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Subject/Title: Capital Circle NW/SW Erosion Control Risk Reduction Techniques

Date: September 15, 2008
Contact Person: Jim Davis/Latesa Turner
Requested By: Blueprint 2000
Type of Item: Information

Statement of Issue:
The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the Intergovernmental Agency of the erosion and sedimentation control measures that are being developed for the Capital Circle NW/SW project.

Supplemental Information:
The IA has clearly communicated to staff that the erosion and sedimentation control implemented on the Capital Circle NW/SW project is to be the best that this community has seen. As such, this agenda item details the techniques and products that have been incorporated into the project by the design consultant, H.W. Lochner. Coordination with Leon County continues.

Recommended Action:
No action required, presented as information only.

Attachments:
Attachment 1: Erosion Control Plan Brochure
Capital Circle NW/SW
Orange Avenue to Tennessee Street

erosion control plan
Requirements and measures being incorporated into the plans to minimize risks include:

1. Designating where the contractor can and cannot work
2. Limiting the duration of exposure and restricting the dates for construction activities with the highest potential to generate erosion and sedimentation in sensitive areas
3. Designating where the contractor can and cannot park equipment or stockpile materials
4. Offering incentives for the contractor & CEI to complete work quickly in sensitive areas as well as disincentives (fines) for any failures
5. Working with FDOT and Leon County to develop road closures and detours that will reduce construction time

Additional Precautions:

1. Redundant Layers of Protection
2. Certified Inspector on Site
3. Emergency Plan and Procedures
4. Continuous Monitoring
5. Best Management Practices
6. New Technology

“This will be the most comprehensive erosion control / disturbance avoidance plan that Lochner will ever develop!”

- Jim Davis
High potential erosion and sedimentation work activities in highly sensitive areas will be limited to the non-hurricane season and an incentive for early completion will be offered.

This will help reduce the chance of a sediment-laden discharge to receiving waters.
Using multiple layers of defense will help ensure protection for nearby Cascade Lake and Gum Swamp.

This picture shows our initial protection of Silt Fence with a second layer of Wattles/Fiber Logs behind it.
By using Sod instead of seeding, the germination period is eliminated and the ground is protected from runoff sooner.

In addition to permanent sodding, temporary sodding will be used between phases in sensitive areas.
Hydromulch can be quickly installed over a large area.

Hydromulching decreases runoff from areas that must be disturbed numerous times.
Erosion Control Blankets provide protective ground cover on slopes and in channels while permanent vegetation is being established.

Erosion Blankets have many benefits including seed protection, moisture retention, slope protection, and reduced water velocity.
Ditch Bottom Inlets will be protected with reusable high density plastic frames with a filter cover.

These install easily and can be moved and reused throughout the project.
Roadway Inlet Protection

Used for Roadway Inlets, this will prevent sediment from entering the storm sewers.

Used for “High Erosion” areas, these can also be easily rinsed and reused.
Properly installed and continuously inspected, Silt Fence will be our first layer of defense for over land flows.

The Silt Fence will be placed at the limits of construction.
This will be the second line of defense. The Wattles, sometimes referred to as Fiber Logs, are filled with mulch.

These can be placed at the right-of-way without clearing the trees and much of the brush. The Fiber Logs can be woven through the trees and brush.
Turbidity Barriers will be used at Cascade Lake, Gum Creek and Gum Swamp. This, again, will be a redundant system.

The first line of defense will be Silt Fence, Wattles, or Sheet Piling. The Turbidity Barriers will be the second or third line of defense.
We are using Sheet Piling within the Gum Swamp area to limit the footprint and reduce impacts. Turbidity Barriers will act as a secondary line of defense.
Treating the water through an innovative technology means cleaner water for wildlife and recreation.
Chitosan Enhanced Sand Filtration
Advanced Stormwater Treatment

In many of these cases, conventional source controls and Best Management Practices have simply not been able to reduce the turbidity and contaminants to discharge and receiving water compliance levels. Extremely fine particles, typically silts and clays, can stay in suspension for decades without settling due to their relative size and ionic charge. The primary advanced treatment method in the market today is chitosan enhanced sand filtration (CESF).

The chitosan chemical, or flocculant, acts on an ionic level to draw soil particles together and create a larger, heavier particle, or floc. The floc can then be removed through gravity settling or filtration.

CESF is a versatile and effective treatment option for reducing extremely high turbidities to below benchmark standards at high flow rates. Simply put, this technology can quickly remove suspended particles from stormwater to manage rain events that cause significant water quality issues.

Chitosan is made from recycled crustacean exoskeletons from the shellfish industry. Chitosan will biodegrade in the environment over periods of weeks and months, rather than years.
Capital Circle SW PD&E Study – Update on Alignments, Evaluations and Upcoming Alternatives Public Meeting
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) on the status of the study’s evaluations, and to inform the IA that an Alternatives Public Meeting has been scheduled for November 13, 2008. The intent of the Alternatives Public Meeting is to present the results of the engineering and environmental evaluations conducted to date and to receive input from the public on each of the alternative alignments currently under study. The evaluation criteria and weightings previously approved by the IA will be applied to the alignments following the Alternatives Public Meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Capital Circle Southwest Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study was initiated in August 2006. Since that time, considerable public involvement has occurred, including six district forums, a two-day Concepts Charette, and several other meetings and workshops, to allow public input into the identification of the alignment corridors for further evaluation and development (see listing of CCSW PD&E Study Public Meetings below). A Community Representatives group consisting of 13 citizens representing the community and other special interests in the area was formed and has met over the course of the study.

CCSW PD&E Study Opportunities for Public Input/Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD&amp;E Initiated</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Forums</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Town Hall Meeting</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts Charette</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternatives Public Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>November 13, 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recommendation to IA</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative Public Meeting</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the objectives identified by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) PD&E process, and specific issues identified during the public involvement process, each of the alignment corridors were developed into specific
alternative alignments and analyzed (See Attachment 1 for the alignments under study). Currently, the project is also being reviewed by State and Federal agencies, as part of the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process, to assess the impacts associated with the potential alignments. The results from the Consultant’s evaluations have been summarized (See Attachment 2) and will be presented at the November 13 Alternatives Public Meeting. Because of the sensitivity of this project, the attached evaluation is significantly more detailed than what is normally required for a PD&E study. For comparison, a standard evaluation summary is provided (See Attachment 3).

**Alternative Alignments**
The study area alignments are divided into four segments. Within each of these segments, alternative alignments have been developed based on the corridor alignments identified from the Concepts Charette (See Attachment 1).

Following the upcoming Alternatives Public Meeting, the next step will be to evaluate the alternatives within each segment to determine the most favorable segment alternative. The most favorable alternatives from segment 1, segment 3 and segment 4 will be combined; and the most favorable alternatives from segment 1 and segment 2 will be combined.

The combined Existing Alignment Alternative, the combined Realignment Alternative and the “No-Build” Alternative will be developed further and considered for final evaluation and selection of the Preferred Alternative. At that time, the 13 evaluation criteria and associated weightings - approved by the IA on September 17, 2007 - will be applied.

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

**ATTACHMENTS:**
Attachment 1: Graphic showing the Alternative Alignments
Attachment 2: Draft Evaluation Summaries for the Alternative Alignments
Attachment 3: Sample Standard Evaluation Prepared for Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Impacts</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Increased congestion limits the potential for economic development in the area and costs motorists through time delays and fuel consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Mobility</td>
<td>No improvements to access and increased congestion may limit mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Housing</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Open Space/Greenways</td>
<td>No physical or natural resource impacts to existing or proposed greenways, preserves U.S. forest lands. Does not provide the opportunity for enhancements to the proposed greenway systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Community</td>
<td>Potential future access impacts to existing or proposed businesses due to traffic congestion. No business relocations required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Does not provide improved pedestrian or bicycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Highways</td>
<td>Existing alignment is part of the Big Bend Scenic Byway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Potential future affects due to congestion and increased response time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
<td>Does not provide opportunity to enhance the existing evacuation route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Impacts</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way Cost</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Business Relocations</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Residential Relocations</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Railroads</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations (Level Of Service)</td>
<td>Traffic operations would be strained as demand approaches and exceeds capacity. (LOS F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Would likely be diminished as a result of increased congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Does not provide improved treatment of stormwater run-off, no retrofitting of the existing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Historical Resource Impacts</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Physical Impacts</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Florida Waters</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Fish Habitat</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmlands</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality (Surface Water Protection)</td>
<td>No additional impact, direct stormwater discharges that currently occur will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild and Scenic Revers</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f)</td>
<td>No effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion may result in negative impacts to air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion may result in negative impacts to air quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social and Economic Impacts

**Economic Development**
- Provides improved access to properties along the existing corridor.
- Provides improved access and mobility to those in the area of CSSW between Springfield Road and Crawfordville Road. Fewer access points and major intersections along the existing roadway is expected to decrease congestion and lead to an increase in the level of mobility, which compares with the no build alternative. Fewer intersections and conflict points along the corridor allow for safer movement of heavy vehicles.

**Mixed Housing**
- Provides improved access to properties along existing corridor, allowing for mixed housing.

**Residential Open Space/Greensways**
- Existing alignment currently extends between two neighborhoods. Total relocations are approximately 15% of adjacent neighborhoods
- Potential for connectivity to the St. Matthew Trail.

**Business Community**
- Provides improved access to businesses in the area. May impact or require the relocation of some existing business along the corridor.

**Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities**
- Provides pedestrian and bicycle paths within the right-of-way.

**Scenic Highways**
- No direct involvement - provides connection to the Big Bend Scenic Byway at Springfield Road.

**Emergency Management**
- Provides increased roadway capacity and may improve response times.

**Evacuation**
- Potential reduced evacuation time compared to no build.

**School**
- No involvement.

**Public Comments**
- To be included following the Alternatives Meeting.

### Engineering Impacts

#### Construction
- New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic using existing roadway in initial phases. Would result in an increase of four lanes of improved area.
- Widening/Milling/Resurfacing. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. May require temporary pavement as part of phasing of construction. Would result in an increase of four lanes of improved area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Road Right-of-Way
- Acreage: 22.8 million.
- Construction Cost: $16.7 million. $16.7 million. $16.3 million.
- Design and CEI Cost: $4.1 million. $4.2 million.
- Road Right-of-Way Cost: $4.2 million. $4.2 million. $4.1 million.

#### Natural and Physical Impacts

**Outstanding Florida Waters**
- Four (4) potential sites - 1 medium risk, 3 low risk.
- Eight (8) potential sites - 2 medium risk, 6 low risk.

**Essential Fish Habitat**
- No involvement.

**Farms**
- No involvement.

**Floodplain**
- No involvement.

**Floodplain Mitigation**
- No involvement.
- $100,000

**Water Quality (Surface Water Protection)**
- 0.18 acres of Munson Slough for bridge construction. Regional pond opportunities can be developed but would be separate from the roadway pond system.
- 0.71 acres of Munson Slough for bridge construction. Regional pond opportunities can be developed but would be separate from the roadway pond system.
- 0.15 acres of Munson Slough for bridge construction. Regional pond opportunities can be developed but would be separate from the roadway pond system.

**Wild and Scenic Rivers**
- No involvement.

**Wildlife and Habitat**
- 13.1 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 1.1 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; no additional habitat fragmentation effects; low likelihood of listed species occurrence.
- 15.2 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 0.4 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; no additional habitat fragmentation effects; low likelihood of listed species occurrence.
- 14 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 0.7 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; no additional habitat fragmentation effects; low likelihood of listed species occurrence.

**Wetlands**
- No involvement.
- 0.89 acres of impact to low quality wetlands.
- 0.35 acres of impact to low quality wetlands.
- 0.16 acres of impact to low quality wetlands.

**Wildlife Mitigation**
- $26,000
- No involvement.

**Noise (prior to mitigation)**
- Thirteen (13) receptors within the 65 dba or above zone. Zero (0) receptors with a +15 dba increase in noise level.
- Ten (10) receptors within the 65 dba or above zone. Zero (0) receptors with a +15 dba increase in noise level.

**Air**
- Anticipate no effect on air quality. Capacity improvements should minimize congestion; thus, reducing potential air quality impacts.

### Cost
- Total Cost: $43.9 million. $49.3 million. $55.8 million.
### Social and Economic Impacts

#### Economic Development
- Provides improved access to the properties along the existing corridor, particularly the Airport and nearby industrial parks, allowing for continued economic growth.
- Improves access and mobility for the Airport and nearby businesses. Fewer access points and intersections along the existing roadway are expected to provide a high level of mobility. Fewer intersections and conflicts along the corridor allow for easier movement of heavy vehicles.

#### Access and Mobility
- Provides improved access to properties along the existing corridor, allowing for more development of mixed housing. This would result in an increase of four (4) acres of impact to mixed housing.

### Habitat Impacts

#### Wetland Mitigation
- No involvement.

#### Wetlands
- No involvement.

#### Wild and Scenic Rivers
- No involvement.

#### Wild and Scenic Rivers
- No involvement.

#### Natural and Historical Resources Impact

#### Natural Features
- No involvement.

#### Historical Features
- No involvement.

### Engineering Impacts

#### Construction
- New Construction: Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic on existing roadway during initial phases. Would result in an increase of four (4) acres of impact to mixed housing.

#### Design and CEI Cost
- $46.6 million.

#### Road Right-of-Way Cost (Assumes United States Forest Service Easement)
- $60.5 million.

#### Land Use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of Business Relocations
- 1

#### Traffic Operations (Level Of Service)
- Number of Business Relocations: 1
- Number of Parcels: 53

#### Safety
- Improved access to the properties along the existing corridor, particularly the Airport and nearby industrial parks, allowing for continued economic growth.

### Unimpacted Receptors

#### Air
- Anticipates no effect on air quality. Capacity improvements should eliminate congestion, thus reducing potential air impacts.

### Cost
- Total Cost: $322.3 million.
### Social and Economic Impacts

#### Economic Development
- Provides access to undeveloped and developing properties near Lake Bradford Road and Orange Avenue.

#### Access and Mobility
- Potentially will improve access to Innovation Park and Florida State University South Campus and will improve mobility to points south and east of Orange Avenue.

#### Mixed Housing
- Provides access to residential and undeveloped properties allowing for the development of mixed housing.

#### Recreational/Open Space/Greensways
- Proposed corridor crosses two proposed greensways and provides opportunity for enhancements along these greensways. No impact to Apalachicola State Forest or other parks and recreational facilities in the study area.

### Residential Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed corridor</th>
<th>Right of Way Cost</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$49.6 million</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>$44.8 million</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$47.8 million</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Business Community
- Alignments impact the fringe of Lake Bradford Estates. Approximately 30% of the overall community is directly affected by the roadway and pond.
- Alignments impact the fringe of Lake Bradford Estates. Approximately 50% of the overall community is directly affected by the roadway and pond.

### Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities
- Provides pedestrian and bicycle paths within the right-of-way.
- Impacts proposed on existing industrial developments.

### Environmental Impacts

#### Noise (prior to mitigation)
- Eight (8) receptors within the 65 dba or above zone. Eleven (11) receptors with a +15 dba increase in noise level.

#### Traffic Operations (Level of Service)
- Provides increased roadway capacity and may improve evacuation response times in the area.
- Potential reduced evacuation time compared to no build.

#### School
- No involvement.

#### Public Comments
- To be included following the Alternatives Meeting.

### Engineering Impacts

#### Traffic Operations (Level Of Service)
- Provides pedestrian and bicycle paths within the right-of-way.
- Impacts proposed on existing industrial developments.

### Cultural and Historical Resource Impacts

#### Historical Sites
- No involvement.

#### Archaeological Sites
- Three (3) previously recorded archaeological sites in vicinity. Two (2) sites (historic railroad tram and Florida State Golf Course) have been determined potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). One (1) site (Black Swamp South) has been determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Cultural Resources Assessment Survey will be conducted following alternative selection.

### Natural and Physical Impacts

#### Natural
- No involvement.

#### Physical
- Four (4) potential sites: 1 medium risk, 3 low risk.

#### Essential Fish Habitat
- No involvement.

#### Fertilizer
- No involvement.

#### Floodplain Mitigation
- No additional 0.64 acre.

#### Water Quality (Surface Water Protection)
- No additional 8.2 acre.

#### Wild and Scenic Rivers
- No involvement.

#### Wildlife and Habitat
- 34.9 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 4.8 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; habitat fragmentation effects likely; likelihood of listed species occurrence is higher than other alternatives.

### Utilities and Railroads
- Provides access to undeveloped and developing properties near Lake Bradford Road and Orange Avenue.

### Capital Circle South West Analysis Summary Report (Draft)

#### Capital Circle South West Analysis Summary Report (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$49.6 million</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>$44.8 million</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$47.8 million</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Emergency Management
- Emergency Management
- To be included following the Alternatives Meeting.

#### Social and Economic Impacts
- Social and Economic Impacts
- No involvement.
### Realignment Alternatives

#### Segment 3c: Lake Bradford Estates West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Impacts</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Provides improved access to underdeveloped and developing properties near Lake Bradford Road and Orange Avenue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Mobility</td>
<td>Potentially will improve access to Innovation Park and Florida State University's Southwest Campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Provides access to residential and undeveloped properties allowing for the development of mixed housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Open Space/Greenways</td>
<td>Proposed corridor crosses two proposed greenways and provides opportunity for enhancements along these greenways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Alignment impacts the fringe of Paradise Cove. Approximately 5% of the overall community is directly affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Community</td>
<td>Impacts proposed or existing industrial developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Provides pedestrian and bicycle paths within the right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Highways</td>
<td>Connects to the Big Bend Scenic Byway on the south end. The realignment may be re-designated as the Scenic Byway should a realignment option be chosen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Provides increased roadway capacity and may improve emergency response times in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
<td>Potential reduced evacuation time compared to no-build.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>No involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments</td>
<td>To be included following the Alternatives Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Engineering Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes of impervious area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraction Cost (range based on variations in design)</td>
<td>$20.2 million - $38.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and CEI Cost</td>
<td>$5.1 million - $10.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way Cost</td>
<td>$21.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of Business Relocations

| No. of Parcels | 163 |

#### Utilities and Railroads

| Potential impact to buried telephone lines, water lines, sanitary sewer and overhead electric. No major utility impacts to transmission lines are anticipated. |

#### Traffic Operations (Level of Service)

| Opportunities exist to provide enhanced or regional stormwater facilities. |
| Increased capacity in the area and improved access will likely result in improved safety. |

### Cultural and Historical Resource Impacts

#### Historical Sites

| No involvement. |

#### Archaeological Sites

| Two (2) previously recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity (Historic railroad track and Black Swamp South). One (1) site (historic railroad track) has been determined potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). One (1) site (Black Swamp South) has been determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Cultural Resources Assessment Survey will be conducted following alternative selection. |

#### Natural and Physical Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlining Florida Waters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Fish Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality (Surface Water Protection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (prior to mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Natural and Physical Impacts

#### Projected Hydrologic Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Modifications to Existing Stormwater Infrastructure

- **South**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

- **North**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

#### Changes to Existing Road Network

- **South**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

- **North**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

### Cultural and Historic Resources Impacts

#### Material Sites

No involvement.

#### Archaeological Sites

No involvement. Archaeological sites and cultural resources in vicinity are non-existent.

#### Natural and Physical Impacts

#### Projected Hydrologic Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Modifications to Existing Stormwater Infrastructure

- **South**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

- **North**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

#### Changes to Existing Road Network

- **South**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

- **North**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

### Cultural and Historic Resources Impacts

#### Material Sites

No involvement.

#### Archaeological Sites

No involvement. Archaeological sites and cultural resources in vicinity are non-existent.

#### Natural and Physical Impacts

#### Projected Hydrologic Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Modifications to Existing Stormwater Infrastructure

- **South**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

- **North**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

#### Changes to Existing Road Network

- **South**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

- **North**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

### Cultural and Historic Resources Impacts

#### Material Sites

No involvement.

#### Archaeological Sites

No involvement. Archaeological sites and cultural resources in vicinity are non-existent.

#### Natural and Physical Impacts

#### Projected Hydrologic Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Modifications to Existing Stormwater Infrastructure

- **South**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

- **North**
  - New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. Would result in an increase of six lanes in impervious area. Provides improved access to developing properties and provides opportunities for mixed housing.
  - No impact. Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields.

#### Changes to Existing Road Network

- **South**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)

- **North**
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
  - Traffic operations will be changed at Lake Bradford and Orange Avenue to accommodate Capital Circle. Operations will also be changed at Orange Avenue and existing Capital Circle. (LOS-B/C)
### Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
<th>Unimproved</th>
<th>Unimproved</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Value</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social and Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 4 (Unimproved)</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Rights of Way</td>
<td>14.5 miles (range based on variations in design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Value</td>
<td>$18.6 million - $23.1 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural Resource Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resource Impact</th>
<th>Unimproved</th>
<th>Unimproved</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Fragmentation</td>
<td>14.7 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 3.3 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; moderate habitat fragmentation effects; moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>0.96 acres of impact to surface waters. Opportunities exist to provide enhanced or regional stormwater facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0.06 acres of impact to surface waters. Opportunities exist to provide enhanced or regional stormwater facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Capital Circle Southwest Analysis Summary Report (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>4a1 South</th>
<th>4a1 North</th>
<th>4a1 Center</th>
<th>4b1 South</th>
<th>4b1 North</th>
<th>4b1 Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Parcels</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>33.7 acres</td>
<td>3.2 acres</td>
<td>0.77 acres</td>
<td>8.2 acres</td>
<td>3.0 acres</td>
<td>0.84 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Circle Southwest Analysis Summary Report (Draft)

- **Road Rights of Way:** 14.5 miles (range based on variations in design).
- **Projected Land Value:** $18.6 million - $23.1 million.
- **Habitat Fragmentation:** 14.7 acres of direct impact to native upland habitats; 3.3 acres of direct impact to surface water or wetland habitats; moderate habitat fragmentation effects; moderate likelihood of listed species occurrence.
- **Water Quality:** 0.96 acres of impact to surface waters. Opportunities exist to provide enhanced or regional stormwater facilities.
- **Wetlands:** 0.06 acres of impact to surface waters. Opportunities exist to provide enhanced or regional stormwater facilities.

### Tables

- **Construction:**
  - No construction.
  - Construction.
- **Design and CEI Cost:**
  - $6.7 million - $11.2 million.
- **Construction Cost (range based on variations in design):**
  - $6.7 million - $11.2 million.

### Notes

- No involvement.
- Some involvement.
- No involvement - alignments shifted to avoid impacts to historic cemetery.

### Summary

- **No construction** and **no involvement** detailed to avoid impacts to historic cemetery.
- **No involvement**.
- **Some involvement**.
- **No involvement - alignments shifted to avoid impacts to historic cemetery.**

### Visuals

- **Road Rights of Way:** 14.5 miles (range based on variations in design).
- **Projected Land Value:** $18.6 million - $23.1 million.
Realignment Alternatives
Segment 4c (ties to Segment 3c)

Economic Development
Provides improved access to Innovation Park, Florida State University’s Southwest Campus, and the Tallahassee Museum. However, it may have negative impacts to the businesses along Orange Avenue because of required relocations.

Access and Mobility
Provides improved access and mobility for those in the area of Orange Avenue and Tyson Road. Provides improved bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to destinations in the area.

Mixed Housing
Provides improved access to undeveloped properties will provide the opportunity for mixed housing.

Recreational/Open Space/Greenways
Provides improved access to Florida State University Intramural Fields, the Tallahassee Museum, and a portion of the National Forest adjacent to Orange Avenue.

Residential Neighborhoods
Alignment impacts the edge of a cluster of homes in the Eisenhower area. Approximately 10% of the overall community is directly affected.

Business Community
Provides improved access to businesses along the existing Capitol Circle Southwest. Relocates one church along Orange Avenue.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities
Provides pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the right-of-way. Could provide an enhanced link between the Florida State University recreation facilities located north and south of Orange Avenue.

Scenic Highways
Connects to the Big Bend Scenic Byway on the north end. The realignment could be re-designated as the Scenic Byway.

Emergency Management
Provides increased roadway capacity and may improve emergency response times in the area.

School
No direct impacts to schools. Potentially provides improved pedestrian access to schools located in proximity to the study area in Mabry/Seminole Manor.

Public Comments
To be included following the Alternatives Meeting.

Engineering Impacts

Construction
Widening/New Construction. Typical construction sequence with phased construction to allow for maintenance of traffic. May require temporary pavement as part of phasing of construction. Would result in an increase of front lanes of impervious area.

Design and CEI Cost
$7.0 million - $11.0 million.

Road Right-of-Way Cost
$27.8 million - $43.8 million.

Financial Impacts

Cost
Total Cost
$53.2 million - $73.2 million.

Utilities and Railroads
Potential impact to buried telephone lines, water lines, sanitary sewer and overhead electric. No major utility impacts to transmission lines are anticipated.

Traffic Operations (Level Of Service)
The increase in capacity and controlled access will likely improve the safety for the travelling public in the area.

Sustainable Management
Opportunities for regional and enhanced treatment of stormwater.

Cultural/Historical Resource Impacts

Historical Sites
No involvement.

Archaeological Sites
Seven (7) sites in the vicinity. One (1) site determined potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Remaining sites determined ineligible or have not been evaluated by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Cultural Resources Assessment Survey (CRAS) will be conducted following alternative selection.

Natural and Physical Impacts

Outstanding Florida Waters
No involvement.

Contamination
One (1) medium risk site.

Essential Fish Habitat
No involvement.

Floodplains
No involvement.

Sediment Mitigation
6.2 acres of impact to 100-year floodplain.

Wetland Mitigation
0.81 acres of impact to moderate quality wetlands.

Wildlife Mitigation
$500,000

4(f) Florida State University’s Golf Course is a 4(f) property, however, alternatives will have no impact.

Noise (prior to mitigation)
Twenty-eight (28) receptors within the 65 dba or above zone. Zero (0) receptors with a +15 dba increase in noise level.

Air
Anticipate no effect on air quality. Capacity improvements should minimize congestion; thus, reducing potential air quality impacts.

Cost
Total Cost
$53.2 million - $73.2 million.
**TABLE 8.1 - Analysis of Alternative Alignments for Capital Circle NW/SW (SR 263)**

South of Orange Avenue to South of Tennessee Street (US 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Alignment</th>
<th>Commercial (a)</th>
<th>Residential (b)</th>
<th>Public/Institutional (c)</th>
<th>Endangered Species (d)</th>
<th>Contamination Sites (e)</th>
<th>Cultural Resource Sites (f)</th>
<th>Floodplains (acres) (g)</th>
<th>Wetlands (acres) (h)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Cost (i)</th>
<th>Construction Cost (SR 283 and SR 263) (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$34.8 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$33.8 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$31.9 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>$30.9 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$30.8 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #3 (Preferred)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$30.2 mil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Used Right-of-Way cost for center alternative along SR 20 (see Table 8.2). Includes costs for stormwater ponds and mitigation site.
(b) Assumed 100-foot bridge at Gum Creek. Includes cost to construct roadway, stormwater ponds and mitigation site, MOT, mobilization, and utility relocation.
(c) The cost of the mitigation site was assumed to be $2.5 million.
(d) Does not include impacts by proposed stormwater ponds.
(e) Potential presence of the Eastern Indigo Snake.
(f) Number of relocations and parcels do not include pond and mitigation sites.

**TABLE 8.2 - Analysis of Alternative Alignments for Blountstown Highway (SR 20)**

West of Capital Circle Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right-of-Way Configuration</th>
<th>Alternate Alignment</th>
<th>Commercial (a)</th>
<th>Residential (b)</th>
<th>Public/Institutional (c)</th>
<th>Endangered Species (d)</th>
<th>Contamination Sites (e)</th>
<th>Cultural Resource Sites (f)</th>
<th>Floodplains (acres) (g)</th>
<th>Wetlands (acres) (h)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way Cost (i)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.14 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.53 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1.38 mil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Affected parcel.
(b) Relocate - Encroachment upon any structure or where greater than 50% of available commercial parking is required.
(c) Affected - Encroachment upon a property where less than 50% of available parking and no part of a structure is required.

Definitions:
- Commercial - Privately owned property and/or improvements zoned for business use.
- Residential - Privately owned property and/or improvements zoned for single family or multi-family dwellings.
- Public/Institutional - Established organizations or foundations dedicated to public service: public works, churches, schools, etc.
- Relocate - Encroachment upon any structure or where greater than 50% of available commercial parking is required.
- Affected - Encroachment upon a property where less than 50% of available parking and no part of a structure is required.
# 3

Capital Circle NW
Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1
Landscaping/Park
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: September 15, 2008</th>
<th>Requested By: Jim Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: David Snyder</td>
<td>Type of Item: Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Blueprint 2000 is in the process of securing permits from COT Growth Management and the FDOT for this landscaping and park amenities project.

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

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

Action by TCC and CAC: Presented as information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None.
# 4

Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item updates the Board on the efforts underway to control the Channeled Apple Snails at the Regional Stormwater Pond.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Blueprint 2000 (BP2K) has continued making progress with the Snail Eradication Program at the 15.3 acre regional stormwater management pond on West Tennessee Street constructed for the Capital Circle NW Project. The Channeled Apple Snails (Pomacea canaliculata), which were destroying the aquatic plantings installed within the pond, have been significantly reduced since this program began in March 2008. The results are allowing the aquatic plantings to recover and actually flourish again.

In an effort to determine how this issue has affected other agencies in similar ponds, BP2K has met with other agencies, including FDOT, Leon County, the City of Tallahassee, FDEP, the FWC and the NWFWMD to share the results of the program. Since all of these agencies are involved in the planning/developing, design, permitting, construction and maintenance of ponds for future projects, the goal is to try and compile all resources and examine alternate solutions.

However, this program has only served as a temporary method, as the snails will likely return and continue to threaten the remaining aquatic plantings. **The BP2K funding for this program is depleted and the program will end shortly. BP2K has conveyed the need to continue this research and funding support to these other agencies, and a meeting to review recent progress on this is forthcoming.**

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested; for information only.

Action by TCC and CAC: Provided for information only.

ATTACHMENTS:
A Status Report provided by McGlynn Laboratories is attached, showing the results and progress of these efforts.
Fifth Update, 04/03/08 – 08/20/08

**Control of Invasive Exotic Island Apple Snails (Pomacea insularum), Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, FL., by McGlynn Laboratories Inc and Van Dyke Environmental. Funded by Blueprint 2000.**

**Executive Summary:**

When this project began in March 2008, the snails had already consumed approximately 75% of the vegetation planted in the pond ($425,000 worth of plants). During the next four months we removed over 7,500 pounds of the live adult Island Apple Snails from the 15 acre Regional Stormwater Facility. This is a remarkable number of snails. The snails were eating the roots of the plants. This was causing the plants to wilt and die. We used baited sling traps and rakes to capture large numbers of snails. By May 2008, the plants began to perk up, and began to grow and reproduce. We switched from sling traps to drop traps as the adult snail population dwindled, perfecting a trap from which the snails could not escape. Egg production continued to be massive and it is necessary to harvest the egg clusters weekly.

This Snail Control Project has had success: we stabilized the remaining aquatic plant population; we removed approximately 99% of the adult snails; we harvested eggs weekly to prevent re-infestation; and we developed traps that capture snails. The surviving aquatic plants are growing and reproducing. Other aquatic plants are colonizing the littoral zone. At this point the population of snails in the pond is under control.

If the project were to stop now, the surviving plants would definitely make it through the winter. By early spring the remaining Island Apple Snails would lay eggs. These young snails would mature by late summer. The remaining plants in the pond would not survive the summer and would start to disappear in June 2009.

To maintain what has accomplished in the Regional Stormwater Facility #1

1) 20 Maintenance Traps need to be deployed in the pond
   a. cost, $1000
   b. personnel, Jess Van Dyke and Lee Ingram
2) The traps need to be baited and emptied every two weeks
   a. cost, 12 x $150 = $1800
   b. personnel, Jess Van Dyke and Sean McGlynn
3) The pond needs to be cleaned of eggs weekly
a. cost, 28 x $100 = $2800  
b. personnel, Franklin Roosevelt and Sean McGlynn

Note: It appears that we have funding for items #1 and #2 but no funding for item #3. The Bureau of Invasive Plant control, now at FWC, only wants to fund testing the traps, and will not fund the labor necessary to eliminate new young while we eliminate the adults.

**Background Information:**

The littoral shelf of the Regional Stormwater Facility #1 in Leon County was planted with approximately $565,000 worth of aquatic plants. This 15-acre pond was designed with a long Sheet Pile Wall to funnel the stormwater through a planted marsh system of aquatic plants, designed to cleanse stormwater before discharge. This pond was also designed to become a public park. Of the original planting, approximately 75% of the plants have disappeared. Of the original species planted Soft Rush (142,124 planted) and Duck Potato (51,227 planted) have survived. All of the Arrowhead (22,673 planted) and Pickerel Weed (27,468 planted) have vanished. Herbivorous invasive exotic island apple snails appeared in the pond after construction and consumed these plants.

A hand harvesting effort by the contractor, M-Inc, in the fall of 2007, removed a large number of adult Island Apple Snails. A population of juvenile snails survived, which were too small to harvest, and re-colonized the pond before the end of the summer. This resulted in an odd situation where there was basically one size class of snails in the pond (approximately 1.2 cm in diameter). Over the winter few snails were observed in the pond as the snails were estivating in the sediments. Blueprint 2000 contracted with Van Dyke Environmental and McGlynn Laboratories Inc, in the spring of 2008 to control the snail population. Using a combination of trapping, baiting and predator release (Redear Sunfish or Shell Crackers, stocked by Michael Hill, FFWCC) the snail population has been brought under control. There has been no subsequent loss of plants in the pond to date. The plant population has stabilized and the surviving plants are growing and reproducing. In addition, the entire shoreline has been colonized by Smartweed, through natural recruitment.

This population of Island Apple Snails in the Regional Stormwater Facility #1 has been greatly reduced. Aquatic plants in the pond are growing faster than the rate of herbivory. The remnant plants are reproducing and volunteer species of aquatic plants are colonizing the pond. While the snail population has been stabilized at a relatively low level, a remnant population of adults persists in the pond. It is difficult to estimate the size of the remnant population but densities along the littoral shelf have declined over 99%.
Throughout the project all of the egg clutches laid by these snails have been collected weekly to prevent re-colonization of the pond. Theoretically, the snail population could be successfully managed indefinitely in this manner. We are currently fabricating traps designed for use for low-level infestations. These will be deployed and tested over the next 30 days.

**Current Findings:**

The Island Apple Snails have been in the Lake Munson Drainage Basin for approximately the last 5 years. They first appeared in the Lake Lafayette Drainage basin at least 7 years ago. The presence of these snails in the headwaters of the Lake Munson Drainage Basin shows how efficiently these macro-invertebrates travel upstream. The larger snails, some over 3 inches in diameter, seem drawn to currents. There is always a high density of adult snails in the inflow to the pond attempting to move upstream. These snails persist during high flows by excavating holes in the clay. When the current slows they proceed deliberately upstream and have been found in the wet detention ponds upstream from the site. Likewise, in the Lake Lafayette Drainage Basin these snails have migrated up Alford Arm into the Lakes of Killearn Estates and will probably be in Lake McBride soon.

If the snails were totally eliminated from the Regional Stormwater Facility #1 re-infestation could be effectively accomplished by modifying the inflow structures to impede the progress of snails moving into the pond from downstream waters. Placing a copper metal strip along the inflow structure or installing a plastic lip on the structure to stop the snails from climbing might accomplish this.

Michael Hill (FFWCC) introduced Red-eared Sunfish, or Shell-Crackers into Regional Stormwater Facility #1. These native fish feed readily on small snails and should be able to eat the juvenile apple snails. Michael Hill, FFWCC, stocked over 100 adults Shell-Crackers in the pond on 5/8/08. Since that time only 3 dead adults have been found, leading us to assume that the majority of these fish have survived. Presumed spawning beds have been found in the pond, however these shallow holes are very attractive to large Island Apple Snails that like to hide in them in them. It is not known whether or not these spawning beds are older beds that have already produced young or even if the Shell Crackers can chase the snails from viable beds. To date no juvenile Shell-Crackers have been seen in the pond, but they would still be very small. The adults Shell-Crackers in the pond are probably consuming juvenile Island Apple Snails. It will take more data to assess their effectiveness. By September the juvenile Shell-Crackers should be large enough to catch and evaluate.
We have devised several types of traps for different population levels of Island Apple Snail infestations. We have applied for patents. Traps have been designed and deployed weekly since the beginning of this project in April 2007. Traps were spaced evenly every 25 yards around the littoral zone of the pond. Initially Sling traps were deployed since the infestation was so severe. Island Apple Snails were collected from the traps with rakes and then dumped into John Boats, as buckets were not big enough. As the population diminished by mid May we switched to Slop Traps that were quite effective with moderate populations of snails. As the population continued to diminish, we found that we needed a trap that would hold the snails indefinitely. New trap designs are being tested.

We have developed baits for attracting Island Apple Snail. Many different types of bait were tested in both the laboratory and field. Some bait was ineffective. Island Apple Snails do not like Sweet Peas. While it worked in the laboratory, Cracked Corn attracted Canada Geese, which ripped the traps apart to get at the bait. Fish and Turtles have also been attracted to certain baits. These baits have been avoided to eliminate by-catch. We have experimented with different additives to the baits to change their consistency and render them less water soluble or prone to wash out. Most of all, we have found that certain combinations of baits and additives elicit a pheromone response in the snails and this attracts numerous snails to the traps within hours of deployment.

Females Island Apple Snails lay masses of 100-1200 bright pink eggs an average of 1.4 times per week on any type of firm substrate available about 6 to 8 inches above the water line (according to the literature). Since there are approximately 300 egg masses found per week, this could be the work of less than 100 female snails. The rate of hatching seems water level and temperature dependant. Rising water levels increases egg-laying activity. High and low temperature extremes inhibit egg laying. The rate of laying and hatching seems to be more rapid than reported in the literature at optimal temperatures.

Summary:

The Regional Stormwater Facility #1 could be managed indefinitely without further trapping and baiting by harvesting egg clutches. A few simple adjustments could stop possible re-infestation from other waterbodies. The current population of Island Apple Snails in the pond is aging and will eventually die out.

After much experimentation, we have perfected our trapping system. Along with continued egg harvesting, we recommend continued adult snail control with our trapping system to control the Island Apple Snail population.
If the project were to stop now, the surviving plants would definitely make it through the winter. By early spring the remaining Island Apple Snails would be laying eggs again which would grow very rapidly and these young would be reproducing by late summer. The remaining plants in the pond would not survive the summer and would start to disappear in June 2009.

To maintain what has accomplished in the Regional Stormwater Facility #1

4) 20 Maintenance Traps need to be deployed in the pond
   a. cost, $1000
   b. personnel, Jess Van Dyke and Lee Ingram

5) The traps need to be baited and emptied every two weeks
   a. cost, 12 x $150 = $1800
   b. personnel, Jess Van Dyke and Sean McGlynn

6) The pond needs to be cleaned of eggs weekly
   a. cost, 28 x $100 = $2800
   b. personnel, Franklin Roosevelt and Sean McGlynn

Note: It appears that we have funding for items #1 and #2 but no funding for item #3. The Bureau of Invasive Plant control, now at FWC, only wants to fund testing the traps, and will not fund the labor necessary to eliminate new young while we eliminate the adults.
Table 1: Summary of the Island Apple Snail control effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Snails (lbs)</th>
<th>Snails (#)</th>
<th>Density (per yd2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/03/08</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/08</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>8440</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/20/08</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>16780</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/08</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>19960</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/03/08</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>16020</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/08</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/08</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>9360</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/08</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>7260</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/08</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6080</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/08</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>5120</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/08</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>14040</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/08</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>9120</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/08</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/08</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/08</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/08</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4680</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/08</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>7333</td>
<td>146660</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment:** These are the weekly trapping activity.

**Date:** This represents the date snails were removed from the traps.

**Snails (lbs):** This is the weight of Island Apple Snails, in pounds, that were removed from the traps that week. There are no native apple snails and in addition there was no significant by-catch.

**Snails (#):** This is the number of Island Apple Snails removed from the traps that week.

**Density (per yd2):** This is a rough estimate of the density of invasive exotic apple snails in the pond at the end of the treatment period specified. This was measured with random meter square quadrates (10) in each treatment area (9) then averaged and converted to yards.
Figure 1 (data from Table 1): The number of snails and their density has been decreasing. This population of snails is from last year’s brood. Egg cluster collection and the snail eating fish have prevented the emergence of juvenile snails. The spike in snail catch numbers in mid June represents a switch to checking the traps for three consecutive days after baiting.
Table 2: Aquatic plant survival statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL STORMWATER POND #1: AQUATIC PLANTS</th>
<th>Total Planted Plants (04/07)</th>
<th>Total Surviving Plants (07/08)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft Rush (33% survival)</td>
<td>142124</td>
<td>46559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck Potato (25% survival)</td>
<td>51227</td>
<td>12668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead (0% survival)</td>
<td>22673</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickerel Weed (0% survival)</td>
<td>27468</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: A graphic of the number of planted aquatics by species (April 2007), versus the surviving plants in the pond. There have been no significant losses of plants since this project began in May 2008. Since Van Dyke Environmental and McGlynn Labs started working on this project in May 2008, the surviving plants have begun to flourish. This graphic does not depict any of the vegetation that has grown in the pond voluntarily, which has been significant.
Figure 3: Hand Picked Island Apple Snails, M-Inc, 09/07.

Figure 4: Weeks 2 and 3, Island Apple Snail Harvest, 4/11-20/08. During week 2, 422 lbs or 8,440 snails were harvested and during week 3, 839 lbs or 16,780 snails, were trapped and baited by MLI and Van Dyke Environmental. This is an efficient method to remove exotic snails. The snail density in the littoral zone was approximately 1 snail per square foot. Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 04/08
Figure 5: Island Apple Snails removed from Regional Stormwater Facility #1. Disposal areas #1 and #2. The snails harvested during the first month were incinerated, these snails were harvested between May and July, 200804/08, Leon County, Florida, 7/11/08.
Figure 6: Collecting Island Apple Snails by boat, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 4/25/08.

Figure 7: Bait testing station, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 4/25/08.
Figure 8: Sling trap with Island Apple Snails congregating, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 4/17/08.

Figure 9: Slop Trap filled with Island Apple Snails, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 4/17/08.
Figure 10: Drop Trap filled with Island Apple Snails, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 5/09/08.

Figure 11: Pheromone Trap with Island Apple Snails, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 5/09/08.
Figure 12: Island Apple Snails Eggs on the control structure between Lake Killlearney and Lake Kinsale, Leon County, Florida, 6/12/08.

Figure 13: Island Apple Snails Eggs on the control structure in a holding pond at Centerville Road and Capitol Circle, near Publix, Leon County, Florida, 2005 (photograph by Michael Hill, FFWCC).
Figure 14: Island Apple Snails in Upper Lake Lafayette, Leon County, Florida, August 2000.

Figure 15: Island Apple Snails in mating in Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 5/09/08.
Figure 16: Invasive Exotic Island Apple Snail eggs on an invasive exotic Chinese Tallow Tree near Lake Lafayette, Leon County, Florida, 2005 (photograph by Jess Van Dyke, FDEP, ret.).
Figure 17: These snail eggs were treated with canola oil. Pink eggs are immature. The eggs turn white as they begin to hatch. The white powder on the ground is from eggs that have hatched. Some of these eggs hatched after treatment with canola oil.

Figure 18: Snail eggs on Soft Rush

Figure 19: Snail eggs on wooden steak
Figure 20: Soft Rush and Duck Potato in Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 07/08.

Figure 21: Soft Rush and Duck Potato, looking east, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 07/08.
Figure 22: Soft Rush and Duck Potato, looking south west towards US Highway 90, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 07/08.

Figure 23: Soft Rush and Duck Potato, looking east down the treatment area that was once totally vegetated, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 07/08.
Figure 24: Jess Van Dyke working on trapping and baiting Island Apple Snails, Regional Stormwater Facility #1, Leon County, Florida, 6/27/08.
# 5
Blueprint Projects: Corridor and Environmental Breakout
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
Based on discussion at the May 15, 2008, Citizens Advisory Committee meeting and the June 2, 2008, Intergovernmental Agency meeting, the following information is provided concerning several questions posed or information requested related to the Blueprint Master Plan and specific projects.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Funding Split
- How much of the Blueprint Program funding had been allocated to Corridor/Transportation projects versus Environmental projects?

Corridor and Environmental Project Listing and Split:  Attachment 1 is a listing of completed corridor projects describing their sidewalk and bicycle facilities and environmental amenities, and a listing of independent environmental projects.

At the last Citizens Advisory Committee meeting the Committee requested staff to provide the change in the percentage of environmental projects in the current Master Plan versus the proposed (2009) Master Plan. Attachment 2 shows the project split graphically and includes the background data in tabular form. The information reflects a decrease in environmental projects from 47.7% to 43.4%.

Note: An Advertising Supplement to the Tallahassee Democrat titled “Take Charge of Your Future” (dated Winter 2000) included the following under Answers to Frequently Asked Questions:

How is the spending split allocated between greenways, parks, stormwater cleanup and roads? Roads seem to be the focus in the news but I have heard there is a lot for greenways and stormwater protection too.
- Altogether, spending for non-road related community projects is about 40% of the total. This includes, greenways, floodplain preservation, sidewalks, non-road related stormwater, water quality enhancements, bike trails, bike lanes, parks and recreation, and protection of natural resources.
Even with the proposed reduction in the Master Plan, the environmental project percentage still exceeds the 40% referenced in the article. It should also be noted that in the comparison (Attachment 2), cost of the additional right of way, bike lanes and the construction of the meandering sidewalk are included in the cost of the roadway and are not reflected as being non-roadway related. If these elements are included in the non-roadway costs the environmental percentage would be higher.

Blueprint 2000 has been very successful in funds leveraging. Through FDOT, Blueprint has received funding through SAFETEA-LU, Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), and Transportation Regional Incentive Program for various roadway right-of-way or construction efforts. It should also be noted that Blueprint has been relentless in its pursuit of grants for environmental projects. Grants have been applied for and won through the Florida Communities Trust (FCT), the Office of Greenways and Trails (FDEP), the Northwest Florida Water Management District, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and the Florida Highway Beautification Council (FDOT).

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects**

- What Bicycle/Pedestrian funding commitment was promised to the public during the marketing of the Blueprint Program sales tax extension?

Note: Jeff Hunter spoke at the June 2 Intergovernmental Agency meeting and referenced a newspaper article stating “that there would be $16M in stand alone bike/pedestrian projects” and that he wanted to know what happened to that money. After three requests, Mr. Hunter did not provide the specific article for our review and comment, however, the following is provided.

The “Blueprint 2000 and Beyond Project Definitions Report” dated February 7, 2000, did include cost estimates for each Blueprint Map, broken down by project element (e.g. right-of-way, construction, stormwater (right-of-way and enhancements), greenway acquisition, greenway amenities and trail development, etc.). The Project Summary Table indicated the following for Greenway Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$21,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Amenities and Trail Development</td>
<td>$12,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Easements</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Head Acquisition</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Greenway Costs</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should also be noted that the Grand Total for all the projects included in the “Project Definitions Report” totaled $809,500,000. This Grand Total is larger than any Master Plan developed or adopted by the Board.

In addition, in 2000 the City of Tallahassee and Leon County signed Interlocal Agreements on how the sales tax receipts would be spent, including the 10 percent of the receipts which went to each government. These Agreements included line items specifically addressing proposed sidewalk, bike lane, trail, and trailhead projects which were to be funded from the 10 percent local government shares.
Capital Circle NW/SW Issues

- What are the legal and financial ramifications of delaying or not completing the widening of Capital Circle NW/SW from US 90 south to Orange Avenue?

For Capital Circle NW/SW, the CAC also requested staff to research legal and financial ramifications of terminating or delaying the project. Based on staff research there are potential legal and financial ramifications of Blueprint not completing or delaying the acquisition of the ROW for the project (See Attachment 3: FDOT/Blueprint Project Agreement, Section 2).

While the legal implication of terminating the proposed construction of the project is not as clear, there is definitely a financial ramification. The project currently is funded with over $8 million in Federal funds which probably would be lost for failure to expend the funds in the designated time period. Delaying the project depending on the length of the delay, could possibility jeopardize the Federal funds and would not produce any saving for transfer to other projects. Any savings from the delaying the project would be offset by inflation. Additional delays in construction may require the existing design to be updated and require new permits.

OPTIONS
For information only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Not presented to TCC.

CAC: At their meeting of August 21, during their discussion of Budget-related agenda items, the CAC took the following action:
- Ask the City and County to provide a project listing and update on the use of their 10% of the Local Option sales tax receipts and their $25 Million in water quality funding.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Blueprint 2000 Corridor and Environmental Project Listing
Attachment 2: Comparison of Corridor and Environmental Projects
Attachment 3: FDOT/Blueprint Project Agreement
Blueprint 2000 Corridor and Environmental Project Listing

Corridor/Transportation Projects:
- Capital Circle NW (I-10 to south of US 90; approx. 2 miles): six lane project is complete. Project included bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides.
- Capital Circle SE (Connie Drive to south of Tram Road; approx. 3 miles): six lane project is complete. Project included bike lanes on both sides, a 5-foot sidewalk on the west side, and a 10-foot sidewalk on the east side.
- Capital Circle SE (Tram Road to west of Woodville Highway; approx. 2 miles): six lanes are under construction. Project will include bike lanes on both sides, a 5-foot sidewalk on the north side and a 10-foot trail on the south side. The project will connect with the St. Marks Trail at Woodville Highway.

With the three projects above, approximately 28 miles of bike lanes or sidewalks will have been constructed.

- Capital Circle NW/SW (US 90 to Orange Avenue; approx. 3 miles): The six-laning of this segment is under design and right-of-way acquisition. Consistent with the other segments, bike lanes are to be provided on both sides and the project will include sidewalks on both sides. Construction is to begin by mid-2009.
- Capital Circle SE (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road; approx. 1.5 miles): Design has been halted at the 60% level. Consistent with the other segments, bike lanes are to be provided on both sides and the project will include sidewalks on both sides. Construction is not currently funded.

These two projects will provide approximately 18 additional miles of bike lanes and sidewalks when constructed.

Environmental Projects and Elements (tied to Corridor Projects):
- The Capital Circle NW project noted above included a 15.3 acre Regional Stormwater Pond; 71.4% of the pond’s treatment volume was for stormwater retrofit. In addition, bids will be received in July for construction of a 0.8 mile trail around the Regional Stormwater Pond. The project will include lighting, landscaping, benches, and parking.
- The Capital Circle NW/SW project noted above includes considerable mitigation to and restoration of the hydrology of Gum Swamp. The 114-acre Delta Property has been acquired as part of the project’s mitigation; a total of 184 acres is to be purchased as mitigation or for restoration. Stormwater management/erosion control during and after construction will be well above the minimum requirements. Several ecopassages will be constructed under the roadway to assist in wildlife migration under the corridor.
- The 230-foot Blueprint right-of-way width for corridor projects allowed the construction of the meandering trail, a wide landscaped median and landscaped borders, and is capable of accommodating additional facilities for transit in the future. Several bus pull-outs were constructed on Capital Circle NW (I-10 to US 90).
90) and Capital Circle SE (east of Woodville Highway) and will be included in all Blueprint projects where StarMetro provides service.

- The wide right-of-way allowed construction of several linear stormwater ponds along Capital Circle SE (Tram Road to Woodville Highway).

Environmental Projects:

- Headwaters of the St. Marks River: In conjunction with the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) and the Leon County Division of Parks and Recreation, 754 acres of the Headwaters of the St. Marks River has been acquired and preserved. In partnership with the Northwest Florida Water Management District, a conservation easement has been placed on an additional 132 acres nearby, and an easement is being pursued on an additional 191 acres to the north. At the request of Blueprint 2000 and with assistance from The Nature Conservancy (TNC), a 1,057 acre tract (which includes Wood Sink) immediately south of the Headwaters properties was placed on the State’s priority purchase list and has been purchased by TNC.

- Fred George Basin acquisitions: Blueprint 2000 funds are the cash match to an approved FCT grant aimed at acquiring approximately 172 acres within the Fred George Basin. The Planning Department and Leon County are currently in the process of acquiring these five parcels.

- Cascade Park: The four segment Capital Cascade Trail project has been under development since 2003. Cascade Park (Segment 2) is scheduled for construction beginning in 2009, and as stated is a “major stormwater facility disguised as a World Class Park.” In addition to its stormwater function, Segment 2 will include approximately 2 miles of sidewalks and trails. The Park design is also incorporating “green technologies” as appropriate.

- Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 of Capital Cascade Trail are currently under study and preliminary design. These segments provide significant stormwater storage and water quality benefits. A Transportation Enhancement Grant has been applied for to construct a bridge across South Monroe Street; the trail will extend west and connect with the St. Marks Trail. Several properties have already been acquired in these segments using Blueprint and/or FCT funds, or thru donation.

- City and County Water Quality funding ($25 Million each) is included in the Master Plan.
Master Plan 2008

Total Master Plan Budget: $622,968,215

- Corridor Improvement: 49%
- Environmental: 48%
- Other: 3%

Attachment 2
Master Plan 2009
Total Master Plan Budget: $513,509,964

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

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

|             | 49.7% | 47.7% | 2.6% | 100.0% |
## PROPOSED MASTER PLAN 2009

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

|                      | 54.0% | 43.4% | 2.6% | 100.0% |
AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

This Agreement entered into this 25th day of August, by and between the State of Florida, Department of Transportation, hereinafter called DEPARTMENT, and the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency called the AGENCY.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the DEPARTMENT and the AGENCY are desirous of having the AGENCY administer the 2.871 mile project along Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) extending from south of Orange Avenue (SR 371) to south of West Tennessee Street (SR 10, US 90) (milepost 6.755 to 9.626) in Leon County, and including expanding the existing two-lane undivided rural roadway to a four-lane or six-lane divided urban (curb and gutter) facility, providing new traffic signals where warranted, including ITS features along with significant landscaping as well as constructing pedestrian, bicycle and recreational amenities, all of the aforesaid being hereinafter referred to as the PROJECT; and,

WHEREAS, the DEPARTMENT and AGENCY mutually agree that the PROJECT is not currently fully funded in DEPARTMENT's Five-Year Work Program and mutually acknowledge that transportation funding priorities are established by the local Metropolitan Planning Organization. AGENCY is prepared to utilize a combination of Agency funds, state/federal appropriations, when and if said state/federal appropriations are available and matching funds towards completion of the PROJECT; and this agreement is sanctioned pursuant to Florida Statute 334; and,

WHEREAS, the manner set forth for completion of the PROJECT is in the interest of both the DEPARTMENT and the AGENCY and it would be more practical, expeditious, and economical for the AGENCY to perform such activities; and,

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived from joint participation in the PROJECT, the parties agree to the following:
1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct and are deemed incorporated herein.

2. The AGENCY shall administer the PROJECT and shall comply with all laws, rules, guidelines, procedures, and specifications that the DEPARTMENT would have to comply with if the DEPARTMENT were administering the PROJECT. The AGENCY will not be required to obtain permits from the DEPARTMENT other than those that would be required if the DEPARTMENT were administering the PROJECT. In administering the PROJECT, the AGENCY shall not jeopardize federal funding of any current or future DEPARTMENT projects. Should the AGENCY fail to complete the PROJECT or comply with the terms of this agreement, it shall be liable to the DEPARTMENT for any costs incurred by the DEPARTMENT in completing the PROJECT and losses resulting from such non-compliance. It is the DEPARTMENT’s intention that the AGENCY shall have the rights under Section 337.274, Florida Statutes, which the DEPARTMENT would have if the DEPARTMENT were administering the PROJECT.

3. The AGENCY shall present the typical section package and the pavement design to the DEPARTMENT for approval or disapproval prior to moving forward with any other phase of the PROJECT. The PROJECT shall be designed to comply with DEPARTMENT standards and specifications and, if there are variances or exceptions, they shall be identified and communicated in writing to the DEPARTMENT each time plans are sent for review. The plans shall be sent to the DEPARTMENT for review at the time of each review cycle and at any other time that significant plans changes are made. The DEPARTMENT shall have 20 working days to review the plans and make comments. Any comment made by the DEPARTMENT within the 20-day period shall be resolved and appropriate revisions shall be incorporated into the plans. However, if no comments are sent within the 20-day period, the AGENCY may proceed without further contacting the DEPARTMENT. All design variances and exceptions shall be handled according to the requirements set forth in the Plans Preparation Manual, specifically the requirements that variances be approved by the District Design Engineer and that all exceptions, and variances for design speed on the FIHS system, be approved by the State Highway Engineer. At all times during the administration of the PROJECT by the AGENCY, the DEPARTMENT, through its procedure, Median Opening and Access Management Decision Process (Topic #625-010-021-e), shall have final authority to approve or disapprove issues related to access management. The AGENCY shall have the right to provide non-binding recommendations to the DEPARTMENT and its Access Management Committee, but decisions by the committee shall be final concerning issues between the AGENCY and the DEPARTMENT.

4. Upon completion of the PROJECT, assorted right-of-way and facilities will be transferred from the AGENCY to the DEPARTMENT and the DEPARTMENT shall thereafter be responsible for maintaining said right-of-way and facilities. However, regardless of the amount of right-of-way acquired by the AGENCY for the PROJECT, the DEPARTMENT shall not be required to accept ownership and maintenance of more
right-of-way or facilities than that required had the DEPARTMENT administered the project. For example, unless mutually agreed otherwise by the AGENCY and the DEPARTMENT, the linear right-of-way to be accepted by the DEPARTMENT will not exceed that shown on a typical section for a similar project in the FDOT Plans Preparation Manual. The right-of-way shall be monumented by the AGENCY prior to transfer to the DEPARTMENT.

5. AGENCY agrees to provide in its contract with the contractor that, after completion of the PROJECT, DEPARTMENT shall be assigned any and all warranties and other rights against the contractor performing work or supplying materials on the PROJECT.

6. This AGREEMENT and any interest herein shall not be assigned, transferred or otherwise encumbered by the AGENCY under any circumstances without the prior written consent of the DEPARTMENT. However, this AGREEMENT shall run to the DEPARTMENT and its successors.

7. Except as otherwise set forth herein, this AGREEMENT shall continue in effect and be binding to both the AGENCY and the DEPARTMENT until the PROJECT is completed and transferred to the Department, or until said AGREEMENT is terminated by mutual written accord between the parties.

8. This AGREEMENT is governed by and construed in accordance with the Laws of the State of Florida.

9. This document incorporates and includes all prior negotiations, correspondence, conversations, agreements, or understandings applicable to the matters contained herein, and the parties agree that there are no commitments, agreements or understandings concerning the subject matter of this AGREEMENT that are not contained in this document. Accordingly, it is agreed that no deviation from the terms hereof shall be predicated upon any prior representation or agreements whether oral or written. It is further agreed that no modification, amendment, or alteration in the terms and conditions herein shall be effective unless contained in a written document executed with the same formality and of equal dignity herewith.

10. A person or affiliate who has been placed on the convicted vendor list following a conviction for a public entity crime, may not submit a bid on a contract to provide any goods or services to a public entity, may not submit a bid on a contract with a public entity for the construction or repair of a public building or public work, may not submit bids on leases of real property to a public entity, may not be awarded or perform work as a contractor, supplier, subcontractor, or consultant under a contract with any public entity, and may not transact business with any public entity in excess of the threshold
amount provided in Section 287.017, Florida Statutes (2001) CATEGORY TWO for a period of thirty (36) months from the date of being placed on the convicted vendor list.

11. Notices pursuant to this AGREEMENT shall be sent by U.S. Mail to the following addresses:

FOR THE AGENCY
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
1311 Executive Center Drive, Suite 109
The Koger Center, Ellis Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301

FOR THE DEPARTMENT
Florida Department of Transportation
Attn: Production Department
1074 Highway 90 East
Chipley, Florida 32428

12. The DEPARTMENT, during any fiscal year, shall not expend money, incur any liability, or enter into any contract which, by its terms involves the expenditure of money in excess of the amounts budgeted as available for expenditure during such fiscal year. Any contract, verbal or written, made in violation of this subsection is null and void, and no money may be paid on such contract. The DEPARTMENT shall require a statement from the comptroller of the DEPARTMENT that funds are available prior to entering into any such contract or other binding commitment of funds. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the making of contracts for periods exceeding one (1) year, but any contract so made shall be executory only for the value of the services to be rendered or agreed to be paid for in succeeding fiscal years; and this paragraph shall be incorporated verbatim in all contracts of the DEPARTMENT which are for an amount in excess of $25,000.00 and which have a term for a period of more than one (1) year.

13. To the extent allowed by the Laws of Florida and pursuant to (2005) Florida Statute 768.28, each party hereby agrees to indemnify, defend, save, and hold harmless the other party from all claims, demands, liabilities, and suits of any nature arising out of, because of, or due to any negligent act or occurrence or omission or commission of the party, its agents, or employees.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the AGENCY has caused this Agreement to be executed in its behalf this 25th day of August, 2006, by its Executive Director, being
authorized to enter into and execute same by the AGENCY; and the DEPARTMENT has executed this Joint Project Agreement through its District Secretary for District III, Florida Department of Transportation, this 26th day of August, 2006.

BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

[Signature]
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Signature]
DISTRICT SECRETARY

[Signature]
LEGAL APPROVAL
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Downgrade of Blueprint 2000 Series 2007 Bond Insurer
SUBJECT/TITLE:  Downgrade of Blueprint 2000 Series 2007 Bond Insurer

Date:  September 15, 2008  Requested By:  Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person:  Phil Maher  Type of Item:  Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to inform the Board of the downgrade of MBIA, Blueprint 2000 insurer of the 2007 series of bonds.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
In the month of June a number of municipal bond issuers’ ratings were downgraded. MBIA who insured Blueprint’s last series of bonds was downgraded by both Moody’s from Aaa to A2 and S&P from AAA to AA. Fitch which had previously given MBIA an AA rating withdrew their rating.

The impact on Blueprint is only as required by the bond documents, when rating action is taken on and insurer of outstanding debt, the insurer is required of file a Material Event Notice. DAC who is our disclosure agent file the required notice on June 30th.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
None required, for information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None
# 7

CAC Meeting Minutes
(May 15, 2008)
Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Conger</th>
<th>Lamar Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jess Van Dyke</td>
<td>Kevin McGorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Amnott</td>
<td>Dianna Norwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Patterson</td>
<td>Scott Balog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

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

Agenda Modifications

Dave Bright stated that Dianna Norwood’s term on the Planning Commission would be ending, therefore the May CAC meeting would possibly be her last. The Planning Commission would need to appoint a new member as their CAC representative, however that person’s application would not be received in time to be included in the June 2, 2008 IA agenda. It would be included in the September 2008 agenda. He stated that Ms. Norwood or her incumbent could attend the August 21, 2008 CAC meeting but she/they would not have a vote. He would confirm that through the CAC By-Laws. Ms. Norwood stated that according to the Planning Commission By-Laws, her position would not be vacant; she would continue to serve until someone was available to replace her. Jerry Conger questioned if Ms. Norwood could continue as a member of the CAC even though her term with the Planning Commission was ending. Jim Davis stated that would have to be determined from the CAC By-Laws.

Information Items

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Phil Maher stated that it was a slow time with leveraging. They were working out the details and documentation for the $1.5M that was received from FDEP in the Legislative appropriation.
**Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update**
Echo Gates of Genesis stated that the Dog Park had been removed from the park design. The main issues behind the decision were animal waste in close proximity to St. Augustine Branch and concerns about it further degrading water quality. She emphasized however, that removing the Dog Park would not eliminate animal waste from the park itself or St. Augustine Branch.

There was a proposed Veterans Memorial that would be located near the existing Korean War Memorial, a rendering of which was included in the agenda. Mr. Davis spoke briefly on the symbolism included in the memorial: the replication of the Silver Star, the third highest award for bravery, the five points of the star represented each of the five military branches. Also there was potential for smaller stars within the large one to represent all of the fallen from Leon County. Admiral Rick Grant, Ret. was in charge of fund raising for the memorial ($1.5M).

Ms. Gates further stated that the site plan was on hold until the submittal (to COT Growth Management) and approval of the Public Infrastructure Variance by the City Commission.

**Item #3: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Update**
Ward Miller of Kimley-Horn stated that due to budget constraints there had been changes to the project scope. They would complete 30% plans for the primary stormwater management system in Phase 1 (1A-data collection and assessments, 1B-design engineering and construction documents). Phase 1 would provide enough information to determine which of the two segments should advance to 100% plans. The park programming elements and permitting would occur in Phase 2.

Dianna Norwood questioned how the FAMU Way extension would affect Segment 3 and Segment 4. Mr. Miller stated that there was a direct relationship between planning and design of Segment 3 and that various FAMU Way alignment alternatives were under consideration with a decision expected in late summer 2008. Blueprint and their consultants would coordinate closely with the City on Segment 3 to identify shared stormwater opportunities and to complement each other. Mr. Ward stated that Kimley-Horn and Blueprint would participate in the related public forums on the FAMU Way project.

Mr. Davis stated that based upon the emphasis put on completing the FAMU Way extension by the City Commission, it would be well under construction, possibly nearing completion before Blueprint began Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 or Segment 4. He stated that coordinated ROW acquisitions and stormwater facilities could still be a possibility.

**Item #4: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Landscaping/ Park and Item #5: Regional Stormwater Pond 1**
(Discussion of items #4 and #5 were combined.)

Dave Bright noted that there was a summary report in the agenda of the efforts to eradicate the snails. Jess Van Dyke stated that while they had made considerable progress, snail reproduction had also increased. The pond was stocked with 130 adult shell cracker fish that would eat the juvenile snails. He estimated that only 25% of the plants remained of what was originally installed.
Mr. Davis stated that a working group had been developed among Blueprint 2000, City, County, Northwest Florida Water Management District (NWFWMD), Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission (FWC), and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 3 with all agencies hopefully providing funding for it. The NWFWMD, who have staff biologists, have agreed to craft, in conjunction with everyone else, a scientific study methodology suitable for future publication to establish parameters for long-term control of the snails. Lamar Taylor questioned if there was a feasible alternative other than plants in the ponds. Several staff members interjected that it could not be done, however several options had been considered but all were cost prohibitive. It was stated that it was possible that the working group could come up with other alternatives.

In regards to landscaping of the pond site and Capital Circle NW, Dave Snyder stated that staff was working through the permitting process and expected comments back from the FDOT by the end of May 2008. Recycled plastic benches had also been included in the design. The request for bid information would be out by the end of June 2008.

**Item #6: Capital Circle SE May 21 Ribbon Cutting Ceremony**
This item was informational only.

**Item #7: Mahan Drive**
Gary Phillips stated that the recommended action from the June 4, 2007 IA Meeting was included in the agenda item. Blueprint 2000 had recently received a letter from FDOT that better defined the proposed sources of the $40M in funding, $10M of which was from Blueprint. Additionally there would be $13.9M from the Department of General Services for the Capital Circle Office Center DRI, $7.8M in FDOT Federal Boxed funds, and $7.6M in FDOT statewide funds for a total of $39.3M for the project. He stated that key dates in the schedule were that the project would be production ready by May 2008, construction letting in September 2008 and ready for construction to begin in early 2009. The project would have a 1,200 day construction schedule. The details of the project were included in the agenda item.

Mr. Davis noted that several large oak trees that were loved by all in the community would be removed in the construction process. Jess Van Dyke asked if the median could be reduced in size to save money and trees. Mr. Davis stated that the median was at the minimum width (18-foot) which would accommodate a turn lane at intersections. The project had been under redesign for several years and the project engineers at LPA had been over it repeatedly to minimize impacts and save the trees. Kevin McGorty stated that it was a project that was widely supported by both City and County Commissions but in looking at the typical section, he was not proud of it as a Blueprint project. Mr. Davis clarified that it was not a Blueprint project; it had some funding from Blueprint but that FDOT was the lead on it.

**Item #8: Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Right-of-Way Acquisition (Additional Parcels) and Resolution**
This item was informational only.
Consent Items

**Item #9: CAC Minutes: April 3, 2008**
Kevin McGorty moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Jess Van Dyke. It passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

**Item #10: Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel**
Dave Bright stated that in 2004, the Sensitive Lands Working Group identified Wood Sink as a priority 1 parcel for acquisition. In partnership with the St. Marks Consortium, Blueprint requested that the entire 1,057 acre St. Joe-owned parcel be added to the state list of St. Marks property slated for acquisition. The property was added to the list and it was later acquired by The Nature Conservancy in 2007. A “hand-shake deal” was made in that process, that if one of the partners could acquire the land in advance, Blueprint would work with them to buy back what was desired as Blueprint or as Leon County.

The 200-acre parcel, including Wood Sink, identified in the agenda item had been proposed for purchase by Blueprint from The Nature Conservancy. Callie DeHaven, The Nature Conservancy, communicated to Dave Bright recently that the FWC would like to purchase the entire contiguous 1,057-acres. Blueprint was amenable to the scenario of FWC purchasing and maintaining the entire tract. If however, that arrangement fell through, Blueprint might present it to the Board in the future for acquisition of the area surrounding Wood Sink.

Lamar Taylor questioned if there was any resistance to moving forward with the “hand-shake deal” if the arrangement with FWC fell through. Mr. Davis stated that he did not feel there would be. The committee agreed that the Gentlemen’s Agreement should be honored.

Dianna Norwood questioned if the agreement moved forward as stated with FWC purchasing the property, how would Blueprint ensure that the $1M would remain available as an allocation for preserving sensitive lands. Mr. Bright stated that the funding was in the Master Plan as part of one of the Headwaters of the St. Mark’s line items. It would take Board action to reallocate it.

**Kevin McGorty moved to honor the verbal commitment if the arrangement with FWC did not come to fruition; it was seconded by Lamar Taylor. It passed unanimously.**

**Item #11: CAC Attendance**
Jerry Conger reminded the committee of member attendance commitments and of the Chairman’s prerogative in making exceptions listed in the By-Laws. He noted that Steve Amnott had been unable to meet the requirements due to medical and dental issues. Mr. Amnott had previously stated to Mr. Conger that he would like to continue serving on the CAC. Mr. Conger proposed to allow him to continue unless there were objections from the remaining members. There were no objections to Mr. Conger’s decision.
Public Hearing

**Item #12: Proposed FY 2009 Blueprint 2000 Operating Budget**
There were no speakers for the public hearing.

Phil Maher stated that staff was requesting an approximate 4% decrease in the overall budget. He briefly covered the breakout of line item allocations that was included in the agenda item.

Gregg Patterson stated that he disagreed with the 3% increase for salaries. He felt that “you get what you pay for” and would not like to see any impairment of Blueprint’s growth and success due to a lack of “taking care of employees.” Mr. Davis stated that the original operating budget presented to the City Manager did not include any increase to salaries. The Manager requested that the placeholder of 3% be added to avoid any misperceptions. Furthermore, with Board approval, Blueprint staff would not be limited to 3%. They would receive the higher of the raises given to the City or the County.

Kevin McGorty questioned if the decreases to the operating budget were due to the overall revenue shortfalls. Mr. Davis stated that staff felt it was incumbent upon them to conserve wherever possible. **Gregg Patterson moved to accept the FY 2009 Operating Budget. It was seconded by Kevin McGorty. It passed unanimously.**

**Item #13: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009 – FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget**
There were no speakers for the public hearing.

Phil Maher stated that at the latest Finance Committee Meeting, Blueprint, the City, and the County agreed that they would all use the same growth rates, based on statewide trends, for the next five years. The Finance Committee recommended a -3% decrease for FY08/09, 1% increase for FY 09/10, 2% increases for FY10/11 and FY11/12 and returning to 4.5% increases after that. The adjustments equated to $109M to be cut from the budget by either delaying or eliminating projects. Based on that, Mr. Maher discussed the process they used to arrive at that figure as well as the Master Plans (both the approved and the proposed) and options for cutting $109M from them.

Kevin McGorty questioned if commitments had been made for the $25M in water quality funds to each the City and County and what the trend of expenditures were. Mr. Davis stated that both governments had committed $10M to specific projects but he could not attest to actual expenditures. The City identified $10M for stormwater and water quality improvements in Frenчtown. The County identified $5M in that category and $5M for Lake Lammonia and the Killeearn Lakes sewer system clean-up, which had already been received by the County. Mr. Davis clarified that the $25M was accumulated at the same rate as Blueprint accumulated the overall revenues. If the City or County needed the money earlier, they pay the interests on those early draw downs, since Blueprint would essentially be their banker. Dave Bright noted that the County has also completed the Okeechepkee Pond and a second pond in the Lake Jackson area as well. Mr. Davis further stated that the County had identified approximately $37M worth of projects for their $25M. He could not speak to what their priorities or schedules as Blueprint did
not track that.

Dianna Norwood questioned why the Landbank was reduced so drastically ($2.8M). Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint did not, in his opinion, have financial or legal commitments that would be affected by reducing the total amount. She felt that while Blueprint might not have legal commitments, they had a philosophy to fund sensitive land acquisitions. Mr. Davis clarified that the Land Bank funds are for any purchase that become necessary.

Kevin McGorty stated that he would like staff to present additional options other than the one that was included in the agenda item because he could not support or vote for it. Mr. Davis reminded him that in the original Blueprint Master Plan there was $22M allocated for greenways and stormwater retrofit, not in conjunction with the corridor improvements but in the vicinity of the west side of Tallahassee. The Board reallocated that $22M toward the completion of Capital Circle NW/SW to Orange Avenue. Blueprint was able to, through grants, to reconstitute those funds in the out years of the program. Blueprint had acquired approximately $4.5M in greenways and mitigation property in that same area.

Mr. Maher discussed each project listed in the Master Plan:
- CCNW (I-10 to US 90) was virtually complete at a total cost of approximately $81M;
- CCNW/SW (US 90 to Orange) while not under contract it was a top priority of the Board (getting to the airport). Furthermore, Blueprint entered into a Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) with FDOT and received $42M for ROW and $8M, in Federal funds, for construction. The only funding available to be cut was in the out years in stormwater retrofit and greenways. However, $4.2M worth of mitigation remained in the project that could be used to reconstitute Gum Swamp;
- CCSE (Tram Road to Connie Drive) was virtually complete with a total cost of approximately $44M;
- CCSE (Woodville to Tram) was currently under contract and under construction. Additionally, Blueprint received $9.5M from FDOT for construction and a SIB loan for Blueprint’s share of the match with FDOT, and there was $4.3M for ROW given as well.

Mr. Davis noted that it would cost Blueprint a fortune to terminate a signed contract. Mr. McGorty stated that he felt that the environmental projects were hit extremely hard with the proposed cuts. He understood that the money had to come from the out-years. Staff had aggressively pursued the road projects, for great reasons – leveraging, the cost of acquisition, etc. However, the voters of Leon County did not vote strictly for road projects. He reiterated his request for options that would benefit the environment as well.

Mr. Maher continued his discussion of the Master Plan:
- CCSE (Woodville to Crawfordville) was completed to 60% design only;
- CCSW (Crawfordville to Orange) retained funding for the PD&E study only. The remaining $27M (design, ROW) was eliminated;  
- Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 – construction was eliminated and $5M was reconstituted for interim improvements to Franklin Boulevard;  
- Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 – funding for all of the ROW and enough construction dollars to make some improvements, was retained but pushed farther out;
Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4 – funding was increased by $5.4M due to inflation and moved out, but was intact.

Mr. Maher stated that the only options for projects to cut funding for would be sensitive lands/environmental projects, Capital Cascade Trail Segments, and CCSW stormwater retrofit.

Lamar Taylor stated that the cost benefits were in favor of honoring present commitments. The cuts might not come to pass but it was a necessary exercise given the decrease in sales tax revenue. He suggested a construction moratorium – so that when money became available it was not immediately routed to a road project but siphoned back to a previously cut environmental project. He felt it was as important to have a prioritization of which projects would be reintroduced as it was to prioritize the cuts.

Mr. McGorty stated that he would agree that there were contractual obligations; however, there was a larger obligation, in his opinion, to the committee and upholding what the voters requested. He agreed with Mr. Taylor that if no other options for cuts could be found, at a minimum the CAC should recommend prioritization for when funding returned.

Jess Van Dyke stated that when the EECC developed the Blueprint 2000 Program, they discussed whether or not percentages should be designated for roadway and environmental projects. The “green” side originally suggested a 50/50 split but then realized that road projects were so expensive and 50/50 would be disproportionate. They compromised on one-third to environmental and two-thirds to roadway projects as their rule of thumb. He was curious how the percentages were distributed in capital budget, both the approved and proposed Master Plans.

Mr. Davis, added the totals, and estimated that environmental issues were at $220M out of $520M; that was 40%. He stated that the 40% did not include any of the environmental components that were handled within the road projects themselves. Furthermore, the environmental projects were 100% funded at the expense of the road projects; which were not fully funded in the first place. Additionally, the original Master Plan for Blueprint was for $520M, only $7M more than the proposed Master Plan. He further stated that the cuts related to the sales tax decrease had essentially negated the leveraging successes of the past few years. Moreover, the Headwaters of the St. Marks was $9M total; it was much more than that even with the cuts. Also, Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4 was not funded in the original Master Plan except for ROW; it was currently fully funded.

Mr. McGorty stated that the roadway projects were at or near completion, for good reasons, compared to environmental and green infrastructure projects that would be taking the brunt of the cuts. Mr. Maher stated that CCSE Woodville to Tram was unfunded until staff won a TRIP grant for $4.3M, found the match, and received $9.5M in a second TRIP grant and a SIB Loan from FDOT for construction. Mr. McGorty stated that in the EECC and when Blueprint went out on referendum they recognized that they would do the best they could to leverage funds; he commended staff for their leveraging successes. In terms of the finished project lists however, some were concerned that it would not contain the expectations and promises that were made.

Mr. McGorty stated that everyone took the cumulative responsibility. With the reality of revenue shortfall, it was a skewed picture. He was unsure if there was anything that could be
done about it however due to contract obligations, etc. At minimum however, he felt there
should be a priority ranking to return revenue to environmental projects if/when the revenue
picture changed in a few years. Mr. Van Dyke requested staff create pie charts to simplify the
statistics and easily identify the percentages allocated to environmental and roadway projects.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was not trying to raid the environmental money at the expense of
the roadways. He further stated that there were some legal and financial ramifications that were
necessary to consider in the process. Capital Cascade Trail for example, the process of designing
and permitting it had been the most difficult one for Blueprint. Staff had been working on that
project for five-years, that was the reason it was not moving forward as rapidly, not because it
had not been emphasized, it was simply a much more complicated design and permitting process.

Mr. Davis questioned how much of the $44M for CCSE Tram to Connie for example should be
credited to environmental issues, recreational issues, or additional holistic amenities. He
guaranteed that the $44M did not represent asphalt on the ground. If he did not include those
amenities then the numbers would be distorted. Gregg Patterson stated that the CAC members
needed that tool to explain it to their communities not just to see it for themselves. Mr. Davis
stated that for the major categories staff would create that for them.

Mr. Maher reiterated that $109M had to be cut from the Master Plan before it was submitted to
the IA for approval in September. The $109M could only come from Sensitive Lands, Capital
Cascade Trail, or stormwater retrofit. Mr. Davis stated that staff was seeking CAC guidance on
whether or not staff had used the correct priorities in working the financial plan or specific
recommendations regarding projects. Staff would be happy to work the details and incorporate
those before presenting it to the Board.

Mr. McGorty stated that governments change contracts all the time and he would like to get an
opinion from City and County legal staff of what the legal obligations would be in terms of
altering some of the road projects. The scenario painted provided very few options and he would
like other alternatives. Mr. Davis stated that there would be some legal and financial
ramifications because there was a JPA with FDOT to construct CCNW/SW as well as
commitments related to the $42M for ROW and $8M from the Federal government.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the legal ramification was that Blueprint might loose the $42M. Mr.
Maher stated that it would not free up any of the $109 that needed to be cut. Mr. Davis stated
that it was worse than that because Blueprint had spent a considerable amount of that $42M
acquiring ROW. He did not anticipate FDOT allowing Blueprint to keep that money if we did
not build the road. Mr. McGorty stated that he felt that type of analysis would be very important
to do on a project by project basis.

Mr. Taylor stated that he was fairly cautious but did not know all the facts, they could speculate
on ups or downs of the market or what FDOT might or might not do. He questioned what would
the implication be of not following through because CCNW/SW was the biggest transportation
project. Mr. Maher stated that they were in the best case scenario only talking about $40M. Mr.
McGorty stated that would be one third and removing Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1 would be
another third. Mr. Maher stated that was exactly what he was hoping to achieve through their
discussion. Mr. McGorty stated that the objective was to keep some of the projects intact to have
completed corridors and environmental projects that were not so fragmented that they no longer meant anything to the public.

Mr. Davis stated that he understood Mr. McGorty to say that he would prefer staff to revisit Capital Cascade Trail to fully fund as many of the segments rather than partially fund all. That seemed contrary to what the CAC recommended at the last meeting. Mr. McGorty agreed it was 100% contrary but that was with a deficit of $70M and the deficit was currently at $109M. He further stated that would get them through one project. He would also prefer staff to perform the analysis in terms of legal liability on certain road projects outside of any currently signed contracts.

Mr. Davis stated that staff could do that. He felt fairly certain that he knew what the response would be from FDOT but would pursue it anyway. Moreover, the Agency Board had always told staff that their number one priority was to “get to the Airport.” He did not think that they would approve a staff recommendation to not build past Tennessee Street. Mr. Maher pointed out that from an environmental standpoint there were many positive impacts to Gum Swamp that would not occur if Blueprint did not construct CCNW/SW.

Mr. Taylor stated that the flip side was that by the nature of road construction, a contract was necessary. That was not the case with environmental projects. He suggested fully funding one segment of Capital Cascade Trail and entering into a contract to secure those funds. Mr. Davis stated that he could not do that without the design or permits. If he had those two pieces, segments of Capital Cascade Trail would be under contract already.

Mr. McGorty stated that he felt they had raised concerns on some items and would like to explore the issue regarding segments on Capital Cascade Trail. He would argue the review of road projects with non-contractual obligations as well; recognizing that it could be down to one project. Lastly, when the CAC returned in August, with the benefit of the IA’s discussion available to them, they could offer a priority if the funding prospects improved in the future.

**Kevin McGorty moved approval of the Master Plan subject to re-examination of Capital Cascade Trail, in terms of funding of complete segments and Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest for legal and financial ramifications of termination or delay of that project. Dianna Norwood seconded the motion. It passed seven to one with Scott Balog casting the dissenting vote.**

Mr. Davis questioned if the committee as a whole supported or if it was the opinion of the majority that Blueprint to investigate not constructing CCNW/SW. Mr. Patterson stated that he was not sure because he was not clear on what the ramifications would be. Mr. Maher stated, besides the legal and financial, the ramification would be not getting to the Airport. Mr. Davis stated that the impact would be, $39M would be available to put onto another project. Mr. Patterson stated that he did not think the IA would approve that course of action. Mr. Davis concurred.

Mr. McGorty stated that was the prerogative of the IA however, it the responsibility of the CAC to say that the one dimensional option for cuts did not reflect the broader goals of Blueprint 2000. He acknowledged that the CAC was merely an advisory board to the IA. He was not
suggesting that the road system never be constructed but that staff examines it from the use of Blueprint dollars. So that funding could be reallocated into other projects.

Citizens To Be Heard

Steve Bailey stated that he was present to speak to a wetland/floodplain mitigation site that was recently cancelled by Blueprint. He spoke of his, and on behalf of his family, their disappointment at the cancellation of the purchase due to the flooding of the area. He stated that millions of dollars were being spent on roadways and parks however in an area where residential tenants and owner-occupants were being impacted Blueprint cancelled the acquisition of property. He distributed photographs of flooding in the Tanglewood mobile home park. Mr. Bright noted that some of the images had been previously distributed (at the April 2008 CAC meeting).

Mr. Bailey described the location of Tanglewood, the locations of the swamps, creeks, and ditches and how it was channeled past Tanglewood. He also spoke to the recent history of their experiences, correspondence with Blueprint, and concerns; as documented in the February and April 2008 CAC minutes.

Mr. McGorty stated that the CAC was given a full presentation at their previous two meetings. The CAC had taken action on it and concluded that Blueprint staff had done their due diligence with it as well. Mr. Bailey stated that he appreciated the CAC’s time and acknowledged the previous presentations because many people would be impacted by Blueprint’s decision. Furthermore, he sat through the full CAC meeting, listening to their discussions and as a member of the public he would continue to give his input because it really impacted people.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 p.m.
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CAC Status Report on Blueprint 2000
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The attached “Citizens Advisory Committee Report on Blueprint 2000” is proposed for publication in the Tallahassee Democrat.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Ballot Language for the extension of the sales tax noted that the tax would be extended until December 31, 2019 “with project spending subject to annual independent audit as well as review by a citizens advisory committee.”

A Financial Audit of the Blueprint Program is conducted annually. In addition, a Performance Evaluation is prepared annually describing the accomplishments of the Blueprint Program, adherence to the goals and philosophy of the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee and is one element in the preparation of the CAC’s Report to the Community.

Recommended Action:
No action required, presented to the IA for information.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Not presented to the TCC.

The CAC approved the Status Report at their meeting of August 21.

ATTACHMENTS:
The downturn in the economy over the last several years has also affected Blueprint 2000. Based on this trend, Blueprint has revised its projected growth rates for the Program. This has resulted in a reduction of over $106 million from the 15-year Master Plan. When the economy rebounds, the Program income will be reviewed and additional projects may be able to be funded. Blueprint staff continues to seek additional revenues thru grants, legislative appropriations and earmarks, and low-interest infrastructure loans.

Financial Update

Widening Improves Access to Airport

The completed widening of Capital Circle NW from Interstate 10 to south of US 90 was celebrated by a ribbon cutting ceremony on September 26, 2007. The two-mile, $75 million project was the first project completed with sales tax funds, and will improve access to the Tallahassee Regional Airport. The project included sidewalks, bike lanes, and bus pullouts; additional landscaping is scheduled to be installed by the fall. Landscaping, a trail, and benches are also to be installed at the Regional Stormwater Pond on West Tennessee Street.

Environmental Issues Key in Capital Circle Projects

This Regional Stormwater Pond was constructed for the Capital Circle project immediately north. However, it shows Blueprint 2000’s commitment to improve existing conditions with its corridor projects. Over 70 percent of the pond’s treatment capacity is for stormwater retrofit – roadways and parking lots which previously sent untreated stormwater runoff into Gum Swamp. This pond, and others to be with the Capital Circle widening from US 90 to Orange Avenue, will improve water quality within the basin that drains into Lake Munson. Construction on the US 90 to Orange Avenue segment of Capital Circle NW/SW is expected to begin by mid-2009. Over 180 acres have been acquired in this area for stormwater treatment, flood plain mitigation, and for greenway preservation.

Construction Begins in 2009 on Cascade Park

Blueprint has initiated the stormwater and park programming study for the next two segments of Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 3 along FAMU Way and Segment 4 leading south to Lake Henrieetta. During late 2009, the Board will determine which elements of Segments 3 and 4 will proceed to construction.

More information on the Blueprint 2000 Program and the status of each project can be found at: www.blueprint2000.org or by contacting us at 850-701-2740.
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County
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Mark Beaudoin, COT
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David Bright, Blueprint 2000
Greg Burke, CRTPA
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Shelonda Gay, Blueprint 2000
Tony Park, Leon County Public Works
Vince Long, County Administration
Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000
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Gabriel Menendez, COT
Harry Reed, CRTPA
Angela Richardson, Blueprint 2000
Debra Schiro, Blueprint 2000
Rita Stevens, COT
Anita Favors Thompson, City Manager
Patrick Twyman, COT
Michael Wright, City Manager’s Office
Bill Woolery, COT

OTHERS PRESENT

James H. Bailey
Nathan Bailey
Steve Bailey
Bill Berlow, Tallahassee Democrat
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Jack Curatelli, Florida Acquisitions
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Amanda Hopkins, Greenhorne & O’Mara
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Maribel Nicholson-Choice*

City
Randy Matheny, OR Colan
Jerry Oshesky, The LPA Group*
Charles Pattison
Gary Phillips, The LPA Group*
Margie Quillman, The LPA Group*
Jim Shepherd, Jacobs Engineering*
Christopher Snyder, Blueprint 2000*
Dave Snyder, The LPA Group*
Tyrone Scorsone, FDOT
Charles Stratton, Broad & Cassel
Lamar Taylor, Citizen’s Advisory Committee
Latesa Turner, Jacobs Engineering*
Ryan Wetherall, KHA
Ruth Wharton, RRSQ
Karyl Wolfe
Ray Youmans, THC*

* Indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

Chairman Ed DePuy called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.
I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Davis stated that there was one agenda modification to the discussion portion of the agenda, Item #M-1, Fiscal Year 2007 Performance Audit, which was finalized on May 30, 2008.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Capital Circle NW/SW Access Management Public Hearing

This item was presented as informational only.

2. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update and Schedule

This item was presented as informational only.

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

This item was presented as informational only.

4. Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update

This item was presented as informational only.

5. Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 and 4 Design Update

This item was presented as informational only.

6. Mahan Drive Update

This item was presented as informational only.

7. Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel

This item was presented as informational only.

8a/b CAC Meeting Minutes – (February 7, 2008 and April 3, 2008)

This item was presented as informational only.

Mr. Davis recommended the Board move to the Consent Items; assuming no one had any questions regarding the Information Items. Commissioner DePuy stated that for the record a copy of the agenda packet was provided ahead of time and each Commissioner had been briefed on all of the items.
IV. CONSENT


RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve minutes as provided.

10. Cultural Facilities Grant Resolution

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

11. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue - Right of Way Acquisition (Additional Parcels) and Resolution

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

Commissioner Katz moved to accept the consent items. Chairman Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 8-0. (Commissioner Proctor was absent.)

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

M-1. Fiscal Year 2007 Performance Audit

Mr. Davis stated that the Florida Center for Prevention Research Emerging Issues & Assessment at Florida State University performed the Performance Audit which was an annual requirement of the of the Blueprint 2000 program. The report was finalized on May 30, 2008. Mr. Davis introduced Mr. Thomas Bowermeister, Florida Center for Prevention Research. Mr. Bowermeister thanked the Board for the opportunity to conduct the audit. He stated that his organization used on-line surveys, interviews with key officials and the general engineering team. The assessment was that the Blueprint 2000 program was doing an outstanding job and offered to entertain questions regarding the evaluation.

Commissioner Thaell stated that although he knew that the Blueprint 2000 staff was doing a fine job, he could not comment on the report because he had not had a chance to review the report since it was handed out at the meeting. He stated that he would like to take at least five minutes to review the report.

Commissioner DePuy stated that there would be an informal recess so that the Commissioners could review the report. Mr. Davis apologized and stated that the report was finalized on May
30, 2008, and that he did not want to wait until September to present the report. He further stated that he had asked Mr. Bowermeister to be very brief in his report. Commissioner Thaell stated that he could see that the performance audit was the extremely strong audit as he expected, however he wanted to confirm that before voting to accept it.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Review and comment on the FY 2007 Performance Audit

Commissioner Thaell moved the staff recommendation. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Commissioner Lightsey stated that the report indicated that Blueprint received grades of 77.8% on two important criteria, which were: had Blueprint 2000 maintained consistency with the original goals of the plan that was discussed with the public and finding external money to fund the program. She stated that these two items were exceptionally important to her. Commissioner DePuy stated that he agreed with Commissioner Lightsey especially in light of the constrained budgets that local government was dealing with. The motion carried unanimously 9-0.

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

Mr. Conger reiterated the role of the EECC in the development of the Blueprint 2000 program and mentioned that the intention of the program was to integrate “Gray and Green” projects into the program. He stated that the CAC had voted to take the following actions, (1) Approve the FY 2009 operating budget as presented, and (2) Recognize that the plan and budget are subject to further hearings and final approval in September. He further stated that the CAC recommended approval of the Master Plan subject to re-examination of Capital Cascade Trail, in terms of funding of complete segments and re-examination of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest for possible budget re-allocation and review of legal and financial ramifications of termination or delay of that project. Furthermore the CAC recommended that the priorities and plans, so carefully established in the Master Plan that the Board approved prior to the projected reductions of revenues, be re-established when the economy returned to normal. (A copy of Mr. Conger’s full statement is attached.)

Commissioner Lightsey asked that Mr. Conger be more specific in the recommendations regarding Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest. Mr. Conger stated that the CAC requested staff to conduct further analysis of the cost impacts of any fund reallocations from Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest that might be applied to the Capital Cascades projects.

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS (continued)

12. Election of Intergovernmental Agency Vice-Chair

Commissioner DePuy stated that the current meeting would be his last as the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Agency and that City Commissioner Andrew Gillum would be the new
Chairman. He further stated that according to the bylaws the new Vice-Chairman needed to be a county commissioner. He opened the floor for nominations of the Vice-Chairman.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
That the Agency conducts an election for a Vice Chair-person in accordance with the approved By-Laws

**Commissioner Thaell nominated Commissioner Sauls to Vice-Chairman.** Commissioner Proctor seconded the nomination. There were no further nominations. The motion carried unanimously 9-0.

13. **Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Update**

Mr. Davis stated that the proposed dog park had been removed from the plans for Capital Cascade Park. Furthermore the previously unfunded proposed Veterans’ Memorial plaza would be funded by the local Veterans’ community. He mentioned that staff would be submitting applications for linear infrastructure variances from the City of Tallahassee, Land Development Code.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
This item was presented as informational only.

14. **Proposed FY 2009 Blueprint Operating Budget**

Mr. Davis stated that the budget represented a 3.42% overall reduction in the budget with a place holder for salary increases of 3%, with a caveat that staff would receive the higher pay raise of either the City or the County once they have been established.

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

15. **Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009-FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget**

Mr. Davis stated that the Master Plan was revised to reflect a reduction of the overall plan by $109.4M due to declining sales tax revenues. He stated that Blueprint would continue to leverage the funds that were available and staff had provided very general options with a request for guidance from the Board. He further stated that the reason that there were not very detailed options was of the complexity. He mentioned that attachment 1 were those outlined in option one of the agenda item (This option was developed considering financial and legal commitments as well as prior Board priorities. These priorities included completing Capital Circle Northwest Southwest, Blueprint’s signature project Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2, City and County Water Quality dollars, and Land Bank which is used to acquire ROW, Sensitive Lands and
provides a needed contingency) and that changes were indicated by the blue colored cells on the spreadsheet.

Commissioner DePuy asked when the Board would need to adopt the budget. Mr. Davis stated that it would need to be adopted at the September 2008 Intergovernmental Agency meeting. Mr. Davis addressed the comment that Blueprint had reduced the budget at the expense of environmental projects. He pointed out that as shown in Attachment 4, Comparison of Corridor and Environmental Projects, in the Master Plan for FY 2008 environmental projects were 48% and in the proposed FY 2009 environmental projects will be 43% of the overall budget. He stated the original EECC envisioned that the environmental projects would be 1/3 of the program.

Commissioner Thaell stated that the assumption was that the economy would rebound and that everything would work out. He stated that the Blueprint should begin talks with the State and the Department of Transportation about taking some responsibility on their roads because of the growth in the county.

Commissioner Mustian asked Mr. Davis to elaborate on the CAC comments regarding the legal and financial ramifications to FDOT. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint received $42M in SIS funds from FDOT to purchase right of way along Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest; some of which had already been spent. He stated that Blueprint had received $8M from Federal DOT for construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest. He further stated that the CAC asked staff to determine the ramifications of not pursuing the construction of the project. Mr. Davis stated that in his personal opinion, Blueprint was legally obligated to continue with the project. And that staff’s analysis was that the Board’s priority for transportation was to get to the Airport.

Commissioner Mustian asked what the CAC’s recommendation was regarding funding of complete segments of Capital Cascade Trail and which one they recommended funding. Mr. Davis stated that the CAC’s recommendation was to fund full segments; however there would be no recommendation of which segment until the ongoing study of segments 3 and 4 are completed.

Commissioner Lightsey asked Mr. Davis to clarify what funding remains for segments 2, 3 and 4 of Capital Cascades Trail. Mr. Maher stated that segment 2 was fully funded through construction, Segments 3 & 4 include some right of way and interim stormwater improvements, and $5M was shown in Segment 1 for interim stormwater improvements for relief of flooding.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the Board has been funding the projects as they went along and that Blueprint has been such a success in completing projects and spent money early in the program and so the only place to take money from are the final projects. She stated that the Board need to be very concerned about completing as much of the stormwater retrofit to Lake Munson because promises were made based upon that. She further stated that the parks, trail and amenities could be added back in later, but as much of the infrastructure as possible needed to be completed in order to address the pollutants, flooding controls and the water quality issues of the area.
Commissioner Thaell stated that he agreed with Commissioner Lightsey. Mr. Davis stated that Kimley-Horn has been hired to study both segments 3 & 4 and take them both to 30% design. He stated that based on the hydrological studies and the design, staff would come back to the Board and present a recommendation for which one should go to 100% design and through to construction. He further stated that if water quality remains the Board’s desire then staff will continue to recommend Segment 4 as the next construction priority.

Commissioner Mustian stated that the City would be working to improve and extend FAMU Way and with Segment 3 adjacent to that project, it would be more efficient for Blueprint to work on Segment 3 in conjunction with the City’s project. He stated that he would like the Board to consider this alternative.

Commissioner Proctor stated that Capital Cascade Trail had been originally prioritized in order of Segments 2, 4, 3 then 1. Mr. Davis concurred. Commissioner Proctor stated that Commissioner Mustian’s recommendation makes sense to achieve maximum efficiency; however he was concerned with the timing of the project. Mr. Davis stated that FAMU Way would be ahead of Blueprint in the construction of Segment 3 because there is no money for the next segment’s construction until 2012. He stated that Blueprint has been coordinating with the City on FAMU Way and that there are discussions of Blueprint taking the construction lead. Commissioner Proctor stated that he was in support of FAMU Way construction and that he would like to see all of the amenities that would frame it by constructing segment 3. He further stated that he would be in favor of reordering the projects to prioritize them in order of 2, 3, 4 then 1.

Mr. Davis stated that he would like to have clarification that the Board would like to have a staff to revisit the funding on Segments 3 and 4, looking at the most critical aspects. Mr. Maher interjected that he also would like to know if the Board wanted the $5M to remain for interim improvements in Segment 1 or whether it should be reallocated to Segment 3 or 4. Commissioner Lightsey stated that she could not give a definitive answer because she could not remember the number of ponds, etc; however she wanted the basic infrastructure to take a high priority in Segments 3 and 4. She further stated that she would be open to reprogramming the $5M. Mr. Davis stated that the he believed interim improvements could be done on Franklin Boulevard for $5M in conjunction with Segment 2 being completed to significantly reduce the flooding on Franklin Boulevard and at Leon High School. Commissioner Mustian stated that he would like to see the trade offs in a future meeting. Mr. Davis requested clarification, was the Board indicating that they were not following the CAC recommendation, to put the money on one segment to complete it, but instead to address the most critical needs on each segment as the money became available?

Commissioner Thaell stated that the improvements in Segment 3 were inline with the improvements on Gaines Street and revitalizing that part of town and that there would be significant impacts on downstream water quality from the proposed improvements. He stated that his recommendation was to pay attention to segment 2 and 4.

Commissioner Lightsey asked staff to send out a map of the Segment 3 and 4 infrastructure proposed for this project.
Commissioner Proctor stated that the project was ordered 2, 4, 3 then 1 to insure that the flooding issues could be relieved and that water had a place to go. He stated that practically the $5M that is in Segment 1 should be moved to segment 4. Commissioner Lightsey stated that staff should cost out each segment and bring the information back to the Board for a vote.

Commissioner Proctor asked for an update of the status of Capital Circle (Woodville to Crawfordville). Mr. Davis stated that the approximate $2M was for preliminary engineering, administrative costs and minor design. He stated that there was no money for construction or 100% design. Commissioner Proctor stated that he would like to suggest to the County Commission that if the fairground were placed in the area that improvements would need to be made to Capital Circle. Mr. Davis stated that previously staff had investigated building this segment by using and matching TRIP funds, however with the economy in a downturn it Blueprint was not able to provide the match at this time. He further stated that there was a bill in Congress that would provide Blueprint with the required right of way easement for the widening and the pond sites needed for that segment of the road.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Review and comment on the revised Master Plan Capital Budget.

**VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

Mr. Stephen Bailey introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that he would like to speak to the Board regarding Tanglewood Estates and the fact that Blueprint 2000 was no longer interested in purchasing the property due to costs. He provided the Board with background of the property and stated that it had a history of flooding in the area. Mr. Bailey provided the Board with a copy of his presentation, which is on record at the Blueprint 2000 office for review.

Commissioner Proctor asked Mr. Davis to what extent promises or offers were made to purchase the property. Mr. Davis stated that there were no offers made and the Blueprint followed the right of way acquisition procedure of FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration. He stated that as a part of due diligence, the County provided Blueprint with several potential sites that would satisfy the environmental requirements needed to complete the roadway project. All of these properties were evaluated, cost appraisals were done and the Tanglewood property was eliminated from consideration. He stated that in the course of doing the evaluations the residents were notified of what was going on and that there was a possibility that the properties would be purchased. Mr. Davis stated that he has spoken to the Baileys several times regarding the decision not to purchase the property.

Commissioner Proctor asked how far Blueprint had gone in making offers to the residents of Tanglewood. Mr. Davis stated that no offers had been made; the property was only being evaluated to determine if it was the best course to pursue and it was determined early on that it was not. He stated that the property would be very expensive and it didn’t meet the requirements for wetland mitigation.
Mr. James Bailey introduced himself and provided his address. He stated that he owned 11 properties in the mobile home park and he stated that he had a letter that was not with him that stated the Blueprint was going to purchase the properties. He further stated that purchasing the property would be the right thing to do to because of the flooding in the area. He mentioned that the property has not been appraised to assess the value and that he would sell any property in Tanglewood for $35,000. Mr. Bailey stated that he felt that Blueprint was doing the easy thing and not the right thing.

Mr. Charles Pattison, 1000 Friends of Florida, introduced himself and provided his address. Mr. Pattison stated that he would like to speak to the Board regarding the budget and that he could not see how the Board could consider taking $55M from the Capital Cascade project because it is a signature project. He further stated that staff should look at more alternative approaches to the budget than environmental versus roadway. Commissioner Lightsey stated that staff has been directed to bring back more alternatives. Commissioner DePuy reiterated that Commissioner Lightsey was correct.

Karyl Wolfe introduced herself stated that she lived and owned her property in Tanglewood. Mrs. Wolfe stated that it would be very costly today to replace her property and that there was a lot of flooding in her neighborhood. She stated that if Capital Circle was widened to 6-lanes into Gum Swamp then the water will go down hill into her neighborhood. She stated that she would like to see more attention paid to the people on the Southside.

Commissioner Sauls asked if there would be things done during the construction that will relieve the flooding into Tanglewood. Mrs. Latesa Turner, Capital Circle Northwest/ Southwest Project Manager stated that the mitigation that would be done in the area will address the direct impact that the roadway will have on the floodplains and the existing wetlands. She further stated that as a part of the environmental permitting, the requirements are to not make any conditions worse. She also stated that Tanglewood Estates is not a part of this project. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was proposing more than the minimum than was required for stormwater treatment. Furthermore neither Blueprint, nor the permitting departments, would create a situation that could potentially be worse than what currently existed.

Mr. Charles Stratton, Attorney, introduced himself and provided his address. Mr. Stratton provided his background and stated that Blueprint had agreements with FDOT which required it to follow state law and manuals when acquiring properties for right of way. He stated that Blueprint was not following those manuals and that it was jeopardizing millions of dollars for those projects. He further stated that he had filed suit against Blueprint because they made an offer to purchase property from his client and then refused to close on it. He stated that they later sent a letter rescinding the offer to purchase the property after his client had accepted the offer.

Commissioner DePuy stated that if the lawsuit had been filed then the Board was prohibited from discussing the issue. Mr. Davis stated that the lawsuit was received at Blueprint on the day of the meeting. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint did withdraw the offers because of significant savings that was involved.
Commissioner Sauls asked that board attorney to review the files on whether the law was followed on the Tanglewood properties.

Mr. Jeff Hunter introduced himself and provided his address. Mr. Hunter asked if the Board considered the bike/pedestrian element environmental or transportation. Mr. Davis stated all of the above because all of the transportation elements contained a bike/pedestrian and specifically in the Capital Cascade Trail network which contains a very extensive trail network. Mr. Hunter asked how many stand alone projects have been done as reference in a 2000 newspaper article that made specific promises before the program was voted on. He stated that at the time of the vote he was the City’s Bike/Pedestrian coordinator and that maybe Mr. Davis was not aware of what was promised. He further stated that the article stated that there would be $16M in stand alone bike/pedestrian projects and that he wanted to know what happened to that money. Commissioner DePuy stated that Mr. Davis could answer the question at the current meeting or research the issue and bring it back to the Board for full discussion at the September 2008 meeting. Mr. Hunter stated that with gas prices going up that it is very important that bike/pedestrian be addressed.

Commissioner Sauls presented Commissioner DePuy with an embroidered Blueprint 2000 shirt in appreciation for serving as the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Agency.

VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no items brought forward by the Commissioners.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman DePuy adjourned the meeting at 4:32 pm.

APPROVED: 

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

ATTEST:

________________________   __________________________
Andrew Gillum     Shelonda Meeks
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA   Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
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Capital Circle
Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue Right-of-Way Acquisition (SR 20 Parcels) and Resolution
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests approval to proceed with the acquisition of right-of-way that has been identified for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
On November 15, 2004, the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) approved the Blueprint 2000 Real Estate Policy. Section 105.09 of the policy titled Acquisitions for Capital Improvement Projects, provides for the approval by the IA of a Resolution (Attachment 1) stating the public purpose of a project and the necessity of acquiring parcels needed to construct the project, which are identified in the Resolution. The acquisition of the necessary parcels can be in the form of a negotiated settlement or through condemnation. On September 18, 2006 by Resolution No. 2006-04 and on September 17, 2007 by Resolution No. 2007-06, the IA approved the acquisition of Parcels 105, 126, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166 and 243 and temporary construction easements, 703 and 705. Due to apparent budget constraints for right-of-way on the Capital Circle NW/SW project, which is expected to exceed the $42 million of Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) funds from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District III, an investigation was conducted to determine if design changes could reduce areas of acquisition along State Road 20 (SR 20), in order to reduce right-of-way costs. A substantive design change has been developed, which significantly reduces the depth of the right-of-way required from the north side of SR 20. While the potential savings have not been quantified, the reduced area meets the applicable design standards. Thus Blueprint is requesting approval to proceed with the acquisition of this revised right-of-way located adjacent to the north side of State Road 20, and as depicted on the location map. The revised parcels are identified as Parcels 105, 126, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166, 243, 703 and 705.

In addition, several temporary construction easements (720, 721 and 722) and a drainage easement (801) are required. Funding for the right-of-way consists of $42 Million of SIS funds.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing right of way acquisition of eight (8) parcels and two corresponding temporary construction easements, revised as the result of substantive
design changes, and three (3) new temporary construction easements and one (1) new drainage easement necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing right of way acquisition of eight (8) parcels and two corresponding temporary construction easements, revised as the result of substantive design changes, and three (3) new temporary construction easements and one (1) new drainage easement necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

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

ATTACHMENTS:

NOTE: Final maps and legal descriptions are currently being prepared and will be provided to commissioners at their scheduled briefing or as an Agenda Modification at the September 15 meeting.

1. Resolution with Composite Exhibit “A”, which consists of the legal descriptions and sketches of the parcels.

2. Location Map
# 11

CAC

Appointments
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item advises the Intergovernmental Agency on four required appointments to the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee. All current positions expire in November 2008 and all appointments will be effective through November 2011. The first meeting for newly appointed or reappointed members will be the December 4, 2008 CAC meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Four CAC positions require action:

1. Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC) Member: This position is currently filled by Kevin McGorty. Mr. McGorty was initially appointed in February 2004 to complete the term of Kathy Archibald, and was reappointed to a full term in September 2005. The EECC has re-nominated Kevin McGorty to the position. The appointment term will be through November 2011.

2. Chair/Representative from the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Commission: This position was filled by Dianna Norwood whose term on the Planning Commission has expired. The Planning Commission has nominated Burt Davy to the position. Mr. Davy has previously served on the Blueprint CAC, from its inception in November 2001 until February 2004. The appointment term will be through November 2011.

3. Planner - nominated by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC): This position is currently filled by Tom O’Steen who was initially appointed in February 2007 to complete the term of Charles Pattison. Mr. O’Steen is eligible for reappointment. The EECC has re-nominated Tom O’Steen to the position. The appointment term will be through November 2011.

4. Representative from the Disabled Community: This position is currently filled by Steve Amnott. Although Mr. Amnott has only been a member of the CAC since September 2006, he has not met attendance requirements and is not recommended for reappointment. Ability First/Leon Center for Independent Living has nominated --------- --------- -. The appointment term will be through November 2011.
OPTIONS

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

Option 2: Provide Board guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

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

Action by TCC and CAC:

Not presented to the TCC.

The CAC endorsed the appointments of Kevin McGorty, Burt Davy, and Tom O’Steen. No nomination had been received from the Disabled Community (Ability 1st) by the CAC meeting date.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment: nomination for Burt Davy
Bright, David

From: Perrine, Beth [Beth.Perrine@talgov.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2008 10:50 AM
To: Bright, David
Subject: Planning Commission Appointee to the BP2000 CAC

Dave,

On July 1, 2008, the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Commission voted to appoint Burt Davy as the Planning Commission representative on the BP2000 Citizen Advisory Committee.

Thank you.

Beth Perrine
Tallahassee-Leon County Planning
851-6410
Beth.Perrine@talgov.com

Click here to take our Survey

7/16/2008
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Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 - Design Supplemental Services Approval
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item advises the IA of the reallocation of funds from CCT: Segment 2’s construction budget to the design budget in order to fund additional design services not included in the original Cascade Park concept, as described below.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Supplemental Services will provide funding for additional design services (Attachment 1) for tasks that have been added to the original scope of services for the project. These items will enhance flood control, stormwater treatment and park amenities for Cascade Park. The following is a list of the major supplemental services design tasks and their associated costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alum injection system design &amp; permitting (Brown &amp; Caldwell for the system mechanical/electrical/structural, EGS for the Geotechnical, and Genesis for the site design)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design of additional structural elements including retaining walls and restroom re-design (Garcia for the walls and Rosenbaum for the restroom)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Veterans Memorial (Carr Lynch and Sandell) for the design, Garcia for the structural and Genesis for the site &amp; landscape design) - to be reimbursed by the Leon County Veterans Association.</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Double bypass culvert and conflict structure design (Garcia for the structural and Genesis for the site and final stormwater design)</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$428,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is approximately $50,000.00 remaining in contingency for this project. Therefore, this request is to reallocate $378,400.00 ($428,400.00 - $50,000.00) from the CCT: Segment 2 construction budget to the design budget which will also replenish the contingency funding. This design supplemental has approximately 35% MBE participation (Garcia and EGS).
OPTIONS:
Option 1:
1. Authorize a new contractual limit of $5,461,721.39 for Contract 533 with Genesis Group consistent with this Supplemental Services Request No. 8.
2. Approve the Supplemental Services Request for up to $378,400.00 to fund design additions for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.
3. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

Advantages:
- Adds chemical treatment to enhance stormwater water quality in St. Augustine Branch.
- In order to increase the amount of stormwater retained, numerous retaining walls were added and wall heights increased during the project design.
- This Supplemental Agreement will advance fund the design for the Leon County Veterans’ Memorial which will allow the concept to move forward. Blueprint will execute an agreement with the Leon County Veterans Association to secure reimbursement for this cost.

Disadvantages:
- None

Option 2: Board Guidance

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

ATTACHMENT(S)
Attachment 1 – Supplemental Services #8 Scope of Work
Attachment 2 – Contract 533 breakouts by consultant fees
ATTACHMENT # 1

Supplemental Services Request No. 8

SCOPE OF WORK

CAPITAL CASCADE TRAIL
SEGMENT 2 DESIGN AND PERMITTING

August 2008
1 STORMWATER CHEMICAL TREATMENT SYSTEM DESIGN

Introduction - Capital Cascade Park is a multi-use park which contains the existing St. Augustine Branch, a wet pond at the north end of the park and a wet pond at the south end of the park. Drainage generally flows from north to south and outfalls under the CSX railroad. Approximately 700 acres drain through the St. Augustine Branch to the north end of the existing surface water system. An existing 54-inch stormsewer outfalls to the surface water system from Myers Park just north of Gaines Street. Other smaller stormsewers outfall to various points in the surface water system. Without enhanced chemical treatment, water quality in the park ponds/creek system is expected to be poor. An evaluation was completed to analyze the load reduction and optimum configuration for a chemical treatment system to treat stormwater inputs into the off-line system to reduce pollutant loads discharging from the pond system and to improve surface water quality within the park ponds.

The selected chemical treatment points include the off-line inflow into the upper pond and the 54-inch stormsewer from Myers Park. The proposed treatment system will include an underground stormwater flow metering and chemical feed equipment vault, an underground chemical storage tank, two stormwater flow sensors located in the two stormsewer diversions, small diameter PVC lines from the equipment vault to the points of flow measurement and chemical addition, two stormwater flow meters and miscellaneous electrical and mechanical equipment. The system will operate automatically in response to stormwater flows in the diversions.

1.1 Scope of Services - The following scope of work outlines the tasks required to complete the design of the Chemical Treatment System:

1.1.1 Scope of Services - includes preparation and submission of the following for the chemical treatment system:

- 60% and final construction drawings
- 60% and final general requirements and technical specifications
- Environmental Resource Permit application information document for the chemical treatment element of the project
- FDEP 319 and TMDL grant applications
- 60% and final opinions of probable construction cost for the chemical treatment system.

1.1.2 Construction Drawings will include: layout and details for stormwater flow metering, chemical treatment and underground chemical storage components; vault structural, mechanical and electrical layout and details; layout and details for water and sanitary sewer services for the system and miscellaneous details needed for construction of the chemical treatment system.

1.1.3 General Requirements and Technical Specifications will be prepared for the following: flow metering, chemical treatment and underground chemical storage components; vault structural, mechanical and electrical; water and sanitary sewer services and miscellaneous items needed for construction of the chemical treatment system.

Opinions of probable construction cost and grant applications will be prepared for all chemical treatment system components.
1.1.4 Geotechnical Investigation for Alum Injection Facilities

Field Investigation

- Install 1-25 feet deep soil boring with SPT on 2 ½ feet centers at the location of the drop inlet (25 feet).
- Install 1-25 feet deep soil boring with SPT on 2 ½ feet centers at the location of the buried underground storage tank (25 feet) grout soil borings closed.

Laboratory Testing

- One (1) grain-size test per 10 feet of soil boring (5 tests)
- One (1) plasticity test per 20 feet of soil boring (3 tests)
- One (1) organic content per 20 feet of soil boring (2 tests)

Report – The CONSULTANT shall prepare a brief Geotechnical report containing:

- A summary of field and laboratory testing
- A summary of subsurface conditions
- Depths to measured and estimated seasonal high groundwater
- Geotechnical design parameters and allowable bearing pressures
- Construction considerations

1.2 Final Design and Permitting Phase - the following specific tasks will be completed by the CONSULTANT for the chemical treatment system:

1.2.1 Attend a Final Design Kick-Off Meeting with BLUEPRINT 2000 to review the selected chemical treatment system configuration, project schedule, meeting schedule, permitting and specific requirements for construction drawings, general requirements, technical specifications, and opinions of probable construction cost.

During the same visit, conduct a field meeting with BLUEPRINT 2000 to select the final location for the equipment vault, the underground storage tank and other chemical treatment system components.

1.2.2 Coordinate Design and Permitting Activities - Review design documents and information related to the overall project and the design of the chemical treatment system. Perform general project management activities related to completing the design and permitting of the chemical treatment system.

1.2.3 Prepare 60% Construction Plans - The plans will include all elements of the proposed chemical treatment system including civil, environmental, mechanical, structural and electrical. The plan set will include: an overall chemical treatment system design sheet (plan view); multiple detailed chemical treatment system design sheets (plan views); vault structural sheets; vault electrical and mechanical sheets; chemical treatment, water flow metering and underground storage
tank detail sheets and miscellaneous detail sheets. All drawings will be prepared using AutoCAD on 24-inch x 36-inch drawing.

1.2.4 Prepare 60% General Requirements and Technical Specifications for all chemical treatment system project elements shown in the construction plans including civil, environmental, structural, electrical and mechanical.

1.2.5 Prepare a 60% Opinion of Probable Construction Cost for the chemical treatment system.

1.2.6 Prepare and Submit four (4) sets of 60% Construction Plans, General Requirements, Technical Specifications and Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.

1.2.7 Conduct a Meeting to review and discuss comments on the 60% construction documents submittal.

1.2.8 Assist the City of Tallahassee in coordinating with the City Wastewater Department related to future floc discharge to the City wastewater system.

1.2.9 Attend a Pre-Application Meeting with NFWMD to review the project as designed and to obtain comments to be incorporated into the Environmental Resource permit application documentation for the chemical treatment system and the Final Construction Documents.

1.2.10 Prepare and Submit chemical treatment system information for the Environmental Resource permitting of the chemical treatment system (for the submittal to the NFWMD).

1.2.11 Prepare and Submit grant applications for construction of the chemical treatment system under the FDEP 319 and TMDL grant programs (for BLUEPRINT 2000 submittal to FDEP).

1.2.12 Prepare Final Construction Plans based on comments received on the 60% construction documents and adding additional information and detail to the drawings for construction. All drawings will be prepared using AutoCAD.

1.2.13 Prepare Final General Requirements and Technical Specifications based on comments received on the 60% construction documents and adding additional information and detail to these documents for construction.

1.2.14 Prepare a Final Opinion of Probable Construction Cost based on the 100% construction documents.

1.2.15 Prepare and Submit Final Documents, including:

- Digital AutoCAD files of construction plans;
- Four (4) complete signed and sealed sets of drawing prints;
- Four copies and electronic copy of Final Opinion of Probable Construction Cost;
- Four copies and electronic copy of all General Requirements and Technical Specifications.
1.2.16 **Provide Responses** for up to two (2) NFWWMD ERP Requests for Additional Information (RAIs) related to the chemical treatment system in a timely manner.

1.2.17 **Attend a Final Coordination Meeting** to discuss the Bidding and Construction Phases of the project.

2 **Final Structural Design**

**Introduction** - To provide engineering services for the final design of retaining walls, drainage culverts, three trail pedestrian bridges and other items listed below for the Capital Cascade Park Segment 2 Project.

2.1 **Design Review and Calculations** - Under this Task the CONSULTANT will review the following:

2.1.1 Review designs for the reinforced concrete cantilever walls as shown in the 60% submittal designated RW-1 to RW-17; RW-21 to RW-25; RW-29 to RW-31; RW-34; RW-40 to RW-47; and, RW-54 to RW-55.

2.1.2 Steel Sheet Piling walls RW-48 to RW-53 including the reinforced concrete cantilever walls connected to them and referred to as Boca Chuba East and West Walls.

2.1.3 Drainage Channel under CSX RR that includes reinforced concrete cantilever walls RW-56 and RW-57.

2.1.4 Historic Limerock Retaining Wall RW-58 (along Monroe Street) and portion of wall along Bloxham Street.

2.1.5 Boca Chuba Pond Trail Bridge.

2.1.6 Material reviewed consists of relevant information such as feasibility studies, design calculations, 60% plans and drawings, concepts and geotechnical information.

2.2 **Complete Wall Analysis and Design Calculations** - Under this Task the CONSULTANT will complete the analysis and design of the walls listed in Task 2.1 above. This will include modifications to base elevations and steps to improve the construction of the walls and such other relevant details not covered in the design.

Other walls and items covered under this Task include:

2.2.1 Complete the design of the reinforced concrete cantilever walls listed in Task 2.1.1 above. Complete design of reinforced concrete cantilever and other walls for the Meridian Plaza Performance Stage and Amphitheater Steps. Reference sheets HS02.02.4 to 07.

2.2.2 Complete the design for the Boca Chuba steel sheet piling walls designated RW-48 to RW-53 (shown in drawings S01.24 and S01.28) and their connection and integration with the Boca Chuba East and West Walls. Also, the interface between RW-53 (steel sheet piling wall) and RW-52 (reinforced concrete cantilever wall).

2.2.3 Develop the details for the concrete slab (between Boca Chuba East and West walls) on which the Boca Chuba fish will be located. Water will flow from the basin into the channel leading under the CSX RR and the front edge of the slab needs to be protected from undermining by the water flow.
2.2.4 Historic Limerock Retaining Wall RW-58: Complete the design for the Monroe Street Limerock Wall and the Bloxham Street Walls shown in drawing S01.27.

2.2.5 Cascade Fountain Walls: Shown on sheets HS02.02.03, HS 02.02.09, and HS 02.02.10.

2.2.6 Connections to Conspan Culvert and Bridge Structures: the CONSULTANT will develop the details connecting walls RW-8 and RW-9 to the Conspan foundation at the Gaines Street Pedestrian Bridge; the details connecting walls RW-43 and RW-44 to the Gadsen Street Pedestrian Bridge; and, connecting walls RW-11 and RW-21 to the Conspan culvert under the Meridian Plaza. We will meet with and coordinate our work with their structure.

2.2.7 Develop details for the water steps exiting the Conspan structure at the Gadsen Street Pedestrian Bridge at RW-44.

Note - The CONSULTANT will not be responsible for the design of the Conspan Units under the Meridian Plaza (S04.01), Gaines Street Pedestrian Bridge (S05.01), or Gadsen Street Pedestrian Bridge (S06.01). However, time has been allotted for review and coordination with Conspan in Tallahassee.

2.3 Culvert Design Review - Under the Task, the CONSULTANT will review the design of the 9 ft. x 8 ft. reinforced concrete culvert extending from a point just north of the Apalachee Parkway off ramp and Franklin Street (Station 44+37.86) to an exit point along the RW-44 reinforced concrete cantilever retaining wall. The current plan and elevation shown on drawings S02.01 and S02.02 is assumed final and will be used to further the design. Also, the box culvert details shown on drawing S03.01 will be used to further the design.

2.4 Complete Culvert Design - Under the Task, the CONSULTANT will complete the design including the following:

2.4.1 Design a screen at the entrance to the culvert to act as a safety measure preventing individuals from being carried into the system accidentally and divert large (to be defined) objects from entering the drainage structure.

2.4.2 Diversion Pipe at about station 50+00.

2.4.3 Develop manhole access details at the locations specified.

2.4.4 Complete the design of the drop section at about station 68+10 that takes the culvert under an existing electric duct bank crossing transversely across the top of the culvert.

2.4.5 Develop design of trash collection vault beyond station 60+20.

2.4.6 Reinforced concrete channel from end of culvert at approximately station 70+40 extending into the basin near Boca Chuba.

2.5 Second (Double Bypass) Culvert Design – If required the CONSULTANT will complete the design of a second bypass culvert that will extend from the primary bypass culvert to the channel leading under the CSX railroad.

2.6 Incinerator Tree Retaining Wall and Elevated Trail – The CONSULTANT shall complete the design of a retaining wall that will be located at the edge of Cascade Park Lane pavement adjacent to the large oak tree that is located adjacent to the existing (to be demolished by others) Incinerator building.
2.7 Geotechnical Investigation for Incinerator Building Tree Retaining Wall and Elevated Trail

2.7.1 Field Investigation – Install 2-10 feet deep soil borings with SPT on 2 ½ feet centers

2.7.2 Laboratory Testing (Classification and Uniformity Purposes)
- Two (2) grain-size test per soil boring (4 tests)
- One (1) plasticity test per soil boring (2 tests)
- One (1) organic test per soil boring (2 tests)

2.7.3 Report – the CONSULTANT shall prepare a brief addendum to the previously submitted geotechnical report containing the following:
- A summary of field and laboratory testing
- A summary of subsurface conditions
- Depths to measured and estimated seasonal high groundwater
- Geotechnical design parameters and allowable bearing pressures
- Construction consideration

2.8 Complete Drainage Channel Design Under CSX RR - Under the Task, the CONSULTANT will start with the design shown on drawings S01.26 and complete the final design of the components.

2.9 Design of Boca Chuba Pond Trail Bridge - Under the Task, the CONSULTANT will design the pedestrian bridge over the Drainage channel spanning from segment A of Boca Chuba East Wall to segment F of Boca Chuba West Wall.

2.10 Design Amphitheater Stage Canopy Arch and Post Supports - Under this Task, the CONSULTANT will complete the design of the Amphitheater Stage Canopy foundations. The work includes two reinforced concrete supports each side of the amphitheater front to which front truss arch for the fabric roof will be supported. Also, four (4) post supports are located at the back of the amphitheater along the ramp. All loads from the canopy will be provided by others along with the base details supporting the arch and posts.

2.11 Analysis and Design Railing Connection - Under the Task, the CONSULTANT will analyze and design the connection for the railing to the cap stone coping for all walls. Also, the connection of the cap stone to the top of the reinforced concrete cantilever walls will be designed to resist the design railing loads.

2.12 Restroom Building Structural Design - This task will consist of the design of a one-story Restroom / Bath House facility to be located in Cascades Park. The new bath house will be approximately 2,200 s.f. The structure will be partially sited on fill with a site retaining wall supporting on perimeter wall of the building.

2.13 Scope of Structural Services - Design Phase Services will include the following:
- Prepare complete Structural Plans and Specifications for the new bath house.
- Respond to permit review comments and make drawing revisions as necessary.
- Cost Estimates will be provided by the architect.
3 VETERANS MEMORIAL

Introduction - The Proposed Veterans Memorial Plaza will provide a special place to recognize, remember and give thanks to the regions veterans. It will also be a place to celebrate the values and freedom for which they fought.

The Plaza will be in the form of the military star which symbolizes the five branches of the military: Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force and Coast Guard. In each of the five corners of the plaza will be a 4’ wide by 10-12’ high vertical element upon which will be placed interpretive text/images related to a specific branch of the military. Above the center of the plaza will be a suspended shading structure, which will comprise of open trellis and a “fretted” bright stainless steel star. This silver star – emblem of bravery – which will cover and shade plaza users is a metaphor for the protection our service people provide. Fretted into this canopy will be star shaped holes that will allow sunlight to pass onto the paving below. Each star could represent a service person killed in action and could be located to allow the “star light” to illuminate that person’s name on the paving below on their birthday. Larger “stars” can illuminate important days of commemoration at 12 noon – Veterans Day – in the center, Pearl Harbor, D Day, etc. One support of the shade structure is missing. This allows for seated gatherings under the star to focus on the main memorial. The missing support symbolizes the lost comrade.

The Star Plaza is sized to allow gatherings of larger groups for special dates and the main monument ‘tablet’ is located adjacent to the trail to be the focus of ceremonies. The shade structure, aided by large shade trees will make the plaza with its benches, seat walls and drinking fountain, a comfortable lunch or rest stop for park users. It also offers a unique vantage point to view the park.

The formal plaza will be set into the naturalistic land form with three of its points rising out of the ground dramatizing this juxtaposition. The plaza paving will be permeable unit pavers and its walls brick veneer with cast stone trim as in the rest of the park.

The following Scope of Work and fee proposal is based on this description and Conceptual Design drawings presented to BLUEPRINT 2000 in February 2008.

3.1 Scope of Work - The CONSULTANT will carry out the following work to prepare 100% design drawings for the Leon County Veterans Memorial:

- Phase 1 - Schematic Design-Completion
- Phase 2 - Design Development
- Phase 3 – Construction Documents

3.1.1 Phase 1 - Schematic Design Completion – The CONSULTANT will begin Phase 1 with a start up meeting with the Leon County Veterans Memorial Committee (LCVMC) and BLUEPRINT 2000. This meeting will review the proposed design and project proposal to confirm approach, space program, scope of work and project schedule.

Following this meeting the CONSULTANT will prepare a Memorandum of Understanding outlining the agreed upon approach.
The CONSULTANT will prepare final dimensioned design drawings. These will include plans, elevations and sections to a minimum scale of 1/4” = 1’-0”. The drawings will delineate major materials- paving, wall finishes, memorial plaques/tablets and the central shade structure.

During this phase, the CONSULTANT and the LCVMC will define the extent of veteran commemoration, significant dates commemoration etc.

_Schematic Design Presentation:_

The CONSULTANT will present the schematic design work to the LCVMC, City Parks Dept and BLUEPRINT 2000.

Following this meeting, the CONSULTANT will prepare a Memorandum of Understanding outlining any modifications required to the memorial design prior to and during the next phase of work. If requested, the CONSULTANT will at this time prepare fundraising rendering/s for the approved schematic design.

### 3.1.2 Phase 2 - Design Development

- The CONSULTANT will prepare design development (DD) plans, sections, elevations and key detail drawings to fully describe the memorial design and will also prepare preliminary graphic design approaches – up to three (3) alterations for each review.

During the DD (Phase 2), the CONSULTANT will work with LCVMC to fully define approach to veteran and key date commemoration. The LCVMC will provide the CONSULTANT with numbers of service people, their military branch and, where possible, the theater of conflict in which they were involved.

_Mid Phase Meeting:_

The CONSULTANT expects that there will be a mid phase meeting necessary with LCVMC to review compiled data in the context of the proposed design.

During DD, the CONSULTANT will define all materials to be used in the construction of the memorial. We will provide samples of key materials – paving, brickwork, copings, monument stone, corten steel and stainless steel/finishes, for review.

_Design Development Presentation:_

The CONSULTANT will present the design development work to the LCVMC, City Parks Department and BLUEPRINT 2000.

Following this meeting, the CONSULTANT will prepare a Memorandum of Understanding outlining any modifications required to the memorial design prior to and during the next phase of work.
3.1.3 **Phase 3 - Construction Documents** - Based upon the outcome of Phase 2, the CONSULTANT will prepare a full set of Construction Documents for the Memorial. These documents will include:

- Plans
- Elevations
- Sections
- Details
- Material Specifications

The CONSULTANT will prepare graphic design layouts and production specifications for all commemorative plaques including five (5) corner corten/stainless steel panels and large stone tablet.

3.1.3 **Structural Design** – The CONSULTANT will complete the foundation design to include the details required to construct the memorial foundation.

4. **Restroom Floor Plan Alternatives** – the CONSULTANT shall prepare alternative floor plans as required to address the issues raised by the City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation Department.
# Capital Cascade Trail Fee Distribution

**September 2003 through August 9, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Cascade Trail Consultant Team</th>
<th>Overall Project - Master Plan Services</th>
<th>Expanded Master Plan Activities</th>
<th>Segment 2 Design and Permitting</th>
<th>Segment 2 Design and Permitting - Supplemental Design Services</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Group</td>
<td>$1,037,644.30</td>
<td>$157,575.64</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$1,418,169.93</td>
<td>$32,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>$232,699.12</td>
<td>$137,116.00</td>
<td>$4,114.00</td>
<td>$13,884.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Geotechnical Specialist*</td>
<td>$84,583.21</td>
<td>$34,303.38</td>
<td>$40,756.79</td>
<td>$98,848.98</td>
<td>$33,743.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Research Associates</td>
<td>$17,896.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,896.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Consulting Inc*</td>
<td>$27,162.12</td>
<td>$24,758.69</td>
<td>$4,578.12</td>
<td>$9,152.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Bass Consulting*</td>
<td>$108,827.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,283.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways, Inc.</td>
<td>$14,024.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,024.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings Environmental</td>
<td>$9,635.60</td>
<td>$32,940.00</td>
<td>$1,860.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,435.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Malone &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$810.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Associates Architects, Inc.*</td>
<td>$138,502.37</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$17,004.20</td>
<td>$5,146.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Lynch &amp; Sandell, Inc.</td>
<td>$117,900.00</td>
<td>$17,650.00</td>
<td>$394,665.00</td>
<td>$119,490.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzzell Advertising*</td>
<td>$14,062.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,562.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Engineering Group, P.A.</td>
<td>$72,048.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$118,367.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Bridge Entineers*</td>
<td>$203,743.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$204,003.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS&amp;J</td>
<td>$30,978.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,478.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Caldwell</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblau</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,533,282.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>$353,753.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,370.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,906,081.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,753.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency Contingency**

$71,400.00

Grand Total = $5,461,721.39
Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 - Contamination Remediation Authorization
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascade Trail (CCT): Segment 2 – Contamination Remediation Authorization

Date: September 15, 2008  
Requested By: Blueprint 2000

Contact Person: Jim Davis/Gary Phillips  
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the IA’s approval to advertise and select a consultant to provide contamination remediation services or approval to utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors for the CCT: Segment 2 project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
This project includes the removal of known contaminated sites in Areas of Concern (AOC) 4 and 5 (Middle Section of the Cascade Park) that are currently protected with engineering controls installed during the recent (2005-2007) City of Tallahassee Cascade Park Removal Action project.

Pursuant to a 1998 Administrative Order on Consent and entered into between the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the City of Tallahassee, Florida (COT), the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the Florida Department of Management Services (FDMS), the Cascade Park was remediated to the level and extent agreed to by USEPA and FDEP in the subsequent Removal Action Plan.

As part of this Cascade Park Removal Action Plan, several contaminated areas located within AOCs 4 and 5 were not removed but protected via engineering controls and restrictive covenants. The intent of the engineering controls is to provide an engineered barrier that will isolate the residual contamination, prevent direct exposure, and permit unrestricted recreational land use. Two types of controls were implemented:

- The standard engineering control was represented by excavation of a minimum of 24 inches of contaminated soil, placement of geotextile fabric and backfilling of the excavation with clean soil to match existing grade.

- The second method used was the placement of geotextile fabric on the original land surface and placement of 24 inches of protective cover on top of the fabric. In one location, by the Incinerator building and historic live oak tree, the treatment included 12 inches of mulch instead of soil cover and the installation of a construction safety fence.
The CCT project excavation will impact several of these engineering control locations which must be addressed in accordance with applicable regulations, including FDEP Chapter 62.730 Hazardous Waste or Guidance Document Management of Contaminated Media under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

The removal of the engineering barriers and hazardous material below will be implemented consistent with the Cascade Park Project’s Institutional Controls/Restrictive Covenants (IC/RC) Report, conceptually approved by FDEP in September 2008. The IC/RC Report identifies 13 contaminated areas (Attachment 1) that will be impacted by the Cascade Park project, of which, 6 will be avoided by design modifications and 7 that are unavoidably impacted by the Cascade Park designs, will be removed, remediated and protected to the level and extent acceptable to the FDEP.

The Contamination Remediation Services required must be performed by a specially licensed Hazardous Materials Contractor. In addition, workers associated with this effort must follow Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA 29 CFR 1910) guidelines for the protection of human health.

In order to keep the project on track and begin the CCT: Segment 2 construction by the middle of 2009, the Board is requested to delegate to the IMC the authority to advertise, negotiate and award this Contamination Remediation Contract or utilize one of the City’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendors.

OPTIONS:

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

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a Hazardous Material Firm or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendor. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a budget of **$550,000**, which includes a ten percent contingency of $50,000.
3. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award a contract with the selected firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
4. Waive the MBE/WBE requirements for these services in that no qualified local firm exists.

Advantage(s):
- Continues forward movement with Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 Project.
- Allows the remediation project to advance before the stormwater/park construction project begins. This will reduce the potential for scheduling delay and claims associated with the hazardous materials contractor holding up the
General Contractor due to encountering previously undocumented/undetected contamination
  • Allows Blueprint 2000 flexibility and control over the Scope of Work for the Hazardous Materials Contractor if previously undocumented/undetected contamination is encountered.

Disadvantage(s):
  • Must be completed prior to issuing Notice-to-Proceed for the Park construction.

**Option 2:** Require the Cascade Park General Contractor subcontract this work to a Hazardous Material Firm.

Advantage(s):
  • The General Contractor may be able to negotiate a lower fee from a Hazardous Material Firm. Hopefully, some of the savings would pass to Blueprint.

Disadvantage(s):
  • Remediation can not begin until design and permitting is competed and construction contract is awarded.
  • Separate contract required with Consultant to prepare remediation plans

**Option 3:** Board Guidance.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

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

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a Hazardous Material Firm or utilize one of the City’s or County’s Environmental Consulting Services Vendor. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a budget of $550,000, which includes a ten percent contingency of $50,000.
3. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award a contract with the selected firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
4. Waive the MBE/WBE requirements for these services in that no qualified local firm exists.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
Attachment 1: Graphic showing 13 Areas of Contamination
# 14
Capital Circle
NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This agenda item requests the IA’s approval to reallocate funds from the Capital Circle NW/SW project’s construction budget to the design budget in order to complete the 100% construction documents from US 90 (West Tennessee Street) to Orange Avenue (SR 371).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Improvements to Capital Circle NW and SW are high MPO and Intergovernmental Agency (IA) priorities. Construction on Capital Circle, from I-10 to US 90 was completed in September 2007. Based on previous IA discussions, the IA concurred that the Capital Circle segment from Tennessee Street to Orange Avenue should be addressed as soon as possible to facilitate ease of access to Tallahassee Regional Airport, and to support further economic development in the south side.

Supplemental Agreement #9 is needed to fund additional work and/or design changes (listed on Page 2) that have occurred since Supplemental Agreement #7 was approved by the IA on February 25, 2008. The Consultant has completed most of the work at-risk.

- On May 16, 2005, the IA authorized supplementing Contract 772 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. to prepare 60% Construction Plans, Right-of-Way Maps, and submit permits for Capital Circle SW from SR 20 (Blountstown Highway) to SR 371 (Orange Avenue).
- On September 17, 2007, the IA increased the contract limit for Contract 772 from $3,117,016.80 to $4,970,776 in order for H.W. Lochner to take the project from 60% design to 100% design completion.
- On February 25, 2008 the IA increased the contract limit to $5,207,000 and approved Supplemental Agreement #7.
- Supplemental Agreement #8 was approved by the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) on August 12, 2008. The IMC’s action authorized staff to use the available $101,176.92 contingency and to reallocate $50,000.00 from post-design services to contingency in order to fund Supplemental Agreement #8 in the amount of $149,920.94. Supplemental Agreement #8 used all available contingency funding in order to keep the Consultants working and the project moving forward until the IA could review and approve Supplemental Agreement #9 and reallocate additional funding to complete the design.
Supplemental #9 is required to complete the following items:

- Redesign SR 20 (west of Capital Circle) to reduce right-of-way impacts – includes roadway, drainage, lighting, signing, pavement marking, maintenance of traffic, utilities, typical section, driveways, quantities, right-of-way maps, parcel sketches, temporary construction easements, and legal description changes;
- Redesign for a second time (at Blueprint’s request) the south end of the southwest frontage road to reduce right-of-way and wetland impacts;
- Redesign the grading and outfall structure for the Perkins Pond to remove it from proposed FDOT right-of-way;
- Change the directional median opening on Capital Circle, south of SR 20, to a full median opening;
- Prepare an Erosion Control brochure;
- Extend the proposed sidewalk on the north side of Gum Road to the Transfer Station entrance (at Leon County Public Work’s request);
- Attend additional snail, right-of-way, etc. coordination meetings;
- Conduct additional geotechnical testing for Karst features at the Broadmoor Pond and Orange Avenue pond sites.

OPTIONS:

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

Option 2: Board direction.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

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

Action by TCC and CAC:
The TCC concurred, with one change; the CAC approved the design supplemental.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Supplemental Agreement #8 Authorization Memo
2. Summary of items to be included in Supplemental Agreement #9
Memorandum

To: Anita Favors Thompson, City Manager
Parwez Alam, County Administrator

From: Jim Davis, Director Blueprint 2000

Date: August 5, 2008

Re: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study
Contract 772, Supplemental Agreement #8

Additional services are required, to supplement the existing contract with H. W. Lochner, Inc. (Contract 772; Expanded Project Development and Environmental Study/Design for Capital Circle; from US 90 to Orange Avenue) in order to complete final right-of-way, design and construction documents. Supplemental Agreement #8 is based on additional services required as a result of design changes requested by Blueprint 2000. The fee for performing this additional work has been negotiated with H. W. Lochner and its subconsultants. The attached memorandum summarizes the tasks included in Supplemental Agreement #8.

Pursuant to Agenda Item #13 of the February 25, 2008, Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting (see attached Agenda Item), the Board authorized the reallocation of $299,908.99 from the Construction Budget to the Design Budget. This increased the total contract amount for Contract 772 to $5,207,000, including a $101,176.92 contingency, which is still available.

Pursuant to Paragraph 1.C of Contract 772, dated May 4, 2004, between Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency and H.W. Lochner, Inc., staff proposes, with H.W. Lochner concurrence, to delete $50,000.00 in post design services from Supplemental Agreement #7 and reallocate the funds to the project’s contingency.

Based on the above, the total contingency amount available is $151,176.92. The total fee requested for Supplemental Agreement #8 is $149,920.94 (see attached Fee Proposal). This brings the total project cost to $5,205,744.02, which is below the maximum authorization of $5,207,000 (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract Amount</td>
<td>$1,921,585.90</td>
<td>EPD&amp;E and 60% Design to SR 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #1</td>
<td>$ 19,341.39</td>
<td>60% Design Extended to Orange Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #2</td>
<td>$ 140,495.41</td>
<td>Finish Design from 60% to 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #3</td>
<td>$ 895,704.10</td>
<td>(Proposed $50k Reduction to $148,732.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #4</td>
<td>$ 8,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #5</td>
<td>$ 131,090.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #6</td>
<td>$1,790,074.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement #7</td>
<td>$ 198,732.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Agreement #8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 149,920.94</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (including Supplemental #8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,205,744.02</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Agreement #9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 350,000.00</strong></td>
<td>Pending IA Approval Sept. 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Your signature on this memorandum indicates the Intergovernmental Management Committee’s approval to authorize Blueprint 2000 to execute Supplemental Agreement #8.

Anita Favors Thompson, City Manager

Parwez Alam, County Administrator

Date

Attachment(s)
1. Agenda Item #13 (February 25, 2008, Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting)
2. Supplemental Agreement #8 Fee Proposal
Date: August 12, 2008

To: File

From: Latesa Turner, GEC Project Manager

Re: Capital Circle NW/SW EPD&E Study
Contract 772, Supplemental Agreement #9

Below is a summary of the items included in Supplemental Agreement #9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant or Subconsultant</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Reason for the Supplemental Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.W. Lochner</td>
<td>$49,179.62</td>
<td>Additional costs above and beyond the amount included in Supplemental #8, to revise construction plans resulting from design changes requested by Blueprint 2000 along SR 20, at the SW Frontage Road median openings, at the SW Frontage Road southern connection, and for the extension of the sidewalk on Gum Road to the Waste Transfer Station entrance. Includes optional services as needed for the design of an additional retaining wall on SR 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Geotechnical Specialists, Inc. (EGS)</td>
<td>$60,497.20</td>
<td>Costs to install additional soil borings and conduct Electrical Resistivity Imaging (ERI) study at the Broadmoore stormwater pond site; Costs to install additional soil borings for investigation of Karst potential at Orange Avenue pond site; Optional services as required to conduct additional geotechnical investigation for additional retaining wall on SR 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$109,676.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 15
Transfer of ROW Appropriation from CCT Segment 2 to CCT Segment 3
SUBJECT/TITLE: Transfer of ROW Appropriation from CCT Segment 2 to CCT Segment 3

Date: September 15, 2008  
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff

Contact Person: Phil Maher  
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to request the transfer of the $1,280,000 appropriated to acquire Right of Way in Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 to Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Blueprint is currently in negotiations with the owners of Myers Industrial Park for a voluntary purchase of this 5+acre site. This site is a critical element of Capital Cascade Segment 3 for both flood control and water quality. Currently there is no funding for land acquisitions for this segment. We have identified $1,280,000 in ROW for Capital Cascade Segment 2 that can be transferred to Segment 3.

The City has also expressed a need for this parcel and we are currently working towards an arrangement with the City to share in the cost of the parcel. This issue has been discussed with the IMC.

In 2006, Blueprint received a Florida Communities Trust (FCT) Grant for acquisition of the Myers Industrial Park parcels. The Grant was not consummated due to conditions of the Grant which were not to Blueprint’s or the community’s advantage (e.g., immediate relocation of the businesses and demolition of the structures.) Now, with the City’s near-term desire for a pond at this location as part of the FAMU Way Extension project or Gaines Street development requirements, the previously unacceptable conditions (based on timing) are no longer an issue. Blueprint will re-apply for an FCT Grant for reimbursement after acquisition.

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

Option 2: Board Direction

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

ATTACHMENT(S):
None
# 16

Proposed 2009 Meeting Dates
SUBJECT/TITLE: Proposed 2009 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules

Date: September 15, 2008    Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Shelonda Meeks    Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item lists the PROPOSED 2009 meeting dates for the Intergovernmental Agency, Blueprint Technical Coordinating Committee, and the Blueprint Citizens Advisory Committee. These proposed dates are “effectively the same dates” as for meetings which were held during 2008.

The Blueprint meeting schedule is developed much earlier in the year than other entities due to the Board’s last meeting of the year being in September. These proposed dates have been provided to and reviewed with City, County, Planning, CRA, and CRTPA staff, and will be adjusted at the February 2009 meeting(s) if needed to avoid all other meetings, conferences, and conflicts.

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

Technical Coordinating Committee (Blueprint 2000 Office, from 1:00 to 3:00 pm)
- Thursday, February 5, 2009
- Thursday, April 2, 2009
- Thursday, May 21, 2009
- Thursday, August 27, 2009
- Thursday, October 29, 2009
- Thursday, December 3, 2009

Citizens Advisory Committee (Blueprint 2000 Office, from 4:30 to 6:30 pm)
- Thursday, February 5, 2009
- Thursday, April 2, 2009
- Thursday, May 21, 2009
- Thursday, August 27, 2009
- Thursday, October 29, 2009
- Thursday, December 3, 2009
OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve the dates as presented.

Option 2: Board Guidance

Action by TCC and CAC:
Will be presented to the TCC at their next meeting; the CAC approved the dates as presented.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the dates as presented.

Option 2: Board guidance
# 17
Capital Cascade Trail:
Segments 3 & 4
Phase I
Improvements;
Segment 1 Interim Improvements
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascade Trail (CCT): Segments 3 & 4 Phase I Improvements, Segment 1 Interim Improvements

Date: September 15, 2008 | Requested By: IA
Contact Person: Jim Davis/Gary Phillips | Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item responds to the IA’s request to identify the most cost effective water quality interim improvements in segments 3, 4 and 1 of the Capital Cascade Trail project. This item requests the Intergovernmental Agency to approve the concept for the Phase 1 and interim improvements as proposed.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The following concept is not fully developed for the following reasons:

1. No funding for Segments 3, 4 and 1 is available until 2012.
2. The overall funding for the project will change
3. The IA will review the Master Plan not less than 4 times before funding becomes available
4. Detailed plans developed today will require revision prior to 2013

IA Actions and Project Status: At the June 2, 2008 Agency meeting, the IA requested that cost effective interim improvements pertaining to water quality and flooding issues should be identified in the following areas:

A. Segments 3 and 4 Phase 1 Master Plan Improvements (Attachment 1)
B. Segment 1 Interim Improvements (Attachment 2)

The following provides additional information related to each of the items listed above. The Phase 1 improvements are listed in the staff’s order of implementation. The Phase 1 activities focus on water quality enhancements on Saint Augustine Branch (SAB) in Segment 3. This is for two reasons: the Phase 1 water quality enhancements in Segment 3 provide water quality treatment that will complement and interface with the proposed Gaines Street revitalization effort and also the FAMU Way Extension projects; and the Lake Elberta Regional SWMF already provides significant water treatment for the Florida State University Watershed which constitutes the majority of the watershed in Central Drainage Ditch (CDD) above SAB.
Segments 3 and 4 Phase 1 Master Plan Improvements:

**Improvement 1. Construct an Off-line SWMF at Myers Industrial Park** - A water quality treatment and flood attenuation facility (SWMF) is proposed for Myers Industrial Park on FAMU Way in Segment 3. Both off-line and online treatments are options for this location. Both options will provide increased water quality and similar flood attenuation on the SAB. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends making the off-line treatment because it will target the initial runoff of untreated waters from a 23 acre watershed located north of the CSX Railroad which currently flows directly into the SAB through a 54” pipe. On-line treatment will treat “mixed” waters (previously treated water mixed with untreated waters as well as runoff from the end rather than the beginning of the storm event). This SWMF may also provide stormwater treatment for the FAMU Way Extension project and Gaines Street Corridor improvement project. Blueprint 2000 staff is coordinating with City of Tallahassee Public Works to address this potential for shared uses and benefits.

Acquisition of the Myers Industrial Park is underway and no other land acquisition will be necessary for this site. The cost associated with Myers Industrial site is $4,200,000 which includes right-of-way, possible contamination clean-up and demolition costs. The cost to construct the SWMF is estimated at $1,350,000. Therefore, the total estimated cost for this improvement is $5,550,000.

**Improvement 2. Construct an Off-line SWMF at Coal Chute Park** - A water quality treatment and flood attenuation facility is recommended for Coal Chute Park as shown in the Master Plan concept in Segment 3. Like Myers Industrial Park, both offline and online treatments are options. Both options will provide increased water quality and similar flood attenuation in the SAB. The off-line treatment option is also recommended for this location for the above reasons because it will target the initial runoff of untreated waters from a 16 acre watershed located north of the CSX Railroad and also Railroad Square which currently flows directly into the SAB through a 36” pipe. One of the main parcels in Coal Chute Park is owned by the City of Tallahassee and another by Leon County. A third parcel (Thomas) has also been acquired. Other relatively minor acquisitions will be necessary for a pond at this location. The right-of-way cost to acquire the necessary properties is estimated at $500,000. The cost to construct the SWMF is estimated at $2,000,000 which includes costs for possible contamination clean-up. The total estimated cost for this improvement is $2,500,000.

**Improvement 3. Line SAB from Bronough St. to South Monroe Street** - The flooding at South Monroe Street due to the constriction of the box culvert was eliminated by the enclosure of the SAB upstream of (east of) South Monroe Street. The higher velocity discharge resulting from this enclosure has stressed the downstream ditch segment creating erosion in the ditch. Blueprint 2000 staff recommends lining the segment of SAB between Monroe Street and Bronough Street improving ditch conveyance. Lining the channel will eliminate the erosion, reduce the routine maintenance effort required in the vegetated channel. Either a concrete gunite lining or a gabion basket lining can be used to provide the desired improvement. The gabion ditch section will provide a more aesthetic ditch section and is more in keeping with the restored stream concept in the Master Plan. However, more right-of-way may be required for the gabion section due to a
higher roughness and wider width requirements. The right-of-way cost to acquire the necessary property is estimated at $200,000. The cost to construct the gabion lining is estimated at $1,360,000. The total estimated cost for this improvement is **$1,560,000**.

**Improvement 4. Construct a SWMF opposite Lake Bradford Treatment Plant** - The City of Tallahassee is acquiring the parcel opposite the Lake Bradford Road Treatment Plant (east of the ditch) to create a development buffer. Excavating the site to an elevation just above the ditch to create a floodplain and planting with wetland vegetation will provide wetland treatment and flood storage. This will be a partial implementation of the master plan design. Phase 2 of the master plan will require acquiring another parcel and expanding the Phase 1 online wetland water quality treatment. The total estimated cost for this improvement is **$1,360,000**.

**Improvement 5. Construct a SWMF at the Master Plan Pond 3 Site, Segment 4** - Master Plan Pond 3 is a wet pond which provides water quality and flood attenuation improvements in Segment 4. The site is located between Lake Bradford Road and Springhill Road north of Orange Avenue at the confluence of the CDD with the relief ditch from Alumni Village Watershed. The full master plan design for the water quality aspect is proposed for Phase 1. Bank stabilization to eliminate bank erosion will be necessary due to the nature of the sandy soils. The nature trails and park amenities will be completed in Phase 2 of the Master Plan. All but one parcel required for this facility has been acquired. The design will take into account the drainage ditch from the Alumni Village neighborhood. The right-of-way cost to acquire the necessary property is estimated at $200,000. The cost to construct the SWMF is estimated at $1,580,000 which includes costs for possible contamination clean-up. The total estimated cost for this improvement is **$1,780,000**.

**Improvement 6. Construct a SWMF at the Master Plan Pond 5 Site, Segment 4** – Master Plan Pond 5 is a wet pond on CDD at the confluence with the Lake Bradford/Black Swamp ditch. Black Swamp Nature Park is recommended as shown in the Master Plan concept in Phase 2. The wet pond will increase water quality in Segment 4. Bank stabilization to eliminate bank erosion will be necessary due to the nature of the sandy soils. The main parcel required for the construction of this pond is owned by Leon County. Two other land acquisitions are required for this online treatment facility. The right-of-way cost to acquire the necessary property is estimated at $400,000. The cost to construct the SWMF is estimated at $2,700,000 which includes costs for possible contamination clean-up. The total estimated cost for this improvement is **$3,100,000**.

**B. Segment 1 Interim Improvements:**

Interim improvements are recommended for Segment 1, if funds permit, to decrease flooding on Franklin Boulevard. However these improvements provide minimal water quality improvement and cannot be incorporated into the Master Plan concept for Segment 1. The greatest benefit of these improvements would result from more immediate implementation or if funding would eliminate the construction of the Master Plan concept.

- Increasing the pavement elevations in certain areas on Franklin will provide the most improvements. Either a minimal amount of permanent R/W or temporary construction
easement will be necessary to raise the roadway and make necessary connections to the existing back of curb area. Estimated cost is $1,420,000

- The Call Street and College Avenue culverts should be removed and replaced with a lined ditch section. Estimated cost is $780,000
- The Park Avenue and Jefferson Street culverts should be replaced with larger box culverts. Estimated cost is $1,890,000
- A gunite or other smooth lining should be placed in the ditch from Jefferson Street to Tennessee Street. Estimated cost is $1,120,000

The total cost to construct the above Segment 1 improvements is $5,210,000.

OPTIONS:

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

Advantages
- Allows the Myers Industrial Park and Coal Chute Park SWMFs to be concurrent with the FAMU Way Extension and Gaines Street improvement projects.
- Allows most effective improvements to be improved sooner.

Disadvantages
- Differs from original Master Plan concept.
- Eliminates most of the benefit to be derived from the interim improvements to Segment 1

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

Advantages
- Maximizes the benefit to be derived from the interim improvements to Segment 1
- Allows the construction of Myers Industrial Park and Coal Chute Park to be congruent with the FAMU Way construction.
- Allows most effected improvements to be constructed sooner.

Disadvantage
- Differs from original Master Plan concept.

Option 3:
- Board Guidance
RECOMMENDED ACTION:

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

Action by the TCC and CAC:
The CAC took the following action: Support interim improvements that do not need to be changed (“thrown away”) in order to implement the full master plan design.

ATTACHMENT(S):

Attachment 1: Planning Concept for Segments 3 & 4 Phase 1
Attachment 2: Planning Concept for Segment 1 Culvert Removal and Replacement
PLANNING CONCEPT FOR PHASE 1
SEGMENT 3

ATTACHMENT 1A
PUBLIC HEARING
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Adoption of the FY 2009 Blueprint Operating Budget and Resolution
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2009 Operating Budget and Resolution

Date: September 15, 2008  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Phil Maher  Type of Item: Discussion & Public Hearing

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to request approval and adoption of the Agency’s FY 2009 Operating Budget.
  • A Public Hearing is advertised and scheduled for 6:00 pm.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
At the June 2, 2008 meeting of the Intergovernmental Agency, the Board was presented the FY 2009 Operating Budget for their review and comment. There were no recommended changes made by the Board. Since that time the proposed budget has been increased by $50,000. This increase is due to the following:

1. The addition a temporary Attorney Position in the amount of $50,000. This position is necessary to assist Blueprint’s Attorney with a number law suits, Orders of Taking, and Public Records requests. Due the number of Public Records Requests (24 within the last 2 1/2 months), Blueprint will begin charging up to the maximum amount allowed under Chapter 119 F.S for staff time in excess of 15 minutes. The revenue received by this charge will be used to offset a portion of the position cost.

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

ACTION BY THE CAC:
The CAC approved the Proposed FY 2009 Operating Budget at their meeting on May 15, 2008. A public hearing was held at the May meeting to review the budget and there were no speakers. The CAC approved the modification to the Proposed Operating Budget at their August 21, 2008 meeting.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1: Budget Resolution
Attachment 2: Budget Detail
Attachment 3: Budget Narrative
WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency’s Budget Policy 102, Section 06, subsection B(2), requires the Intergovernmental Agency to adopt an annual operating budget and appropriate funding for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency has acknowledged the receipt of sales tax revenue to fund expenses for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2008, and ending September 30, 2009,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, hereby approves and adopts the budget for Fiscal Year 2009 as reflected below, and that all incomplete project balances, requisitions, and encumbrances from prior years will automatically be re-appropriated.

**Blueprint 2000 FY 2009 Budget Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>$791,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$303,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Liability Premium</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Cost</td>
<td>$63,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-fund Transfer Gen. Eng. Consultant</td>
<td>$845,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Operations</td>
<td>$2,032,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Capital Projects</td>
<td>$8,103,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$14,988,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB loan Transfer</td>
<td>$5,276,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Request</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Funds</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted this ______ day of September, 2008

Tallahassee/Leon County, Florida

By: _________________________
Andrew Gillum, Chairman Blueprint 2000
Intergovernmental Agency

By: _________________________
Gary Herndon Treasurer-Clerk
City of Tallahassee

Approved as to Form:

By: _________________________
Maribel Nicholson-Choice
Blueprint 2000 General Counsel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2007 Actual</th>
<th>FY2008 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY2009 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511000 Salaries $446,615</td>
<td>$515,957</td>
<td>$515,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511500 Temp wages $31,918</td>
<td>$43,710</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512000 Overtime</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512400 Other Salary Items $11,979</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515000 Pension-current</td>
<td>$41,260</td>
<td>$49,362</td>
<td>$50,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515100 Pension-MAP $33,560</td>
<td>$41,279</td>
<td>$42,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515600 Mandatory Medicare $6,847</td>
<td>$7,675</td>
<td>$7,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516000 Health Benefits</td>
<td>$26,670</td>
<td>$43,259</td>
<td>$43,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Health Benefits Retirees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Flex Benefits $12,251</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$611,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$730,686</strong></td>
<td><strong>$791,751</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521010 Advertising</td>
<td>$3,511</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521030 Reproduction</td>
<td>$3,407</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521040 Professional Fees/Services</td>
<td>$61,166</td>
<td>$120,966</td>
<td>$92,100</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>$1,543</td>
<td>$6,193</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521160 Legal Services</td>
<td>$58,631</td>
<td>$45,582</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521180 Uncl. Contractual Services</td>
<td>$17,884</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521190 Computer Software</td>
<td>$4,147</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522080 Telephone</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523010 Chem-Med-Lab</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523020 Food</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523030 Gasoline</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523050 Postage</td>
<td>$1,859</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523060 Office Supplies</td>
<td>$16,893</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524020 Journals and Books</td>
<td>$5,233</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523080 Unclassified Supplies</td>
<td>$2,078</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523100 Vehicle Non-Garage</td>
<td>$3,597</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524010 Travel and Training</td>
<td>$12,398</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524030 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524050 Rental of Office Space</td>
<td>$76,921</td>
<td>$92,731</td>
<td>$94,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524080 Unclassified charges</td>
<td>$3,226</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$277,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>$303,694</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540040 Liability Insurance Premium</td>
<td>$20,790</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2007 Actual</td>
<td>FY2008 Amended</td>
<td>FY2009 Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Svcs/Charges</strong></td>
<td>$20,790</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550030 Office Equipment</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550040 Computer Equipment</td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550060 Unclassified Equipment</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560010 Human Resource Expense</td>
<td>$5,231</td>
<td>$5,678</td>
<td>$5,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560020 Accounting Expense</td>
<td>$32,232</td>
<td>$10,603</td>
<td>$40,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560030 Purchasing Expense</td>
<td>$22,835</td>
<td>$16,504</td>
<td>$16,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560040 Information Systems Exp.</td>
<td>$11,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated Costs</strong></td>
<td>$71,678</td>
<td>$32,785</td>
<td>$63,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Inter-fund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Eng. Consultant</td>
<td>$882,000</td>
<td>$885,506</td>
<td>$845,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>$1,870,408</td>
<td>$2,052,579</td>
<td>$2,032,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Other Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects</td>
<td>$14,390,676</td>
<td>$48,399,851</td>
<td>$8,103,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611300 Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$9,586,704</td>
<td>$14,222,495</td>
<td>$14,988,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB Loan</td>
<td>$3,941,685</td>
<td>$5,276,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for future years</strong></td>
<td>$34,864,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>$60,711,919</td>
<td>$68,616,610</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2007 Actual</th>
<th>FY2008 Amended</th>
<th>FY2009 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$27,832,864</td>
<td>$34,864,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbrance carry forward</td>
<td>$15,106</td>
<td>$31,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (interest, admin fees)</td>
<td>$1,869,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Proceeds</td>
<td>$30,988,777</td>
<td>$33,738,014</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of inv. From DSF</td>
<td>$5,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$60,711,919</td>
<td>$68,633,977</td>
<td>$30,401,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 Budget Narrative

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

511500 Temp wages includes Intern during the summer $10,000 and $10,000 for temporary help to replace full time temp administrative employee and $50,000 for additional legal assistance

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

512000 Overtime for Admin Asst and OPS staff

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

5210000 Copies, letterhead, CAC’S performance report.

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

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

521160 Legal services includes outside General Counsel Attorney services

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

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

522080 Telephone long distance and 5 cell phones

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

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

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

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

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

524020 Journals and Books including legal subscriptions

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

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

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

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

550030 Office equipment any office equipment over $1000.

550040 Computer equipment, additional computer and miscellaneous equipment

550060 Unclassified equipment includes items such as filling cabinets, camera, and miscellaneous equipment needs

560010-40 Blueprint’s share of Allocated Costs. Accounting Services expense increase is to bring the charge inline with actual usage.

612400 General Engineering Consultant $845,519 and transfer of sales tax revenue to Capital Project.
PUBLIC HEARING

# 19
Adoption of
FY 2009-FY 2013
Capital Budget and Resolution
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to request the Board’s approval of the Revised Master Plan, FY2009-2013 Capital Budget, and to appropriate Fiscal Year 2009 funding.
- A Public Hearing is advertised and scheduled for 6:00 pm.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
At the June 2, 2009 Intergovernmental Agency meeting, the Board was advised that due to the current economic downturn the Finance Committee met to revise Blueprint’s projected growth rates. These growth rates are used to forecast the cash flow for the Master Plan. The result of the meeting was a reduction of $109 million from the approved Master Plan. Staff presented the Board with a revised balanced Master Plan to use as a basis to make changes.

The plan included completing Capital Cascade Trail (CCT) segment 4, the majority of CCT segment 3, and interim improvements on CCT segment 1. The Board instead recommended constructing as much of the basic infrastructure necessary regardless of completing these segments to provide the maximum water quality improvements possible. The details of this change are included in Agenda Item #17. It should be noted:
- That with the exception of Segment 2 and design dollars there are no funds available for Capital Cascade Trail until 2012.
- The Capital Budget will be brought back to the Committees and Board three more times before funds become available.

Based on the Board’s recommendation and since segments 3 & 4 are being designed together Blueprint is recommending these segments be consolidated along with segment 1.

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

CAC ACTIONS:
The CAC approved the Revised Master Plan and FY 2009-2013 Capital Budget with the following motions:
- Motion: Support interim projects that do not need to be changed (thrown away) to implement the full Master Plan concept.
- Motion: Approve Master Plan as presented, but as funding becomes available, CCT projects that were cut should get funding first.
ATTACHMENT(S)
Attachment 1: Budget Resolution
Attachment 2: Revised Master Plan September
Attachment 3: Revised Master Plan June
Attachment 4: Approved Master Plan
Attachment 5: June IA Agenda Item (narrative only)
Attachment 6: FY 2009-2013 CIP Program
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-05

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency’s Budget Policy 102, Section 06, subsection B (2), requires the Intergovernmental Agency to adopt an Capital Budget and appropriate funding for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency has acknowledged the receipt of bond proceeds and sales tax revenue to fund expenses for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2007, and ending September 30, 2009,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, hereby approves and adopts the budget for fiscal year 2009 as reflected below, and that all incomplete project balances, requisitions, and encumbrances from prior years will automatically be re-appropriated

Blueprint 2000
Fiscal Year 2009 Capital Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCNW from I-10 to U.S. 90</td>
<td>$49,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNW from U.S.90 to Orange Ave</td>
<td>$641,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Connie to Tram</td>
<td>$38,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram to Woodville</td>
<td>$848,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSW Orange to Crawfordville</td>
<td>$344,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td>$819,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters St Marks</td>
<td>$555,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank ROW/Floodplain</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management – Sensitive Lands</td>
<td>$47,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,344,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted this ______day of September, 2008

Tallahassee/Leon County, Florida

By: _________________________    By: _________________________
Andrew Gillum, Chairman Blueprint 2000    Gary Herndon Treasurer-Clerk
Intergovernmental Agency                  City of Tallahassee

Approved as to Form:

By: _________________________
Maribel Nicholson-Choice
Blueprint 2000 General Counsel
### Master Plan

**Fiscal Year Begins October 1 (10/1/2008)**

**Attachment #2**

#### Project: Headwaters St. Marks NWFWMD
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $60,047
- **2006:** $174,968
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $1,264,985
- **2009:** $1,500,000
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $1,000,000
- **2012:** $1,000,000
- **2013:** $1,000,000
- **2014:** $1,500,000
- **2015:** $900,000
- **2016:** $10,470,221
- **2017:** $1,000,000
- **2018:** $1,000,000
- **2019:** $1,000,000
- **2020:** $1,000,000

**Total: $5,270,776**

#### Project: Payback City (2002 Operations Loan)
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $418,000
- **2006:** $867,776
- **2007:** $838,339
- **2008:** $432,675
- **2009:** $428,267
- **2010:** $38,502
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $1,604,939**

#### Project: LIDAR
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**

#### Project: Capital Project
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**

#### Project: Preliminary Engineering
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**

#### Project: Program Management
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**

#### Project: Right-of-Way Acquisition
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**

#### Project: Right-of-Way Acquisition & Construction
- **2003:** $0
- **2004:** $0
- **2005:** $0
- **2006:** $0
- **2007:** $0
- **2008:** $0
- **2009:** $0
- **2010:** $0
- **2011:** $0
- **2012:** $0
- **2013:** $0
- **2014:** $0
- **2015:** $0
- **2016:** $0
- **2017:** $0
- **2018:** $0
- **2019:** $0
- **2020:** $0

**Total: $0**
<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>Payback County (2002 Operations Loan)</td>
<td>$4,285,996</td>
<td>$2,540,000</td>
<td>$2,808,805</td>
<td>$808,805</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality (County)</td>
<td>$1,768,129</td>
<td>$6,140,574</td>
<td>$7,578,195</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$60,047</td>
<td>$174,968</td>
<td>$1,764,985</td>
<td>$500,000</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>Lafyette Floodplain</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIDAR</td>
<td>$5,142,237</td>
<td>$213,882</td>
<td>$84,796</td>
<td>$44,086</td>
<td>$8,742,637</td>
<td>$2,133,233</td>
<td>$1,000,000</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>Program Management</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,155</td>
<td>$191,133</td>
<td>$115,633</td>
<td>$29,727</td>
<td>$55,099</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>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$625,996</td>
<td>$3,660,000</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>Greenway</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>$5,602,832</td>
<td>$15,172,550</td>
<td>$23,096,863</td>
<td>$4,338,812</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>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,274,594</td>
<td>$2,936,222</td>
<td>$5,801,430</td>
<td>$2,921,284</td>
<td>$7,471,952</td>
<td>$1,215,920</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>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Capital Circle NW/SW (US 90 to SR 20)</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>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Capital Circle SE (Tram to Connie)</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>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Capital Circle SW (Crawfordville to Orange)</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>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Capital Cascade Trail General and Segment 1</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>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

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

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

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

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

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

The following are the options for reducing the Master Plan:

Option 1

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED ACTION

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

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

ATTACHMENT(S):

Attachment 1 Proposed Master Plan
Attachment 2 Approved Master Plan
Attachment 3 Proposed FY 2009 – 2013 Capital Budget
Attachment 4 Comparison of Corridor and Environmental Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Schedule</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Water Quality</td>
<td>$8,646,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$713,255</td>
<td>$1,662,031</td>
<td>$1,695,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Water Quality</td>
<td>$20,486,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks NFWMD</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwater St Marks</td>
<td>$4,516,224</td>
<td></td>
<td>$555,920</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson Basin</td>
<td>$3,542,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar</td>
<td>$349,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank ROW/Sen.Land</td>
<td>$8,550,034</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Lands and Land Bank</td>
<td>$401,748</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCNW from I-10 to U.S. 90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$759,396</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,410</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>$25,058,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$4,285,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$83,798,705</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCNW from US 90. to Orange Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$2,141,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>$641,351</td>
<td>$219,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>$1,898,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$2,540,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering and Design</td>
<td>$5,270,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$47,842,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$46,807,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$106,500,091</td>
<td></td>
<td>$641,351</td>
<td>$219,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Schedule</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Connie to Tram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$2,985,058</td>
<td>$38,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$4,656,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Build Contract</td>
<td>$36,488,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$44,129,058</td>
<td>$38,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Tram. to Woodville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,568,015</td>
<td>$848,172</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,604,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$13,174,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$20,560,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$36,907,431</td>
<td>$848,172</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSE Woodville to Crawford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$553,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,435,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,988,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSW Crawford to Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$740,927</td>
<td>$344,117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,160,927</td>
<td>$344,117</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>Program Management</td>
<td>$1,858,767</td>
<td>$819,336</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$2,904,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,762,767</td>
<td>$819,336</td>
<td>$834,520</td>
<td>$989,952</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$3,672,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$26,347,205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$31,299,805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Schedule</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascade Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$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>Total</td>
<td>$2,667,600</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>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,052,720</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$6,958,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan Drive</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$381,011,236</td>
<td>$4,344,802</td>
<td>$1,424,119</td>
<td>$2,703,207</td>
<td>$6,612,031</td>
<td>$10,103,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>