.

Option 3: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve conducting a separate Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Workshop with the IA in the fall, as scheduling permits.

ATTACHMENT(S)
None
#10

Capital Cascade Trail Property Lease Resolution
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Property Lease Resolution

Date: June 4, 2007
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the IA execute the attached Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Property Lease Resolution which requests the lease of land owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida for land required for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Portions of the middle (between Gadsden and Gaines) and upper (north of Gaines) sections of the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project are located on land owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (TIITF) of the State of Florida. In coordination with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, it has been determined that Blueprint 2000 will apply for a 50-year lease from TIITF in order to utilize the land for the stormwater, greenway and park project. The TIITF Lease Application (Attached) requires a formal resolution adopted by the Board of County/City Commissioners requesting the proposed lease. There will be a $300/year fee for the lease.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Execute the attached resolution which requests the lease of land owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida.

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Execute the attached resolution which requests the lease of land owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida.

ATTACHMENT(S)
- IA Resolution requesting lease of land owned by TIITF
- TIITF Lease Application
RESOLUTION NO. ______

A RESOLUTION OF THE LEON COUNTY-CITY OF TALLAHASSEE
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY REQUESTING THE
LEASE OF LAND OWNED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FOR THE CAPITAL CASCADE TRAIL – SEGMENT 2 PROJECT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 163.01(7), Florida Statutes Leon County and
the City of Tallahassee have created a Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency to
govern the project management structure for the project planning and construction of the
Blueprint 2000 projects listed in the Interlocal Agreement, which includes Capital
Cascade Trail; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Leon County and the City
Commission of the City of Tallahassee shall constitute the Blueprint 2000
Intergovernmental Agency; and

WHEREAS, the reduction in flooding hazards and the improvement of water
quality are matters of great concern to the people of the City of Tallahassee, and are
necessary to ensure the quality of life within Leon County; and

WHEREAS, the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, desires to implement
the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project, which provides stormwater facilities,
water quality improvements and park features; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that a portion of the middle and upper
sections of the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project are located within Trustees of
the Internal Improvement Trust Fund lands, and for which a legal description and sketch
of description are attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “A”; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental
Agency will apply for a 50-year lease from the Board of Trustees of the Internal
Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida for the land described in Exhibit “A”.

WHEREAS, the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund Lease
Application requires a formal resolution adopted by the Board of County/City
Commissioners requesting the proposed lease.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Leon County – City of
Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency hereby requests the Board of
Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida, to grant to the
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, a lease agreement over the property as
described in Exhibit “A”.
INTRODUCED, PASSED AND ADOPTED by Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency of Leon, County, Florida, this _____ day of ______________, 2007.

By:_____________________________

Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency

ATTESTED

By:___________________________  By:______________________________
Shelonda Gay    Debra W. Schiro, Esquire
Blueprint 2000 Board Secretary  Blueprint 2000 Attorney

Attachment:
Exhibit “A” – Survey and Legal Description
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the IA approve the Supplemental Services Request (attached) for up to $500,000 to fund the final design for six park amenities, as described below.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Blueprint 2000 staff recommends the following six park amenities be advanced from the programmed schematic design (30%) level to final design (100% - construction drawings) during this phase of the project. This approach is consistent with the Marketing Plan being developed by ZifferStansbury and full design will allow these amenities to move quickly to construction once funding has been identified. Full design will provide the basis for accurate cost estimates to be developed and facilitate the marketing of the amenity to a private sponsor. The six amenities include:

◊ Meridian Monument Plaza and Stage
◊ Interactive Water Play Area
◊ Cascade
◊ History Timeline Fence
◊ Boca Chuba
◊ Dog Park

The funding for this supplemental services request will come from right-of-way funds reserved in the Blueprint Master Plan which are not needed for this Segment. Blueprint 2000 staff believes there is a potential to recover some of these additional design costs from amenity sponsors and project partners.

- Carr, Lynch, and Sandell will be the primary recipient of the majority of these additional design funds.
- The amount of the contract supplement exceeds the authority of the Intergovernmental Management Committee.
OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve the supplemental services request for up to $500,000 to fund design additions to the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

Option 2: Do not fully design the unfunded amenities until a sponsor has been found for the amenity.

Option 3: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the supplemental services request for up to $500,000 to fund design additions to the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Supplemental Services Tasks and Fee Estimate
### Blueprint 2000 Capital Cascade Trail - Segment 2 Design & Permitting

Approximate Supplemental Services - June 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Task</th>
<th>Salary Totals</th>
<th>Reimbursable Expenses</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger Park/Restroom Building</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Six (6) Amenities</td>
<td>$371,600.00</td>
<td>$34,800.00</td>
<td>$406,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Geotechnical Investigations</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$395,100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$439,900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency = $43,990.00

Total Costs = $483,890.00
#12

FY 2006 Performance Audit
SUBJECT/TITLE: Fiscal Year 2006 Performance Audit

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: IMC
Contact Person: Phil Maher  Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the review of the Annual Performance Audit for the Blueprint 2000 program, for the year ended September 30, 2006, as required by the Interlocal Agreement.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Part V, Section 1.B. of the Interlocal Agreement requires that the Intergovernmental Management Committee: “Implement an annual financial audit conducted by an independent accounting firm licensed under Chapter 473, Florida Statutes, and an annual performance audit conducted by a firm qualified to perform such audits.”

The annual comprehensive performance audit of the Blueprint 2000 program for the year ended September 30, 2006, has been completed and is being presented for your review and comment. The audit was performed by Kaye Kendrick Enterprises and is the forth independent performance audit of the Blueprint 2000 program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Review and comment on the FY 2006 Performance Audit

ACTION BY CAC:
Accepted by the CAC.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1: Draft Fiscal Year 2006 Performance Audit
Performance Evaluation
For Year Ending September 30, 2006
April 21, 2007

To the leadership of the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency

We have completed our performance evaluation for the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency for the year ended September 30, 2006. The executive summary, findings, and recommendations are contained herein.

Our procedures were performed in conformity with Statements on Standards for Consulting Services of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The results of our evaluation are based upon the specific work described in this report.

We would like to acknowledge the efforts and assistance provided by leadership and staff of the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency. We also appreciate the opportunity to provide these performance evaluation services.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kaye L. Kendrick, CPA
Kaye Kendrick Enterprises, LLC
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Purpose, Scope and Methodology

This performance evaluation of the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency (Blueprint 2000) was conducted to assist Blueprint 2000 in assessing its ability to successfully meet its stated goals, based upon the results of operations for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2006. Specifically, we evaluated Blueprint 2000’s ability to (1) implement holistic and coordinated planning, (2) preserve, protect, and enhance the community’s quality of life through development of specific joint local government projects concerning transportation, water quality, environment and green spaces, and (3) apply sound funding and resource management practices that provides a cost efficient and effective use of funds through the application of financial tools and business practices. The methodology involved interviews, as well as review and analysis of documentation, to gain an understanding of Blueprint 2000’s ability to efficiently and effectively meet its goals.

Results of Evaluation Work

The results of our work are presented within five primary focus areas.

Preserving, protecting, and enhancing the community’s quality of life

Blueprint 2000’s projects are expected to preserve, protect and enhance the community’s quality of life. Our work indicated Blueprint 2000 is accomplishing the program goals and principally meeting expectations, but is challenged by escalating prices. There were several caveats brought to our attention that could mitigate the long-term success of Blueprint 2000:
• The projects are generally progressing as expected, however, the Cascade Park project has moved slower than desired due to complex environmental issues. Our interview results indicated this project to be perceived as highly important in establishing the Blueprint 2000 "holistic" legacy.

• Adequate planning for the cost of long-term maintenance of the 2000 projects was expressed as a concern. To ensure preservation of these cooperative and "holistic" projects, it will be important for the IA to ensure there is a focused, cooperative effort to identify and establish responsibility for maintenance funding and management to assure future enjoyment of these projects. We noted that long-term maintenance was addressed in a recent IA meeting.

• Another issue of importance expressed is that a good balance be maintained between transportation (gray) versus environmental (green) projects. Blueprint 2000 needs to remain cognizant of the “balance” it faces in meeting expectations relative to the challenging and competing goals, in such areas as environmental versus transportation. Any opportunity to clarify and rank the competing outcomes relative to this sensitive balance should assist in providing the best alternatives for the public.

Seeking and obtaining additional funds from various government entities

Blueprint 2000 has been able to leverage its sales tax funding through other governmental funding sources and can be commended for its efforts and success to-date. To reach the ultimate level of success and overcome the challenge of increasing
price trends, there will need to be a continuous and intense focus on leveraging opportunities.

Another potential source of funding for Blueprint projects may be the legislature’s provision for developers to fund the impact of their development projects, known as “concurrency”. Though recent concurrency legislation is not fully implemented, we recommend Blueprint 2000 stay abreast of the implementation status of new concurrency provisions and pursue the possibility of attaining concurrency funding for its projects.

**Using sound, but innovative business practices**

Blueprint 2000 was created with an innovative management structure, and has used innovative approaches to its projects, such as the “design-build” project approach. Blueprint 2000 has utilized a small staff, procuring a General Engineering Contractor (GEC) to manage private contractors that perform the project work. This has enabled the program to attain the specializations and expertise needed for its project without incorporating them into a permanent organizational structure. In addition, the program uses the City of Tallahassee administrative functions, procedures and processes to the extent possible, eliminating the need to invest its own funds for this purpose.

**Keeping the citizenry informed and involved**

Our interviews, observations, and review of the program website and documentation, indicated a focused effort to keep the citizenry informed. Numerous public meetings, workshops, interviews, speaking engagements with local groups and television reflects Blueprint 2000’s involvement with the public in developing and evaluating alternatives
and modifying projects as needed when additional information regarding impacts (costs and benefits) become evident. Keeping the citizenry informed and involved will continue to be critical to Blueprint 2000’s mission.

**Effective and efficient operations**

The overall performance of the Blueprint 2000 program, its leadership and staff is indicated to be effective and efficient. The Blueprint 2000 projects pose a challenge for Blueprint 2000, the City and the County to work together and agree on project details. While the relationships have been strained at times, overall these entities are supportive of each other’s needs and perspectives. There are frustrations, some of which are reported to be a result in the differences between standards, procedures and priorities.

The managerial structure supporting the Blueprint 2000 program is reported to be working well. However, the frustrations previously mentioned do appear to culminate in the Technical Coordinating Committee, which is reported to feel adversarial. While the role of the TCC is advisory to the Blueprint 2000 program, some of the TCC members also have City/County permitting oversight roles. These competing roles would inherently make this Committee seem to have a more “regulatory” nature than the other Blueprint 2000 advisory committees.
**Purpose, Mission and Goals**

Blueprint 2000’s overall responsibility is to: (1) Implement holistic and coordinated planning, (2) preserve, protect, and enhance the community’s quality of life through development of specific joint local government projects concerning transportation, water quality, environment and green spaces, and (3) apply sound funding and resource management practices that provides a cost efficient and effective use of funds through the application of financial tools and business practices. Blueprint 2000 has developed the following mission statement to accomplish these goals:

“To implement the Blueprint 2000 Program in a timely and cost effective manner, utilizing sound but innovative business practices, while keeping the citizenry informed and involved.”

We identified five primary focus areas for performing our work and reporting the results of our evaluation, as follows:

- Preserving, protecting, and enhancing the community’s quality of life
- Seeking and obtaining additional funds from various government entities
- Using sound, but innovative business practices
- Keeping the citizenry informed and involved
- Effective and efficient operations

**Approach and Methodology**

Our approach involved identifying and assessing the key outcomes critical to the success of Blueprint 2000. The methodology involved interviews, as well as review and analysis of documentation, to gain an understanding of Blueprint 2000’s ability to efficiently and effectively meet its goals. We reviewed historical and background
documents, minutes of meetings, the Blueprint master plan, and progress documentation. We interviewed staff of Blueprint 2000 and its partner organizations, which included the City of Tallahassee, Leon County, and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). We also interviewed selected members of the Intergovernmental Agency (IA), the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC).

**Creation of Blueprint 2000**

On November 7, 2000, voters approved an extension of a one-cent local option sales tax for critically needed community initiatives. The approved referendum read:

> To improve local and state roads; reduce traffic congestion; protect lakes and drinking water; reduce stormwater problems and flooding; protect and expand natural areas, parks, and recreational facilities; and seek matching funds from state and federal programs for these purposes, shall the existing one cent sales tax within Leon County be extended until December 31, 2019, with project spending subject to annual independent audit as well as review by a citizens advisory committee.

An Interlocal agreement, executed between the City and County Commissions was developed to define the mission, goals, governing process, and revenue distribution for Blueprint 2000. The agreement states that the Intergovernmental Agency (IA), consisting of the current members of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners and the Tallahassee City Commission, provides governance. The IA also approves
annual work plans, operating budgets, the capital improvement plan and any plan changes, and designates officer and staff positions.

The Interlocal Agreement sets forth the IA’s organizational structure. The Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) is a two-person committee consisting of the County Administrator and the City Manager that reports to the IA. The IMC administers the Blueprint 2000 program; monitors operations; recommends approval of the operating budget and work plans; recommends issuance of requests for proposals; approves purchases, contracts, and change orders; and hires the Executive Director for Blueprint 2000.

Blueprint 2000, with its multi-disciplinary staff is responsible for financing, planning, development and construction of the projects authorized by the IA. Many of the projects are described in the report titled, *Blueprint 2000 and Beyond*, which was developed by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC), a diverse group of citizens representing community, local business, and environmental interests.

A number of advisory groups provide input to Blueprint 2000. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) is a twelve member advisory group that reviews work plans, audits and evaluations, and makes recommendations to the IA. The Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) provides technical expertise relating to project scope and implementation plans. The TCC also provides coordination among government departments for projects and related issues and reviews other city and county projects to ensure coordination between governments. The IA has also established the
Financial Advisory Committee, the Corridor Advisory Committee, the Sensitive Lands Working Group and an IA Subcommittee of two commissioners from each commission, which reviews and resolves certain issues in detail and make recommendations to the full IA. A copy of the organizational structure is provided in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1 – Organizational Structure of Blueprint 2000

The revenues are to be distributed in accordance to the terms described in the Interlocal agreement and are as follows: 10% each for city and county projects, $25M each for water quality/sensitive lands projects and the remaining 80% for Blueprint 2000 projects. Any significant change from the projects specified in the agreement would require a super majority vote of each commission and two public hearings.
Results of Evaluation Work

Preserving, Protecting, and Enhancing the Community’s Quality of Life

Blueprint 2000’s projects are expected to preserve, protect and enhance the community’s quality of life. The expected outcomes of Blueprint 2000 include:

- More efficient transportation - Blueprint 2000 is working toward completion of Capital Circle NW and SW which will provide for rapid transport of goods to and from I-10, which can be expected to reduce the cost of doing business, encourage business and job growth, keep expenses down, and provide opportunities for personal income growth.

- Recreational opportunities in new parks, green spaces and trails - Blueprint project designs include the integration of bicycle and pedestrian walkways, removing barriers to pedestrian traffic through installation of sidewalks, crosswalks, greenways, and linear parks. The urban streetscapes envisioned for the Cascade Trail, the project expected to be the "crown jewel" for Blueprint 2000, can be expected to bring the vision of a more vibrant downtown closer to fruition, increase a sense of community, be aesthetically pleasing, and foster improved economic well-being.

- Environmental protection through land acquisition - Blueprint 2000 facilitated solutions that resulted in donated or purchased land for right-of-way for road projects, stormwater ponds, and protection of headwaters of the St. Marks River through land acquisitions and conservation easements. A key project has been
Blueprint 2000’s work with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Florida Communities Trust, and the Northwest Florida Water Management District to acquire 594 acres within the headwaters of the St. Marks River and secure a conservation easement for 132 acres. Negotiations have been completed for an additional 160 acres to protect the headwaters of the St. Marks. Blueprint 2000 worked with a number of groups, including the U.S. Forest Service, FDOT, private property owners, and various committees to obtain properties.

- Environmental protection through animal protection and habitat restoration - Blueprint 2000 policy requires quality landscaping and planting a large number of quality trees. It is also designing eco-passages, also known as animal crossings, under Capital Circle, near Gum Swamp, in hopes of reducing animal-vehicle conflicts in this environmentally sensitive area.

- Environmental protection through infrastructure enhancement - Blueprint 2000 implemented a number of projects to reduce stormwater problem areas and flooding problems. A large stormwater pond, totaling 15.3 acres is under construction on West Tennessee Street, west of Capital Circle to treat runoff that is not currently being treated and handle stormwater resulting from the Capital Circle NW expansion project. A 114 acre property for a stormwater restoration project within Capital Circle from West Tennessee to Orange Avenue has been acquired. Current methodologies in drainage design are being utilized to protect
areas impacted by stormwater in the immediate area of occurrence and downstream.

Interviews indicated that Blueprint 2000 is meeting program goals, and principally meeting expectations, but is challenged by escalating prices. Blueprint 2000 is delivering large, cooperative projects in a holistic manner that likely would not have been possible without its existence. Blueprint 2000’s leadership structure, with its diverse participation of business people, community activists, scientists, and environmentalists; and its organizational structure, as an independent governmental agency, are reported the be the primary contributing factors to Blueprint’s success toward accomplishing their mission. In addition, the Citizen’s Advisory Committee representative expressed commitment to ensuring consistency and compliance with intent of the Blueprint 2000 plan.

There were several caveats brought to our attention that could mitigate the long-term and perceived success of Blueprint 2000, as follows:

- *The projects are generally progressing as expected; however, the Cascade Park project is moving slower than desired due complex environmental issues.* Our interviews indicated this project to be of high importance in establishing the anticipated Blueprint 2000 "holistic" legacy.

- Adequate planning for the cost of long-term maintenance of the 2000 projects was also expressed as a concern. *To ensure preservation of these cooperative and "holistic" projects, it will be important for the IA to ensure there is a focused, cooperative effort to identify and establish responsibility for*
maintenance funding and management to assure future enjoyment of these projects. We noted that long-term maintenance was addressed in a recent IA meeting.

- Also mentioned by interviewees was the need to maintain a good balance between transportation (gray) versus environmental (green) projects. *Blueprint 2000 needs to remain cognizant of the “balance” it faces in meeting expectations relative to challenging and competing goals, in such areas as environmental versus transportation.* Any opportunity to clarify and rank the competing outcomes relative to this sensitive balance should assist in providing the best alternatives for the public.

The one-cent local option sales tax revenues are spread throughout Leon County. From the Capital Cascade Trail in the downtown area, to Capital Circle improvements on the south, west and northwest, to purchasing land on the upper St. Marks River Basin in eastern Leon County, and plans to purchase and develop more property, Blueprint 2000 is striving to balance the many competing interests and needs with the available funding, while using priorities set forth by the IA and the Interlocal Agreement.

**Seeking and Obtaining Additional Funds**

Blueprint 2000 has been able to leverage its sales tax funding through other governmental funding sources. While primary funding is provided through the one-cent sales tax, additional funds have been obtained through revenue bonds, and loans and grants for designated uses within specific projects. This has enabled the program to further its accomplishments, in spite of increased prices.
The program has obtained $89,238,648 from roadway and environmental grants and savings from low interest State Infrastructure Bank loans. In 2006, Blueprint 2000 received $53.6M grant funding from FDOT for road construction and $671,000 from the Florida Communities Trust. There have also been recent applications submitted for grants to obtain funds from the Northwest Florida Water Management District’s Florida Forever Program and the FDOT Highway Beautification Program. While interviewees commended Blueprint 2000 for its efforts and success in leveraging its funds, to reach its ultimate level of success and the challenge of increasing price trends, there will need to be continuous and intense focus on leveraging opportunities.

Another potential source of funding for Blueprint projects, brought to our attention, results from the legislature’s provision for developers to fund the impact of their development projects, known as “concurrency”. A concurrency review is required for new construction, additions to existing buildings or conversions of existing buildings. The purpose of the concurrency review is to assess the impacts of proposed development on various public facilities and services, including roads, stormwater facilities, and parks and recreation. Though recent concurrency legislation is not fully implemented, we recommend Blueprint 2000 stay abreast of the implementation status of new concurrency provisions and pursue the possibility of attaining concurrency funding for its projects.

**Sound but innovative business practices**

Blueprint 2000 was created with an innovative management structure, and has used innovative approaches to its projects, such as design-build. These approaches, though
reported to be “rocky” in the beginning, have proved to work efficiently for Blueprint 2000.

Blueprint 2000 has utilized a small staff, procuring a General Engineering Contractor (GEC) to manage private contractors that perform the project work. This has enabled the program to attain the specializations and expertise needed for its project without incorporating them into a permanent organizational structure. In addition, the program uses the City of Tallahassee administrative functions, procedures and processes to the extent possible, eliminating the need to invest its own funds for this purpose. Recently, however, the project did determine the need to retain its own in-house attorney to realize a cost-savings.

**Keeping the citizenry informed and involved**

Our interviews, observations, and review of the program website and documentation, indicated a focused effort to keep the citizenry informed. Numerous public meetings, workshops, interviews, speaking engagements with local groups and television reflects Blueprint 2000’s involvement with the public in developing and evaluating alternatives and modifying projects as needed when additional information regarding impacts (costs and benefits) become evident. Blueprint 2000 provided a variety of citizen participation opportunities and public information activities during fiscal year 2006. Citizen participation opportunities included four public meetings/workshops, a public hearing and an open house on the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest PD&E study, all of which were coordinated and conducted by Blueprint 2000. Public information activities included publishing a CAC Report to the Citizens; issuing over eighteen press releases;
coordinating interviews with the Tallahassee Democrat, WCOT, WCTV, and FAMU TV; making over fourteen presentations to civic groups, and; distributing over five related fact sheets and one project-related newsletter.

Efficient and effective operations

Our work indicated the overall performance of the Blueprint 2000 program, its leadership and staff to be effective and efficient. This conclusion is supported by our interviews, and review and observation of its accomplishments (see Appendix A – Blueprint 2000 Master Plan Comparison).

As expected in a newly created organization, improved efficiency in the administrative processes has been realized since the inception of its operation. There are several attributes that have contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of operations: (1) a specific listing of tangible projects to be undertaken by Blueprint 2000, (2) a high level of accountability through its progress reporting process, and (3) adequate authority and discretion given to the Executive Director to make decisions.

While the relationships between Blueprint 2000, the City and the County have been strained at times, overall these entities are supportive of each other’s needs. There have been changes such as reduced funding and workload impacts on existing permitting processes in the City and County due to the creation and operation of the Blueprint 2000 program. Also, the Blueprint 2000 “design-build” approach requires a lot of coordination and must adhere to a critical time schedule. There are frustrations that
exist within Blueprint 2000, the City and the County, some of which are reported to be a result of the differences between standards, procedures and priorities.

The managerial structure supporting the Blueprint 2000 program is reported to be working well. However, the frustrations previously mentioned do appear to culminate in the Technical Coordinating Committee, which is reported to feel adversarial. The responsibilities of the Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee, as specified in the Interlocal Agreement between Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, Leon County and City of Tallahassee, dated February 1, 2003, provide the following responsibilities of the Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee:

- Work with Staff Director to ensure coordination with other ongoing and future projects and related issues.
- Review Blueprint 2000 Project scope and implementation plans and make recommendations to Staff Director.
- Annually review other projects of the City and County to ensure coordination between governments.
- Such other responsibilities as shall be provided in the Bylaws or as provided by the Board of Directors.

While the role of the TCC is advisory to the Blueprint 2000 program, some of the TCC members also have City/County permitting oversight roles. These competing roles
would inherently make this Committee seem to have a more “regulatory” nature than the other Blueprint 2000 advisory committees.
### Appendix A - Blueprint 2000 Master Plan Comparison

**Fiscal Years 2004, 2005, and 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$5,530,363</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capital Circle SW (Orange to SR 20)</td>
<td>2003-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
<td>$15,700,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capital Circle NW/SW (US 90 to Orange)</td>
<td>2003-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$122,577,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$104,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$7,546,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$7,201,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Capital Circle SW (Springhill to Orange)</td>
<td>2005-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$3,370,818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$1,647,173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,459,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,349,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$520,215,992</td>
<td>$545,215,362</td>
<td></td>
<td>$591,863,397</td>
<td>$62,370,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 right-of-way acquisition deferred

shaded areas - not yet funded for construction
The electronic version of this report is available on the Web site of Blueprint 2000 and Beyond

www.blueprint2000.org

A bound report may be obtained by calling

Blueprint 2000 and Beyond
(850) 701-2740
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Blueprint 2000
Real Estate
Policy - Revision
STATEMENT OF ISSUE: With Blueprint’s ongoing active acquisition of right-of-way, particularly along the Capital Circle corridor, Blueprint staff has discovered a need to revise a portion of our Real Estate Policy, which addresses when Blueprint will be required to obtain a second appraisal report. Currently, the real estate policy states that a second appraisal report shall be required when the independent state-certified appraiser’s initial estimate of value exceeds $400,000. Blueprint staff is requesting that the threshold, which triggers this option, be increased to $750,000. In addition, staff is requesting the current policy be further revised to change this from a mandatory requirement to obtain a second appraisal report to a discretionary one.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

- On November 15, 2004, the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) approved the Blueprint 2000 Real Estate Policy.
- **Section 107.06 A.1.**, describes the Executive Director’s authority to approve real estate transactions involving the purchase of property for land banking purposes or the payment of legal settlements for property acquired under the treat of condemnation. Essentially, the Executive Director may approve these real estate acquisitions provided the purchase price, exclusive of attorney fees and costs and business damages, if applicable, does not exceed $750,000 or 20% above the appraised value, whichever is greater.
- **Section 107.08 A. 2.**, states that for acquisitions in which the estimate of value of the real property does not exceed $400,000.00 an independent state-certified appraiser shall be retained to determine the fair market value of the property.
- **Section 107.08 A. 3.**, states that when the initial appraised fair market value of the property exceeds $400,000.00, two independent state-certified appraisers shall be retained to determine the fair market value.
- FDOT Right of Way Manual provides that a second appraisal may be obtained when the initial estimate of value exceeds $1,000,000.
OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve staff’s recommendation to change the threshold amount required to obtain a second appraisal report for properties with initial estimates of value that exceed $750,000 and permit this to be an option and not a mandatory requirement.

Advantages:
- Decrease right-of-way acquisition cost.
- Create uniformity within the Real Estate Policy

Disadvantage:
- None

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve staff’s recommendation to change the threshold amount required to obtain a second appraisal for properties with initial estimates of value that exceed $750,000 and permit this to be an option and not a mandatory requirement.

Action by TCC and CAC: The CAC approved the revisions to the Policy. It was provided to the TCC as an information item only.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Section 107.08 of Real Estate Policy showing proposed changes in legislative format.
APPRAISALS AND OTHER VALUE ESTIMATES:

A. For all real property transactions, Blueprint shall prepare or obtain a value estimate or an appraisal report, which estimates the fair market value of the real property interest involved in the transaction in accordance with the following procedures.

1. For acquisitions, sales, or dispositions in which the estimated value of the real property does not exceed $25,000.00, an in-house value determination or an appraisal shall be prepared.

2. For acquisitions, sales, or dispositions in which the estimated value of the real property exceeds $750,000.00, an independent state-certified appraiser shall be retained to prepare an appraisal report with an estimate of the fair market value of the real property.

3. For acquisitions, sales, or dispositions in which the estimated value of the real property exceeds $750,000.00, two independent state-certified appraisers, may be retained to each prepare an appraisal report with an estimate of fair market value of the real property.

4. All appraisal reports being obtained for property under the threat of condemnation shall be reviewed by an independent state-certified appraiser. All other appraisals may be reviewed at the discretion of the Director of Blueprint or his/her designee.

5. Nothing in this section is intended to preclude Blueprint from purchasing real property pursuant to sections 125.355 or 166.045, FL Statutes, if it chooses to do so.
#14

CAC Chairman: CAC Actions
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: CAC Chairman’s Report

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: Terence Hinson
Contact Person: Jim Davis  Type of Item: Presentation

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

CAC Chair Terence Hinson will be present to address the CAC’s discussion and recommendations on appropriate agenda items before the IA.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The Blueprint Citizens Advisory Committee met on May 17 to discuss items on the June 4 IA agenda.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

ATTACHMENT(S):
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Election of Vice Chairman
SUBJECT/TITLE: Election of Vice Chair

Date: June 4, 2007  
Requested By: Chairman Mustian

Contact Person: Jim Davis  
Type of Item: Discussion

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

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The By-Laws of the Agency specify:

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

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

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

Action by TCC and CAC: none
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Capital Circle SE Design Update (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle Southeast Design Update (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Rd)

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips  Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item updates the IA on the design status for the Capital Circle Southeast project from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road. The item also describes a possible interim improvement.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
- The Phase II (60%) design plans and 100% right-of-way maps are expected to be completed at the end of June 2007. Blueprint 2000 stopped the design at the 60% phase pending future funding for right-of-way and construction. This approach will allow Blueprint the ability to initiate right-of-way acquisition and advertise a design-build contract, contingent upon available resources. Blueprint 2000 is also evaluating potential interim improvements that would not require additional right-of-way, would utilize recent intersection improvements at Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Road and would cost significantly less than the ultimate seven-lane improvement. A possible four-lane interim improvement is discussed below.
- An interim four-lane improvement cost estimate is shown below (see attached typical section and right-of-way needs):
  - Right-of-Way: $ 0.0 M
  - Design/Build Contract: $10.0 M
  - Construction Engineering Inspection: $ 1.5 M
  - Total: $11.5 M (Present Day Cost)
  - $12.0 M (inflated to the anticipated construction letting date of mid-2008)

- The seven-lane ultimate improvement cost estimate is shown below (see attached typical section and right-of-way needs):
  - Right-of-Way: $ 8.8 M
  - Design/Build Contract: $16.0 M
  - Construction Engineering Inspection: $ 2.4 M
  - Total: $27.2 M (Present Day Cost)
  - $28.3 M (inflated to the anticipated construction letting date of mid-2008)
Based on the recent traffic counts and forecasts, a four-lane divided interim improvement project will operate at an acceptable Level-of-Service (LOS) through the design year of 2030. The Capital Circle/Crawfordville Road Intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS without any improvements for approximately 10 years or until 2020.

TRIP Funding: To have the best chance of securing TRIP funds from FDOT, the CRTPA must designate this segment (Woodville to Crawfordville) as the number 1 TRIP priority and within the top 3 of the overall CRTPA Major Project Priorities List.

Blueprint does not currently have $6 million for a TRIP match in the Master Plan.

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) has agreed to provide Blueprint with a federal lands easement deed for the roadway and drainage improvements along Capital Circle (at no cost to Blueprint). Blueprint has submitted the required project information to USFS and has prepared an easement deed between FHWA and FDOT. Once USFS completes the required easement stipulations, the deed can be executed.

USFS Legislation (HR 5725) that would allow the USFS to sell the Flea Market Tract directly to a public or private entity was not acted upon by the 109th Congress. Blueprint was informed that this legislation was “reintroduced” to the new 110th Congress in both the House and Senate.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
For IA information and discussion; no action required.

**ATTACHMENT(S)**
- Typical Sections: Interim Improvement (Four-lane Typical Section) and Ultimate Improvement (Seven-lane Typical Section) graphic
- Right-of-Way Needs graphic
Capital Circle Southeast Right-of-Way Needs

From West of Woodville Highway to West of Crawfordville Road
FPID#415782-6
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Capital Circle SW PD&E Study: Guidance for Evaluation Criteria
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to request IA guidance on the evaluation criteria that will be used to analyze the various factors to be considered for all alignments studied. The evaluation criteria will be assigned weighted values later in the study and be incorporated into a comparative matrix, used for selection of a preferred alternative. Guidance from the IA for assigning these weights will be sought later in the study.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The thirteen evaluation criteria listed in the Evaluation Matrix shown below are provided for Board consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Floodplains</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lake Bradford Chain &amp; Other Surface Water Protection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wetlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stormwater Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Access &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Business Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Economic Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Historical and Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mixed Housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recreation/Open space/Greenways</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process will apply a value ranging from minus three (-3) for most adverse impact to plus three (+3) for greatest enhancement after consideration of the applicable study topics listed below. Each evaluation criterion will be weighted by values determined by the Study Team with input from the Public, Community Representatives and CAC. Guidance from the IA for assigning these weights will be sought later in the study.

During the normal course of the PD&E process the following study topics will be addressed. The resulting information will be used to support the value assigned to each evaluation criterion. The study topics include, but are not limited to, the following:

### STUDY TOPICS

#### Engineering
- Constructability
- Erosion Control
- Safety
- Traffic Operations, LOS
- Transportation Plan, (SIS, LRTP, Comp Plan)
- Travel Needs (Regional, Local)

#### Physical Features
- Bike/Pedestrian Facilities
- Greenways
- Hazardous Materials/Contamination
- Noise
- Transit
- Utilities
- Water Management (Quantity)
- Water Quality

#### Natural Environment
- Air Quality
- Aquifer
- Cypress Swamp
- Cypress Wetlands
- Karst Geology
- Marsh Wetlands
- Mixed Hardwood Wetlands
- Mixed Hardwood/Pine Forest
- Open Water
- Protected Species
- Protected Species Habitat
- Total Wetlands

#### Cost
- Construction
- Mitigation
- Right-of-Way

#### Socio-Cultural
- 4(f) Properties
- Cemeteries
- Conservation Areas
- Cultural/Historical/
- Archaeological
- Commercial Properties
- Community Cohesion/Identity
- Crime/Response
- Economic Analysis
- Government/Institutional Properties
- Minority Neighborhoods
- Parks/Recreational Areas
- Recreational/Commuter Access
- Residential/Business Access
- Residential Properties

### OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve the list of thirteen evaluation criteria presented above.

Option 2: Board Guidance

### RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the list of thirteen evaluation criteria presented above.
**Action by the TCC and CAC:**
CAC: The evaluation criteria were approved by the CAC. Discussion included the differing quality of the wetlands to be evaluated (Delta site’s degraded quality versus the pristine quality of the Chain of Lakes) and the benefit the realigned corridor would have on maintaining the capacity of the existing corridor to serve trips to the Airport.

**ATTACHMENTS:** None
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Regional Stormwater Pond: Park Concept (CCNW)
SUBJECT/TITLE: Regional Stormwater Pond: Park Concept (CCNW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: June 4, 2007</th>
<th>Requested By: Blueprint staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Item:</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT OF ISSUE: This issue advises the Board of a Park concept proposed for the Regional Stormwater Pond which is being constructed on West Tennessee Street as part of the Capital Circle NW corridor project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The Blueprint Project Definitions Report recommends “build(ing) regional ponds as multipurpose facilities -- passive recreation, open space, hiking/biking trails connected to other greenways. Use as a combination functioning facility and a public amenity.”

The award of a $565,000 “grant” from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) for the wetland plantings in the pond released existing funding committed to the project. It is proposed that the released funding be used to construct the trail around the pond, and provide benches, fitness stations, landscaping, and other amenities. Parking, a boardwalk, and other facilities are also proposed, depending on total funding available and cost.

The attached graphic shows the Park concept currently under consideration. The final Park design plan and timing of the construction may depend on the acquisition of an additional parcel on West Tennessee Street immediately north of the Pond (the small used car dealership).

The development of this project has been coordinated with the Leon County Division of Parks and Recreation.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Action by TCC and CAC: Presented as information only.

ATTACHMENTS:

Park Concept Graphic
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Approval of the Issuance of $72,000,000 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2007
The bond agenda item will be provided at a later date.

Thanks
Blueprint Staff
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Proposed FY 2008 Blueprint Operating Budget
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The Blueprint 2000 Budget Policy, approved by the Board of Directors of the Intergovernmental Agency on June 17, 2002, provides a procedure for the annual adoption of the operating budget. This agenda item presents the Proposed FY 2008 Operating Budget to the Citizens Advisory Committee for their review and approval.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
- In accordance with Blueprint 2000’s Budget Policy, the Executive Director shall develop a proposed operating budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Once the budget has been developed and approved by the Intergovernmental Management Committee, the Director shall place the proposed budget on the agenda for the next Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting. Concurrently the Executive Director shall schedule an opportunity for public comment on the proposed budget.
- At the September 10, 2007, Intergovernmental Agency meeting, a public hearing on the recommended budget will also be conducted prior to adoption of the budget and approval of the budget resolution. This action will formally appropriate the funds for the FY2008 Operating Budget, which commences October 1, 2007.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Review and comment on the FY 2008 Operating Budget.

CAC Recommendations:
Approved the Proposed FY 2008 Operating Budget

ATTACHMENT(S):
(1) FY 2008 Budget Comparison
(2) FY 2008 Budget Narrative
(3) Letter of Authorization (LOA) 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2006 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2007 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY 2008 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511000 Salaries</td>
<td>$362,478</td>
<td>$511,141</td>
<td>$497,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511500 Temp wages</td>
<td>$25,801</td>
<td>$41,105</td>
<td>$43,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512000 Overtime</td>
<td>$346</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512400 Other Salary Items</td>
<td>$11,199</td>
<td>$11,199</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515000 Pension-current</td>
<td>$31,898</td>
<td>$46,667</td>
<td>$49,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515100 Pension-MAP</td>
<td>$27,073</td>
<td>$39,409</td>
<td>$41,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515600 Mandatory Medicare</td>
<td>$5,650</td>
<td>$7,412</td>
<td>$7,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516000 Health Benefits</td>
<td>$23,715</td>
<td>$39,375</td>
<td>$41,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Flex Benefits</td>
<td>$10,141</td>
<td>$13,776</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$498,301</strong></td>
<td><strong>$712,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>$745,061</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521010 Advertising</td>
<td>$4,899</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521030 Reproduction</td>
<td>$1,963</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521040 Professional Fees/Services</td>
<td>$48,955</td>
<td>$115,306</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.Audit, Fin. Audit, Fin. Advisor Bond Disclosure Serv. ERD, and Internal Control Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521100 Equipment Repairs</td>
<td>$4,932</td>
<td>$3,949</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521180 Uncl. Contractual Services</td>
<td>$11,742</td>
<td>$29,220</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521190 Computer Software</td>
<td>$16,894</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522080 Telephone</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523010 Chem-Med-Lab</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523020 Food</td>
<td>$1,949</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523030 Gasoline</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523050 Postage</td>
<td>$1,147</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523060 Office Supplies</td>
<td>$18,844</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524020 Journals and Books</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523080 Unclassified Supplies</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523100 Vehicle Non-Garage</td>
<td>$6,378</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524010 Travel and Training</td>
<td>$6,487</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524030 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524050 Rental of Office Space</td>
<td>$70,825</td>
<td>$77,246</td>
<td>$92,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524080 Unclassified charges</td>
<td>$3,467</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$268,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>$357,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>$337,731</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540040 Liability Insurance Premium</td>
<td>$2,952</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Svcs/Charges</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,952</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY 2008 Proposed Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2006 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2007 Amended</th>
<th>FY 2008 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550030 Office Equipment</td>
<td>$3,893</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550040 Computer Equipment</td>
<td>$2,819</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550060 Unclassified Equipment</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>$13,712</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560010 Human Resource Expense</td>
<td>$2,625</td>
<td>$5,678</td>
<td>$5,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560020 Accounting Expense</td>
<td>$8,652</td>
<td>$32,232</td>
<td>$32,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560030 Purchasing Expense</td>
<td>$5,408</td>
<td>$22,835</td>
<td>$22,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560040 Information Systems Exp.</td>
<td>$27,038</td>
<td>$11,381</td>
<td>$11,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated Costs</strong></td>
<td>$43,723</td>
<td>$72,126</td>
<td>$72,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Inter-fund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Eng. Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$907,000</td>
<td>$885,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>$1,734,224</td>
<td>$2,066,177</td>
<td>$2,075,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Other Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,500,000</td>
<td>$13,498,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611300 Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$8,240,791</td>
<td>$10,365,614</td>
<td>$14,222,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,941,685</td>
<td>$3,941,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for future years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,832,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>$50,307,879</td>
<td>$60,279,130</td>
<td>$33,738,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Funds**
- **2003 Bonds Funds**
  - Fund Balance | $17,867,907 | $27,832,864 |
  - Encumbrance carry forward | $34,357 | $15,106 |
  - Other (interest, admin fees) | $785,417 | |
  - Sales Tax Proceeds | $31,620,198 | $32,431,160 | $33,738,014 |
  - **Total** | $50,307,879 | $60,279,130 | $33,738,014 |
2008 Budget Narrative

511000 Salaries Enhancement reflects a 5% pay raise and 2% for bonuses
511500 Temp wages includes Administrative Assistant $33,710 and Intern during the summer $10,000.
512000 Overtime for Admin Asst and OPS staff
521010 Public hearing notices, CAC annual report ($4,000) and, etc.
521030 Copies, letterhead, CAC’S performance report.
521040 Unclassified Professional fees; Financial Audit $30,000 Performance Audit $35,000, Financial Advisor $15,000, Bond Information Services $6,000, ERD $4000, and $15,000 Internal Controls Review
521100 Equip repairs, copier maintenance contract and copies, recording equipment, power point projector no longer on warranty, fax machine.
521160 Legal services includes outside General Counsel Attorney services
521080 Unclassified Contract Services includes two FSU planning interns $16,000 and ISS support $6,000 and $4000 misc.
521190 Computer Software $4,000, maintenance, software licenses $1,000.
522080 Telephone long distance and 5 cell phones
523020 6 CAC meetings, workgroup meeting, lunch meetings, and 1 evening IA meeting
523060 Office supplies printer toner, paper, and general office needs.
523080 Unclassified Supplies, items such as surge protectors, safety vests, same as last years
523100 Repairs and service on 3 Vehicles. Average of age of vehicles is 6 years
524010 Out of State trips i.e. anticipated bond sale in New York, trips similar to Chattanooga, in State trips i.e. Team Florida, Fla. Bar, & etc. registrations fees $1000 and training $2000.
524020 Journals and Books including legal subscriptions
524040 Membership dues Government Finance Officers Association and Certificate of Achievement Program, Florida Bar dues and etc.
524050 Rental of 5215 sq. ft. of full service office space.
524080 Unclassified Charges, Paying Agent charges Reward and Recognition $1000 and etc
540040 Liability Insurance Premium includes Workers Comp, General Liability, Automobile, Public Officials, Employment Practices liability and consultant services
550030 Office equipment any office equipment over $1000.
550040 Computer equipment, additional computer and miscellaneous equipment
550060 Unclassified equipment includes items such as filling cabinets, camera, and miscellaneous equipment needs
560010-560040 Blueprint’s share of Allocated Costs
612400 General Engineering Consultant $885,506 and transfer of sales tax revenue to Capital Projects

State Infrastructure Bank loan
**ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC**

**Name of Project:** Blueprint 2000 GEC

**County:** GENERAL PROGRAM MGMT & SUPPORT

**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated

**Consult. No.:** FAP No.: Estimator: Jerry Oshesky

### Task Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Staff Hours</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Average Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Salary By Activity</th>
<th>Average Rate Per Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Program Setup</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>$116,346.24</td>
<td>$67.33</td>
<td>$45.03</td>
<td>$46.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Program Mgmt Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11,301.60</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Coord &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17,170.60</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Land Acq and Mgmt</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>18,566.40</td>
<td>77.33</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>SW &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>159,346</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>11,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Intelligent Trans Sys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Alt Transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Staff Hours:** 0

**Total Staff Cost:** $176,515.68

**TOTAL DIRECT LABOR:** $176,515.68

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (HOME OFFICE):** $42,795.36

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (FIELD OFFICE):** $133,720.32

**OVERHEAD (HOME):** 165.78% $70,946.15

**OVERHEAD (FIELD):** 123.48% 165,117.85

**SUBTOTAL:** $412,579.68

**OPERATING MARGIN:** 12.5% 51,572.46

**EXPENSES (15% of Raw Labor):** 10.0% 17,651.57

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE:** $481,803.71

**SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS:** $218,390.19

**SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE):** $218,390.19

**SUBCONSULTANT - PE (MBE):** $73,152.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - OLH (MBE):** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - QUEST (MBE):** $34,099.20

**SUBCONSULTANT - THC RWSI:** $58,060.80

**SUBCONSULTANT - UZZELL (MBE):** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - BH:** $- $-

**SUBCONSULTANT - WW:** $- $-

**SUBCONSULTANT - WES:** $- $-

**CONTINGENCY:** $- $-

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES:** $403,702.19

**GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:** $885,506

**FY07 LOA1 BUDGET:** $885,506

---

**MBE Percentage:** 14.37%

---

**Attachment 3 - Method of Compensation**
Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2008-FY 2012 Blueprint Capital Budget
SUBJECT/TITLE: Adoption of the Revised Master Plan and Fiscal Year 2008-2012 Blueprint Capital Budget and Resolution

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Phil Maher  Type of Item: Discussion and Public Hearing

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to request approval of the revised Master Plan and FY 2008-2012 Capital Budget.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
At the September 18, 2006 IA meeting, the Board approved a revised Master Plan. Based on priority approved in the Master Plan and subsequent events, the following are the major changes that Blueprint is recommending to the plan.

- Increase of $12.2M for the construction of Capital Circle Southeast from Tram Road to Woodville Highway. This increase is the result of the additional TRIP dollars from FDOT for construction and SouthWood mitigation dollars.
- Increase of $915,285 to the Headwaters of the St Marks to reflect Florida Community Trust Grant for Booth II.
- Modification of the City Water Quality dollars to reflect how they are currently receiving their funds. The City currently receives their fund as Blueprint receives its sale tax dollars. This eliminated the reduction for receiving funds early.
- Increase of $13.7M for Capital Cascades Segment 1 in FY 2015 – 2018 due to cost escalation and permit issues. The original cost estimates were based on Segment 1 being primarily a water quality and flooding project. Based on recent discussions with City Growth Management on Segment 2, it appears that current stormwater regulations (Chapter 5, Article IV, Section 5-86: Stormwater Management Design Standards) will require Segment 1 to be treated as a Major Roadway Project. This results in Blueprint providing stormwater treatment facilities to permit the reconstructed four (4) - lane roadway.

The Proposed FY 2008-2012 Capital Budget implements the revised Master Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

ACTION BY CAC
Public Hearing was held on May 17, 2007 and there were no speakers. The FY2008-2012 Capital Budget was approved by the CAC.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1: Revised Master Plan
Attachment 2: Master Plan Approved in September
Attachment 3: FY 2008-2012 Capital Budget
Attachment 4: GEC’s LOA Detail
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1,510,320</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
<td>$35,857,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$5,602,830</td>
<td>$13,400,980</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,995,340</td>
<td>$436,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$24,048,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$171,720</td>
<td>$718,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$1,325,520</td>
<td>$1,248,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,172,550</td>
<td>$8,782,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,326,720</td>
<td>$955,490</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$191,130</td>
<td>$15,172,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$7,310,260</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,040,930</td>
<td>$111,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $26,351,562

**Annual Project Expense** $26,351,562
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project</td>
<td><strong>$5,052,97</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,486,26</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,449,05</strong></td>
<td><strong>$484,40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td><strong>$405,48</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,542,42</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,242,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,031,78</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,904,43</strong></td>
<td><strong>$948,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td><strong>$581,26</strong></td>
<td><strong>$147,28</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,843,84</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$10,000,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>$4,500,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td><strong>$54,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td><strong>$23,858,66</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$1,556,79</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td><strong>$1,210,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td><strong>$26,347,20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td><strong>$1,852 $1,651,00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td><strong>$9,282,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,366,00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$1,510,32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$980,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td><strong>$8,674,00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$135,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,522,50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td><strong>$13,006,84</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,852 $1,651,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,282,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,366,00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td><strong>$20,793,39</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
<td>**$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td><strong>$26,164 ,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,651,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,199,835</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,368,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,031,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,171,903</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,183,044</strong></td>
<td>**$12,944,588$</td>
<td>**$12,300,000$</td>
<td>**$591,863,372$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Water Quality</td>
<td>$8,646,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Water Quality</td>
<td>$15,486,898</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks NWFWMDD</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks</td>
<td>$3,131,567</td>
<td>$799,903</td>
<td>$555,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson Basin</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar</td>
<td>$349,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank ROW/Sen.Land</td>
<td>$9,084,401</td>
<td>$2,133,233</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Lands and Land Bank</td>
<td>$346,649</td>
<td>$55,099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW from I-10 to U.S. 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$718,673</td>
<td>$70,723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$51,694,644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$23,858,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$4,285,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82,557,982</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,723</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW from U.S. 90. to Orange Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$936,143</td>
<td>$564,007</td>
<td>$561,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering and Design</td>
<td>$4,187,177</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$21,206,604</td>
<td>$20,793,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$57,387,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,954,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,545,167</strong></td>
<td>$561,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Schedule</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Connie to Tram</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$2,721,246</td>
<td>$263,812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$9,156,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Build Contract</td>
<td>$36,488,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$48,365,246</td>
<td>$263,812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Tram. to Woodville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$626,506</td>
<td>$941,509</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,604,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$8,674,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$20,560,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$31,465,922</td>
<td>$941,509</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSE Woodville to Crawford.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$441,852</td>
<td>$111,894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,435,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,876,852</td>
<td>$111,894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCSW Crawford to Orange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$289,829</td>
<td>$421,098</td>
<td>$348,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,709,829</td>
<td>$421,098</td>
<td>$348,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Cascade Trail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,140,111</td>
<td>$718,656</td>
<td>$807,600</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$1,020,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$2,904,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,044,111</td>
<td>$718,656</td>
<td>$807,600</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$1,020,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,672,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,672,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blueprint 2000 5-Year Capital Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Schedule</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$2,667,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,072,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>$3,072,720</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
<td>$7,301,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>$3,072,720</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
<td>$7,301,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$247,465,463</td>
<td>$121,761,019</td>
<td>$4,622,520</td>
<td>$8,712,520</td>
<td>$9,790,952</td>
<td>$2,520,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC

### LOA NUMBER TWO (FY08)

**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated  
**Consult. No.:**  
**County:** CAPITAL CASCADE TRAIL  
**FPN:**  
**Date:**  
**FAP No.:**  
**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

### Staff Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Staff Classification</th>
<th>Total Staff Hours</th>
<th>Total Staff Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.1 Project Manager</strong></td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,231.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (Roadway)</strong></td>
<td>Senior Proj Engineer</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>$37,486.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (Concept/RO)</strong></td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>$80,749.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (GW &amp; Envir)</strong></td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$9,041.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.3 Design (Roadway)</strong></td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$17,291.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.3 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</strong></td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$53,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.4 Construction</strong></td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.5 Project Closeout</strong></td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SH Salary Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>SH Salary Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.1 Project Manager</strong></td>
<td>$67.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (Roadway)</strong></td>
<td>$65.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (Concept/RO)</strong></td>
<td>$46.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.2 Planning (GW &amp; Envir)</strong></td>
<td>$47.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.3 Design (Roadway)</strong></td>
<td>$35.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.3 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</strong></td>
<td>$45.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2.4 Construction</strong></td>
<td>$29.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Hours Summary

- **Total Staff Hours:** 5,120
- **Total Staff Cost:** $154,668.00
- **Check = $154,668.00**

### Summary of Costs

- **Total Direct Labor:** $154,668.00
- **Salary Related Costs (Home Office):** $46,527.36  
- **Salary Related Costs (Field Office):** $108,140.64  
- **Overhead (Home):** 165.78%  
- **Overhead (Field):** 123.48%  
- **Subtotal:** $365,333.12  
- **Operating Margin:** 12.5%  
- **Expenses:** 10.0%  
- **Subtotal Estimated Prime Fee:** $426,466.56  

### Subconsultant Costs

- **SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - PE (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - QCI (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - KB (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - DGA (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - THC NYSS**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - UZZELL (MBE)**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - BH**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - WES**  
- **SUBCONSULTANT - WV**  
- **Contingency**  

**Cost Breakdown:**

- **MBE Percentage = 18.03%**
- **GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:** $743,654

**FY07 LOA2 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$743,654</td>
<td>FY07 LOA2 Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MBE Percentage:**

- **MBE Percentage = 18.03%**

**Estimate of Work Effort and Cost - The LPA Group, Inc.**

Name of Project: Blueprint 2000 GEC  
County: CAPITAL CASCADE TRAIL  
FPN:  
Date:  
Estimator: Jerry Oshesky
### Project: Blueprint 2000 GEC

#### LOA Number Three (FY08)

**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated  
**County:**  
**FPN:**  
**Date:**  
**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>3.1 Project Mgmt</th>
<th>3.2 Planning (Roadway)</th>
<th>3.2A Planning (Concept)</th>
<th>3.3 Design (Roadway)</th>
<th>3.3A Design (GW &amp; Env)</th>
<th>3.4 ROW Acquisition</th>
<th>3.5 Construction (Roadway)</th>
<th>3.5A Const (GW &amp; Env)</th>
<th>3.6 Project Closeout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff Hours</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff Cost</td>
<td>$3,231.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,520.64</td>
<td>$3,433.92</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,955</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH by Activity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary By Activity</td>
<td>$5,232</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,154</td>
<td>$6,337</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15,205</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rate per Task</td>
<td>$67.33</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$46.73</td>
<td>$47.09</td>
<td>$35.77</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (HOME OFFICE):** $4,520.64  
**SALARY RELATED COSTS (FIELD OFFICE):** $6,655.76  
**OVERHEAD (HOME):** 105.71%  
**OVERHEAD (FIELD):** 123.48%  
**SUBTOTAL:** $26,911.60  
**OVERHEAD (15% of Raw Labor):** $3,363.95  
**TOTAL DIRECT LABOR:** $11,186.40

**CONSULTANT FEES:** $39,328.97  
**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE:** $40,515.37  
**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES:** $39,328.97  
**GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:** $79,844.34
## ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC

**Name of Project:** Blueprint 2000 GEC  
**County:** CAPITAL CIRCLE SOUTHEAST (E1, TRAM-CONNIE)  
**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated  
**Consult. No.:**  
**FPN:**  
**Date:**  
**FAP No.:**  
**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

### SH Salary Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rate Per Hour</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Planning (Roadway)</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.21 Planning (Concept/Rpt)</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.22 Planning (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.23 Planning (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.24 Planning (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Design (Roadway)</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.31 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.32 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.33 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.34 Design (GW &amp; Envir)</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.41 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.42 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.43 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.44 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.51 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.52 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.53 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.54 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Project Closeout</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.61 Project Closeout</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.62 Project Closeout</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.63 Project Closeout</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.64 Project Closeout</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Staff Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Project Management</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Planning (Roadway)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Design (Roadway)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Const (Roadway)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Project Closeout</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>528</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Staff Cost

| Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task | Activity | Rate Per Hour | Task |
|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|---------------|------|
| 4.1 Project Management | 67.33 | 0 | 4.11 Project Management | 66.58 | 0 | 4.12 Project Management | 66.73 | 0 | 4.13 Project Management | 47.09 | 0 | 4.14 Project Management | 35.77 | 0 | 4.15 Project Management | 45.03 | 0 | 4.16 Project Management | 29.43 | 0 |
| 4.2 Planning (Roadway) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.21 Planning (Concept/Rpt) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.22 Planning (GW & Envir) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.23 Planning (GW & Envir) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.24 Planning (GW & Envir) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.25 Planning (GW & Envir) | 65.08 | 0 | 4.26 Planning (GW & Envir) | 65.08 | 0 |
| 4.3 Design (Roadway) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.31 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.32 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.33 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.34 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.35 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 | 4.36 Design (GW & Envir) | 46.73 | 0 |
| 4.4 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.41 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.42 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.43 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.44 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.45 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 | 4.46 ROW Acquisition | 47.09 | 0 |
| 4.5 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.51 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.52 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.53 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.54 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.55 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 | 4.56 Const (Roadway) | 35.77 | 96 |
| 4.6 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.61 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.62 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.63 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.64 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.65 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 | 4.66 Project Closeout | 29.43 | 0 |

**Total Staff Cost:** $23,266.08

**TOTAL DIRECT LABOR:** $23,266.08

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (HOME OFFICE):** $4,520.64

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (FIELD OFFICE):** $18,745.44

**OVERHEAD (HOME):** 165.78% $7,494.32

**OVERHEAD (FIELD):** 123.48% $23,146.87

**SUBTOTAL:** $53,997.27

**OPERATING MARGIN:** 12.5% $6,738.41

**FCM:** $5

**EXPENSES:** 10.0% $2,326.61

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE:** $62,972.28

**SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS:** $130,745.45

**SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE):** $5,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - POPE ENVIRONMENTAL (MBE):** $3,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - OLH (MBE):** $-1,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - KATHERINE BECK (MBE):** $-20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - QUEST (MBE):** $7,257.60

**SUBCONSULTANT - THC RWSI:** $7,357.60

**SUBCONSULTANT - UZZELL (MBE):** $5,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - BH:** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - WV:** $-1,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - NOBLES:** $-1,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - WES:** $-1,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - CONTINGENCY:** $-1,000.00

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES:** $200,839.85

**GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:** $263,812

**LOA 4 Fee Proposal FY08.xls**

**Fee Sheet - Prime Attachment 3 5/6/2007  10:14 PM**

**MBE Percentage = 16.24%**

**FY07 LOA4 BUDGET**
### Estimate of Work Effort and Cost - The LPA Group, Inc.

**Project Name:** Blueprint 2000 GEC

**Consultant:** The LPA Group, Incorporated

**County:** CAPITAL CIRCLE NORTHWEST/SOUTHWEST (ORANGE AVE - US90)

**Consult No.:**

**FPN:**

**Date:**

**FAP No.:**

**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

#### Salary Related Costs (Home Office): $17,016.00

#### Salary Related Costs (Field Office): $30,623.04

#### Overhead (Home): 123.49% $37,813.33

#### Overhead (Field): 123.49% $37,813.33

#### Subtotal: $113,661.49

#### Operating Margin: 12.5% $14,207.69

#### Operating Margin: 12.5% $14,207.69

#### Subtotal Estimated Prime Fee: $132,633.09

#### SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS
- $149,750.38

#### SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE)
- $20,000.00

#### SUBCONSULTANT - POPE ENVIRONMENTAL (MBE)
- $20,000.00

#### SUBCONSULTANT - OLH (MBE)
- $14,630.40

#### SUBCONSULTANT - KATHERINE BECK (MBE)
- $34,999.20

#### SUBCONSULTANT - QUAINT (MBE)
- $1,047,894.40

#### SUBCONSULTANT - WWA (MBE)
- $1,000.00

#### SUBCONSULTANT - WWA (MBE)
- $1,000.00

#### SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES: $1,341,374.38

#### Grand Total Estimated Fee: $1,474,007

#### FY07 LOA5 Budget $1,474,007

---

### Task Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Engineer*</th>
<th>Project Manager*</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Public Info Specialist*</th>
<th>Project Engineer*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$67.33</td>
<td>$65.08</td>
<td>$46.73</td>
<td>$47.09</td>
<td>$36.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$45.03</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$41,175</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Staff Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Engineer*</th>
<th>Project Manager*</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Public Info Specialist*</th>
<th>Project Engineer*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Staff Hours:** 864

**Total Staff Cost:** $47,639.04

*Denotes Field Office Staff

---

**MBE Percentage:** 7.38%
Name of Project: Blueprint 2000 GEC

Consult Name: The LPA Group, Incorporated

County: SENSITIVE LANDS ACQUISTIONS

FPN No.: FAP No.: Estimator: Jerry Oshesky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Rate Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,232</td>
<td>67.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2A</td>
<td>Planning (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$3,434</td>
<td>65.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2A.1</td>
<td>Planning (Concept)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Design (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Right of Way Acq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Construction (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Staff Hours: 0 4 8 0 0 0 0 9 6 0 0 0 0 0 144

Total Staff Cost: $3,231.84 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $3,433.92 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00 $0.00

$6,665.76

TOTAL DIRECT LABOR $6,665.76

TOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE: $17,425.30

SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES: $37,673.57

*GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE: $55,099

MBE Percentage = 36.30%

LPA = LPA Group, Inc. (Prime)
JACOBS = Jacobs Civil, Inc. (Prime Sub)
MB = Moore Bass Consulting (Stormwater, Landscape)
RE = Rice Environmental, Inc. (Environmental)
OLH = OLH International (Program Controls)
KB = Katherine Beck Consulting Services, Inc. (Gov Relations)
THC = General Corporation of America (Public Involvement)
WV = Weigel-Veasey (ROW Appraisal)
WWA = Welch & Ward Architects (Architecture, Facilites)
WES = Williams Earth Sciences (Geotech)
# ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC

**Name of Project:** Blueprint 2000 GEC

**County:** CAPITAL CIRCLE SOUTHEAST (E2, WOODVILLE-TRAM)

**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated

**FPN:**

**FAP No.:**

**Consult. No.:**

**Date:**

**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>By Rate</th>
<th>Total Staff Hours</th>
<th>Total Staff Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.1 Project Management</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,232</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.2 Planning (Roadway)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.2 Planning (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.3 Design (Roadway)</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$24,990.72</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>$35,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.3 Design (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.4 Right of Way Acq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.5 Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7.6 Project Closeout</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Staff Hours:** 1,776

**Total Staff Cost:** $86,669.28

---

# TOTAL DIRECT LABOR

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (HOME OFFICE):** $38,552.64

**SALARY RELATED COSTS (FIELD OFFICE):** $48,116.64

**OVERHEAD (HOME):** 165.79% $63,912.57

**OVERHEAD (FIELD):** 123.48% $59,414.43

**SUBTOTAL:** $209,996.27

**OPERATING MARGIN:** 12.5% $26,249.53

**FCCM:** $ -

**EXPENSES (15% of Raw Labor):** 10.0% $8,666.93

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE:** $244,912.74

**SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS** $255,467.10

**SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE)** $30,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - POPE ENVIRONMENTAL (MBE)** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - OLH (MBE)** $248,716.80

**SUBCONSULTANT - KATHERINE BECK (MBE)** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - QUEST (MBE)** $29,836.80

**SUBCONSULTANT - THC RWS** $216,576.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - IZZELEZ (MBE)** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - BH** $20,000.00

**SUBCONSULTANT - WV** $ -

**SUBCONSULTANT - WWA (MBE)** $ -

**SUBCONSULTANT - WES** $ -

**CONTINGENCY** $ -

**SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES:** $840,596.70

**GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:** $1,085,509

**FY07 LOA BUDGET REQUEST** $1,085,509

---

*MBE Percentage = 32.11%*
## ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC

**Name of Project:** Blueprint 2000 GEC

**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated

**Consult. No.:**

**Date:**

**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

### Staff Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Total Staff Hours From &quot;Summary&quot;</th>
<th>Chief Engineer*</th>
<th>Senior Proj Engineer</th>
<th>Project Manager*</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Public Info Specialist*</th>
<th>Project Engineer*</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>Salary Rate</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost By Activity</th>
<th>Cost Per Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.1 Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67.33</td>
<td>$95.08</td>
<td>$46.73</td>
<td>$47.09</td>
<td>$35.77</td>
<td>$45.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0/5/0/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.2 Planning (Roadway)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.2 Planning (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.3 Design (Roadway)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$10,724</td>
<td>$44.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$10,724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.3 Design (GW &amp; Env)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.4 Right of Way Acq</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.5 Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8.6 Project Closeout</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Staff Hours

| Total Staff Hours | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 96 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |

### Total Staff Cost

| Total Staff Cost | $0.00 | $0.00 | $4,486.08 | $4,520.64 | $1,716.96 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $10,723.68 |

**Check = $10,723.68**

### TOTAL DIRECT LABOR

$10,723.68

**Salary Related Costs (Home Office):**

$4,520.64

**Salary Related Costs (Field Office):**

$6,203.04

**Overhead (Home):**

165.79%

$7,494.32

**Overhead (Field):**

123.48%

$7,559.51

**Subtotal:**

$25,877.51

**Operating Margin:**

12.5%

$3,234.69

**FCCM:**

-

**Expenses (15% of Raw Labor):**

10.0%

$1,072.37

**Subtotal Estimated Prime Fee:**

$30,184.57

**Subconsultant - Jacobs:**

$15,144.55

**Subconsultant - MBE (MBE):**

$5,000.00

**Subconsultant - Olh (MBE):**

-

**Subconsultant - Katherine Beck (MBE):**

-

**Subconsultant - Oui (MBE):**

$17,049.60

**Subconsultant - THG (ROW):**

$114,515.20

**Subconsultant - Uzzell (MBE):**

$15,000.00

**Subconsultant - BH:**

$15,000.00

**Subconsultant - WV:**

-

**Subconsultant - Wwa (MBE):**

-

**Subconsultant - WES:**

-

**Contingency:**

-

**Subtotal Estimated Subconsultant Fees:**

$181,709.35

**Grand Total Estimated Fee:**

$211,894

**FY07 LOA8 Budget Request:**

$211,894
## ESTIMATE OF WORK EFFORT AND COST - THE LPA GROUP, INC

**Name of Project:** Blueprint 2000 GEC  
**County:** CAPITAL CIRCLE SOUTHWEST (CRAWFORDVILLE-SR20)  
**Consult. Name:** The LPA Group, Incorporated  
**Consult. No.:** FPN  
**Date:**  
**Estimator:** Jerry Oshesky

### SH Salary Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.1 Project Management</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.2 Planning (Roadway)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$29,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.3 Design (Roadway)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.4 Right of Way Acq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.5 Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>9.6 Project Closeout</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Classification</th>
<th>Total Staff Hours From &quot;Summary&quot;</th>
<th>Total Staff Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,231.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Engineer*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$12,495.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Proj Engineer</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$4,520.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager*</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>$12,018.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Info Specialist*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Check = $32,266.56

**TOTAL DIRECT LABOR $32,266.56**

**TOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE: $421,098.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARY RELATED COSTS (HOME OFFICE)</td>
<td>$17,016.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY RELATED COSTS (FIELD OFFICE)</td>
<td>$15,250.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERHEAD (HOME)</td>
<td>105.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERHEAD (FIELD)</td>
<td>123.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$79,307.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING_MARGIN</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCCM</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES (15% of Raw Labor):</td>
<td>$3,226.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PRIME FEE:</td>
<td>$92,447.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - JACOBS</td>
<td>$193,769.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - MB (MBE)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - POPE ENVIRONMENTAL (MBE)</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - OLH (MBE)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - KATHERINE BECK (MBE)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - QUEST (MBE)</td>
<td>$42,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - THC RWS</td>
<td>$7,257.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - UZZELL (MBE)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - BH</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - WX</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - WWA (MBE)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCONSULTANT - WES</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SUBCONSULTANT FEES:</td>
<td>$328,650.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:</td>
<td>$421,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY07 LOA9 BUDGET REQUEST $421,098**

---

*MBE Percentage = 23.18%*
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Fred George Basin Acquisition Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1
SUBJECT/TITLE: Fred George Basin Acquisition Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1; Public Hearing

Date: June 4, 2007  Requested By: IA
Contact Person: Jim Davis  Type of Item: Discussion/Public Hearing

STATEMENT OF ISSUE: Hold a Public Hearing and conduct the “super majority vote” to move the Fred George Basin project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program.

A Public Hearing was advertised for 5:30 pm at the May 17, 2007, CAC Meeting, and for 4:30 pm at the June 4, 2007, Intergovernmental Agency Meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

- Acquisition of Fred George Sink and much of the undeveloped portions of the Fred George Closed Basin is included as Map 1 of the Blueprint Project Definitions Report. However, implementation of Map 1 is not a Tier 1 Blueprint project, and therefore it is not funded in the Adopted Blueprint Master Plan.
- The County Commission has directed Planning Department and County Grant staff to acquire several parcels (174 acres) in the Fred George Basin. During the discussions, Blueprint 2000 was one of the funding sources suggested for the project, either in total, or as grant match funding. County staff is currently preparing an FCT Grant Application which will be submitted May 9.
- On February 26, 2007, the Intergovernmental Agency voted to initiate the process to move the acquisition of the Fred George Basin properties from a Tier 2 Blueprint project to a Tier 1 Blueprint project.
- The motion approved by the Intergovernmental Agency Board in February stipulated that no more than $2.77 million in Blueprint funds be moved from the Lake Jackson Basin budget item to the Fred George project. The Blueprint funds are to be used for the FCT match for the acquisition of the subject properties.

OPTIONS:

Option 1: Following the Public Hearing, conduct the supermajority vote in order to move the Fred George Basin Acquisition project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. An affirmative supermajority vote by each Commission would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and direct staff to move $2,770,000 from the Lake
Jackson Basin budget item to the Fred George Basin project. The Blueprint funds are to be used for the acquisition of the subject properties.

**Option 2:** Board guidance.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1: Following the Public Hearing, conduct the supermajority vote in order to move the Fred George Basin Acquisition project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. An affirmative supermajority vote by each Commission would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and direct staff to move $2,770,000 from the Lake Jackson Basin budget item to the Fred George Basin project. The Blueprint funds are to be used for the acquisition of the subject properties.

**TCC Action:** The following was favorably received by the TCC (and County staff) at their meeting of February 8, 2007:

- Move $2.691M from the Lake Jackson Basin, to be used for the FCT match for the acquisition of the subject properties. If the County is unsuccessful with the FCT grant, then the balance would be funded from the county’s water quality funds, without review by the consultant. (This would be a one time exception to policy for the IA) or from other County resources. (“e.” above). (Note: The above was the Recommended Action at the time of the TCC meeting. The CAC, which met later in the day (February 8), requested the Action be revised to delete the reference to water quality funds without review by the consultant and the one time exception to policy.)

**CAC Action:** The following Action was adopted by the CAC at their meeting of February 8, 2007:

- Move $2.691M from the Lake Jackson Basin, to be used for the FCT match for the Acquisition of the subject properties. If the County is unsuccessful with the FCT grant, then the balance would be funded from other County resources. The CAC also recommends that the Lake Jackson projects remain Tier 1.
- May 17 action: The CAC approved Option 1 (Recommended Action) above.

**IMC Action:** To be provided.

**May 17, 2007 Public Hearing Comments:** There were no speakers at the Public Hearing.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Parcel Map
Proposed Properties to be Acquired

Legend
- Property Boundary
- Project Boundary
- Acquisition
  - Conservation Easement
  - Fee Simple

NOTE: This product has been compiled from the most accurate source data from Leon County and the City of Tallahassee. However, this product is for reference purposes only and is not to be construed as a legal document or survey/instrument.
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Mahan Drive Update-FDOT
Funding and Moving Project
from Tier 2 to Tier 1
STATEMENT OF ISSUE: Hold a Public Hearing and conduct the “super majority vote” to move the Mahan Drive project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program.

A Public Hearing was advertised for 5:30 pm at the May 17, 2007, CAC Meeting, and for 4:30 pm at the June 4, 2007, Intergovernmental Agency Meeting.

In order to provide FDOT a firm commitment of Blueprint 2000 funds, the Mahan Drive Project will need to be moved from a Tier 2 project to a Tier 1 project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

- This item informs the IA of the status of the proposed Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) funding for the Mahan Drive widening project from Dempsey Mayo Road to Interstate 10.
- The IA has stated that no action will be taken to advance this project from a Tier 2 to a Tier 1 Blueprint project until funding issues have been resolved with the FDOT.
- The purpose of this action is to commit the $10 million reserved in the Mater Plan to the Mahan project only if FDOT provides the balance needed for construction.
- The FY 2008-FY 2012 FDOT Work Program shows $6,260,000 boxed for Mahan Drive construction in FY 2012.
- The Adopted Blueprint 2000 Master Plan has $10,000,000 reserved for Mahan Drive construction. As Mahan Drive is a Tier 2 project, the IA would need to initiate the required process (CAC/TCC/IMC recommendations, two public hearings, IA super majority vote) to move Mahan Drive from a Tier 2 project to a Tier 1 project in order to allocate and commit the funding.
- An updated cost estimate was noted by the District:

  Construction: $31.1 M
  Construction Engineering Inspection: $4.7 M
  Total: $35.8 M (Present Day Cost)
  $40.0 M (inflated to the anticipated construction letting date of mid 2008)
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Agenda Item
Item Title: Mahan Drive Update - FDOT Funding and Moving Project from Tier 2 to Tier 1; Public Hearing
Meeting Date: June 4, 2007
Page 2

- Key dates:
  - 60% design plans: February 2007
  - 90% design plans: July 2007
  - 100% design plans: January 2008
  - Final plans: March 2008
- Construction: Five to six months for advertising, letting and award – August 2008

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

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Following the Public Hearing, conduct the supermajority vote in order to move the Mahan Drive project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. An affirmative supermajority vote by each Commission would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and officially commit and appropriate the $10,000,000 reserved for Mahan Drive to the project only to be used if FDOT provides the balance needed for construction; and if that financial commitment is not made the project would move back to Tier 2.

TCC Action: The TCC had no comments.

CAC Action: The CAC approved Option 1 (above) with the addition noted below in bold: “Following the Public Hearing, conduct the supermajority vote in order to move the Mahan Drive project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint Program. An affirmative supermajority vote by each Commission would move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and officially commit the $10,000,000 reserved for Mahan Drive to the project only to be used if FDOT provides the balance needed for construction; and if that financial commitment is not made the project would move back to Tier 2”.

IMC Action: To be provided.

May 17, 2007, Public Hearing Comments: There were no speakers at the Public Hearing.

ATTACHMENTS:
None.