

**TALLAHASSEE-LEON COUNTY
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY**

Meeting Minutes

February 20, 2006

3:00 pm, City Commission Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

County

Commissioner Ed DePuy
Commissioner Tony Grippa
Commissioner Bill Proctor
Commissioner Bob Rackleff
Commissioner Jane Sauls
Commissioner Cliff Thaell, Chair

City

Commissioner Andrew Gillum
Commissioner Allan Katz
Commissioner Debbie Lightsey
Commissioner Mark Mustian, Vice-Chair

CITY/ COUNTY STAFF

DeLane Adams, County Commission
Leticia Adams, County Commission
David Bright, Blueprint 2000
Mazie Crumbie, City DMA
Jim Davis, Director, Blueprint 2000
Rick Feldman, City DMA
Shelonda Gay, Blueprint 2000
Vince Long, County Administration
Gabriel Menendez, City Public Works

Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000
Tony Park, Leon County Public Works
Tammy Peters, Blueprint 2000
Angela Richardson, Blueprint 2000
Debra Schiro, City Attorney Office
Rita Stevens, City DMA
Wayne Tedder, Planning
Anita Favors Thompson, City Manager
Michael Wright, City Manager's Office

OTHERS PRESENT

Skip Cook, CDM
Jack Diestelhorst, Capital Cascade Council
Paco de la Fuente
Laura Haddock, FDOT
Paul Hiers, Jacobs Engineering*
Jerry Ingram, Kimley-Horn & Associates
Josh Kuspil
Shuli Leonard, Bateman Harden
Bill Little, Jacobs Engineering*
Kevin McGorty, CAC
Doug Martin, OLH International*
Robert Neff
Steve Nichols, RS&H

Maribel Nicholson-Choice, Greenberg Traurig
Jerry Oshesky, The LPA Group*
Bryant Paulk, FDOT
Bonnie Pfuntner, The LPA Group*
Gary Phillips, The LPA Group*
Ed Prescott, FDOT
Alan Rosenzweig, Leon County OMB
Jim Shepherd, Jacobs Engineering*
Mike Sheridan, CAC
Del Suggs, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
John Taylor, RS&H
Ray Youmans, THC Right of Way Services*

* Indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

Chairman Cliff Thaell called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

There was special recognition given to David Bright for receiving a Superior Achievement Award from the City of Tallahassee's Rewards & Recognition Council for his work in managing the Blueprint 2000 grants program. David was awarded a plaque and a \$400 gift certificate.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Davis stated that there were 3 agenda modifications. He stated that for Agenda Item #7, there was a substitution page for page 51 due to a mathematical error. He further stated that there were 2 additional agenda items, #8, Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Expanded PD&E Study: Frontage Road south of Jackson Bluff Road, and #9, Capital Cascade Trail Design Team.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

The following items were presented to the Board for information only, therefore no action was requested. For further information on these items, please refer to the agenda items which are available at the Blueprint 2000 offices.

1. Land Swap with United States Forest Service

Commissioner Mustian commented on the proposal that the property be used as a site for the relocation of the North Florida Fair Grounds. He questioned whether taking valuable property that could be on the tax rolls and keeping the majority of it off the tax rolls. He suggested that commercial properties be placed on the front portion and the Fair Grounds in the rear. Commissioner Mustian stated that he did not feel that this would be the best used for this valuable property or that much is accomplished by moving the Fair Grounds from Monroe to Capital Circle.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that a better location for the Fair Grounds to relocate to would be behind the Annett Bus Company on Crawfordville Road because it is not as immediately commercially developable and it is adjacent to property that is owned by the forest service. He stated that this would solve the issue that was raised by Commissioner Mustian.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the agenda item stated that Blueprint would be able to get a roadway easement for free on the property. She pointed out that this property had high quality successional forest, which will limit the development of the property. She stated that this should not be considered approval to move forward with the purchase of this property.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the proposed property is not currently on the tax rolls and therefore the county would not be losing tax revenue if this property were to be used as the Fair Grounds. He further stated that the property on which the Fair Grounds currently resides is inside the community and can generate tax revenues. Commissioner Proctor stated that he felt that this was a viable option and that staff should move forward with the negotiations on this property.

2. Minutes of CAC Meeting: November 17, 2005

No action was required on the Informational Items.

III. CONSENT

3. Acceptance of FY 2005 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2005 Operating Fund Balance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Accept the draft FY 2005 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and approve appropriation to the FY 2006 Operating Budget of \$35,925 for encumbrances and \$91,306 be transferred to Fund Balance.

4. IA Meeting Minutes: December 15, 2005

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Minutes as presented

Commissioner Katz moved approval of the consent agenda. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 10-0 (58-0).

IV. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

5. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study

Mr. Jim Davis stated that the one outstanding issue was whether or not the existing Capital Circle alignment needs to be included in the PD&E study. He further stated that the Board had asked District Secretary Ed Prescott to attend the meeting to discuss his position on this issue.

Mr. Ed Prescott, Florida Department of Transportation District Secretary, stated that Capital Circle is a very important transportation facility within the state highway system. He continued that this is a corridor that is on the strategic intermodal system. Secretary Prescott stated that he was asked if the PD&E study could be done for this segment of Capital Circle without looking at the existing alignment. He stated that the study could be done without including the existing roadway, however it then would not be eligible for federal funds. He further stated that his charge was to keep every state transportation facility eligible for these funds. He stated that funding is already tight and that steadily increasing costs make them even tighter and federal funds should be utilized whenever there is the opportunity. Secretary Prescott stated that currently no federal funds had been spent on this segment, however in order to be eligible for federal funds in the future, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (<http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regis/nepa/nepaeqia.htm>) process must be followed no matter what class of action is chosen. He stated that there were 3 classes of action ranging from categorical exclusion, where there are no significant environmental impacts to actions that require an environmental impact statement. He further stated that he had addressed the Board's question to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on December 19, 2005, and the response was "Yes, you should" look at the existing corridor and also look at a No Build option as well. He mentioned that the FHWA technical advisory states that under build alternatives, that both improvements to the existing highway and alternatives on new locations must be evaluated. Secretary Prescott stated that this does not mean that the existing corridor must be selected, but it must be reviewed and analyzed. He stated that the decision on the corridor should be related to the environment and the impacts on the environment as well as other socio-economic impacts of the project. Additionally, the decision making process should first consider those alternatives which meet the purpose and the need for the project at acceptable cost and level of environmental impact relative to the benefits derived from the project. He stated that even if the existing alignment is ruled out, it must be reviewed and analyzed. Secretary Prescott further stated that according to Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations 1502.14

(<http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/1502.htm#1502.14>) “The Agency shall rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.” He stated that this has been a great partnership between local government, Blueprint 2000 and the Florida Department of Transportation and he did not want to jeopardize the partnership and eliminate federal funding for the future. He mentioned that this is at least a \$100M- \$200M project which is not fully funded and he would recommend that the Board not eliminate federal funding options.

Commissioner Thaelle asked what it meant that exclusion of a route may jeopardize federal funding and is there in fact any funding available for this project. Secretary Prescott stated that normally what occurs is that there is a federal earmark; however currently there is no earmark for this segment at this point. He stated that as FDOT develops corridors in their PD&E studies they always go through the NEPA process even if there are no federal funds in the project because on some phase of the project they may want to use federal funding. He stated that local and state money can be used for PD&E and design, however they may not have enough local and state money for right-of-way acquisition and construction and they will look to federal money. He further stated that if you have not completed the NEPA process you would automatically be eliminated from eligibility for federal funds. He further stated that it is best to keep the option on the table whether it is needed or not. Secretary Prescott stated that this is a \$200,000,000 project and the cost to do the PD&E study for the existing alignment would cost approximately \$100,000 dollars, which would be a minimal expenditure to keep the project eligible for construction costs down the road, if they are needed.

Commissioner Grippa asked if the alternative alignment were selected, could federal funds be used for stormwater retrofit for the current alignment based upon the outcome of the PD&E study. Commissioner Grippa stated that there is little to no stormwater treatment being done in the existing corridor, then years later it was determined that the route was causing pollution, could federal funds be used for stormwater retrofit. Secretary Prescott stated yes, that the study would need to be updated for more current information, but the information is still good and it could be utilized for some other project. He stated that he would like to have all options available on the table.

Commissioner Grippa asked Maribel Nicholson-Choice, Board Counsel, if she agreed with Secretary Prescott. Ms. Nicholson-Choice said yes, the NEPA policy establishes a decision making process. She stated that the existing route should be identified and compared to the alternate routes because comparisons can't be made to each other; they have to be made to what exists. She further stated that the most feasible and least environmental impact will hopefully be the route that will be selected, however you take away from the credibility of the analysis if a component of the existing alignment is eliminated altogether.

Commissioner Grippa asked Mr. Davis if he agreed with Counsel and Secretary Prescott. Mr. Davis stated that from everything that he knows, he agrees. Commissioner Grippa commented that he did not want to risk the \$45M nor losing any federal funding.

Commissioner Mustian stated that the Board has committed not to use the existing route and that there is concern that if it is studied, it will come back as cheaper, then the existing route will be back on the table. Secretary Prescott stated that if the Board does not choose to use the existing route, then the reasons should be documented.

Commissioner Rackleff asked if Secretary Prescott could grant a waiver for doing the full-blown study on the existing alignment. Secretary Prescott stated that FHWA already responded to this request, and as previously stated, the existing route would need to be studied as well as the no build option. He further stated that he would not give a waiver on studying the existing alignment. He stated that on the state level, FDOT has to make choices about whether to use federal funds on projects. He pointed out that road projects on average take about 10 years from start to finish and a lot of things change within that time, and that they do not like to jeopardize federal funding. Commissioner Rackleff restated his question to Secretary Prescott, which was “that under no circumstances could we get a waiver to not include that in the study and spend several hundred thousand dollars for facts that we are not going to use.” Secretary Prescott stated that neither FDOT nor FHWA would grant a waiver not to include the existing corridor in the study. Commissioner Rackleff asked if it was FDOT that has decided that the Board would not apply and get a waiver from this requirement. Secretary Prescott affirmed that this was the stance of the Florida Department of Transportation. Commissioner Rackleff asked if Secretary Prescott was saying that if the Board requested a waiver from the FDOT that it would not be granted. Secretary Prescott stated that he was correct.

Commissioner Lightsey asked if the NEPA process was what the Board was currently following. Mr. Davis stated that doing the PD&E study was following the NEPA process. He stated that the study would take approximately 3 years because the current alignment as well as the alternate corridor will be studied. He further stated that the current budget for this study was approximately \$1.6M. Commissioner Lightsey asked if the Board decided to abandon all federal funds and not follow the NEPA process, then what process would be used to study the alternate route. Mr. Davis stated that the Board could decide to abandon federal funds and eliminate the current alignment, however the alternative route would not be a state road and would not be eligible for federal funding. He further stated that Blueprint would follow a very similar process to NEPA because we would still want to very thoroughly evaluate the environmental impacts, impacts on neighborhoods and cost etc.

Commissioner DePuy stated that he would like to go on record to say that he is not in favor of abandoning the current roadway. He stated that he understood that there is currently no stormwater treatment on the current roadway so that anything that is done would be an improvement. Secretary Prescott stated that there was natural stormwater collection, such as the lakes and the swamps, in the segment that were there when the roadway was initially built. He further stated that there were no stormwater facilities that treat the runoff before it went into the lakes and swamps. Commissioner DePuy asked if there are plans to return the current roadway to its natural state by removing the roadway. Secretary Prescott stated that that could be a decision that was made after the PD&E study was completed, however he did not know of any plans to remove this roadway. He further stated that he recommended that it stay because it would provide more relief to roadway congestion and provides access to the Airport.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Include Corridor 1 in the contract for the PD&E Study.

Commissioner DePuy moved approval of staff recommendation. Commissioner Rackleff seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he understood that roadway projects take 10 years to complete especially when you have to study unlikely corridors. He stated that his problem was not with following the NEPA guidelines but that they should be followed on realistic roadways that governments are going to fund. He stated that the challenge with doing the study is that it adds time that could be used to focus on the segment that is going to be built. He mentioned that staff had drafted a letter that laid out a consistent case as to why the current alignment was not a preferred option, which was not sent to FDOT. He stated that the existing corridor does not meet several of the objectives that were addressed in this letter. Commissioner Gillum stated that the goal of the program was to enhance its relationship with FDOT, find as much money to complete projects and do so in a reasonable and practical approach that does not waste taxpayer money or the government's time.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the Board did not wish to use the current alignment, however he understands Secretary Prescott's explanation of the reason that the current alignment needs to be included in the PD&E study. He further asked if there was an MBE component that is mandated in the NEPA process. Secretary Prescott stated that there was no mandate. Commissioner Proctor asked if there was a state mandated MBE component. Secretary Prescott stated that FDOT has set targets and goals for MBE and DBE programs and they are tracked for federal and state projects.

Commissioner Thaelle pointed out that the IA has established MBE goals that are in place whether there are state or federal MBE goals or not.

Commissioner Sauls stated that she appreciated Secretary Prescott attending the meeting and that it would be a no brainer to vote to include the existing route on the PD&E study.

Commissioner Thaelle stated that at the September IA meeting the IA voted unanimously to eliminate the existing route from the Study.

Commissioner Rackleff moved to call the question. Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion.

Commissioner DePuy stated that at the September IA meeting he recalled that the Board voted to eliminate the existing route from the PD&E study depending on the response that was received for FDOT.

The motion (to include the existing corridor in the Study) carried unanimously 10-0 (58-0).

6. Construction Cost Escalation in Florida

Mr. Davis referred the Board to a newspaper article that appeared in the weekend Tallahassee Democrat regarding road construction cost escalation. He asked if the Board had any questions regarding the agenda item or the article.

Commissioner Gillum asked if there was merit to the argument that there could be a cost saving if full parcels were purchased instead of partial pieces of land. Mr. Davis stated that this was not an option because under the NEPA process there are right-of-way maps that identify how much of a property is necessary for the road. He further stated the Board does not have the authority to arbitrarily condemn the entire parcel without showing a public need, because it exceeds what is necessary for the infrastructure improvement. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint has been very

successful in their right-of-way incentive program, and we are 6 months ahead of schedule in right of way acquisition. Commissioner Gillum asked if an offer could be made on the full parcel. Mr. Davis referred the question to Mr. Ray Youmans, Right of Way Manager. He further stated that there would be a question as to where the money would come from and whether federal or state money could be used to purchase the parcel since it would be more than what would be needed for the right of way. Mr. Youmans stated that if the appraisal determined that there was an uneconomic remainder of the parcel, then an offer could be made to the property owner to purchase the remaining portion of the property. He further stated that it would be up to the property owner as to whether he/she would like to accept the offer.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the process requires the program to do something that does not make good financial sense. She stated that if it would be cheaper to purchase the entire parcel and we are unable to demonstrate a need, then the government is forced to pay more. Commissioner Gillum asked for something in writing that explained the process of acquiring land for roadway projects. Mr. Davis stated that for all of the property that is acquired through Blueprint that very conscience decisions are being made to insure that they are the most economical for the agency. He stated that through the land banking policy staff works with willing sellers to do whole takes and then later we would sell the remnant, and generate revenue. He further stated that Florida is a property rights state; therefore most of the rules for right-of-way acquisition work in favor of the property owner.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For Information Only

Mr. Michael Sheridan, Chairman of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), stated that the CAC performance report was being finalized and will be presented at the next IA meeting and that overall it will be positive. He stated that the CAC is sensitive to the desires of the citizens particularly regarding Capital Circle SW, acquisition of headwaters of the St. Marks, etc. but one of the things that they have learned is that the program can't do whatever it wants to do on a local basis because there are rules that must be followed when using people's money. He further stated that through leveraging the program received an additional \$61M in commitments for state grants and federal funding. Mr. Sheridan stated that due to hurricane redevelopment and increases in the cost of oil, the cost for construction has gone through the roof, therefore the program needs federal money.

7. Reallocation and Appropriation of Supplemental Funds in the Master Plan

Mr. Phil Maher stated that over the last several months Blueprint has been awarded \$61M in federal and state grants as outlined in the agenda item.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Accept the recommended allocation of additional funds as shown in Attachment 1 and appropriate the amounts reflected in FY 2006.

Commissioner Rackleff moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion.

Commissioner Grippa asked what specific project the \$2.5M would go to in the Northwest Greenways. Mr. Maher stated that this was for the Atkinson parcel, a greenway project that was

applied for through DEP. It is a 214-acre parcel in the northwest quadrant of Capital Circle and West Tennessee Street. He stated that in fiscal year 2006, \$1M is allocated to leverage DEP funds for the purchase of the property, and in fiscal year 2007 & 2008 there is \$2.5M allocated each year for the purchase of the property if the DEP grant does not materialize. Commissioner Grippa asked if this was property originally identified within the Blueprint plan. Mr. Maher stated that staff was directed to reprioritize this project in association with funding Capital Circle NW to the Airport. Commissioner Grippa asked if it made more sense to look at other key roads such as Mahan Drive and how far the program was from funding Mahan Drive. Someone from the audience responded (that Mahan funding was for) 2010-2011. Secretary Prescott stated that the answer given was correct, however FDOT was interested in advancing the project. Commissioner Grippa asked if the project were funded (by Blueprint) then would there be a greater chance of getting matching funds from FDOT. Secretary Prescott stated that it would. Commissioner Grippa stated that the funds were allocated to purchase a property which is not adjacent to the roadway (Atkinson property) and that the money would be better spent on Mahan Drive since it is a crucial part of the community.

Commissioner Grippa made a substitute motion to reallocate the \$2.5M in year 2007 currently slated for Capital Circle Northwest Greenways to the Construction of Mahan Drive. Commissioner Thael stated that the motion could not be accepted because Mahan Drive was a tier 2 project. Ms. Nicholson-Choice stated that the process for taking a project from tier 2 and putting it into tier 1 is a separate process. **Commissioner Grippa made another substitute motion to start the process of moving the Mahan Drive project to a tier 1 project.** Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gillum asked if the money shown in Attachment 1 under priority 1, Leveraging were in-house and available to use. Mr. Davis stated that the \$4.3M for TRIP Right of Way in fiscal year 2006 is an award, which must be matched with \$4.3 from Blueprint; however the \$10M is set aside as an anticipated match for TRIP funds for construction which will be applied for by the CRTPA. The \$10M must be available if the grant is awarded in order to leverage the money. He further stated that the \$980,000 is match to the grant awarded by FCT for Capital Cascade Trail, however it is not in-hand. He further stated that the \$1M Greenways & Trails is also an anticipatory matching grant.

Commissioner Gillum asked where in the program Gaines Street was because FAMU Way is mentioned as a part of Gaines Street. He mentioned that there is not enough money for Gaines Street. Mr. Davis stated that funding for Gaines Street is shown at \$17M and the project is listed as a tier 2 project in the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Davis stated that the Blueprint program was \$150M short in completely funding the tier 1 projects, and to move a project up from tier 2 will cause a greater shortfall in tier 1, or money will need to be diverted from another project. Commissioner Gillum stated that he was interested in leveraging money on projects that are realistic and not potential leveraging opportunities. Commissioner Gillum asked Mr. Michael Wright how much the Gaines Street project was short and stated that he was interested in moving Gaines Street to a tier 1 project as well. Mr. Wright stated that what has been agreed on between the City and the County is that the City will be contributing \$17M of the 10% City set aside from the sales tax money, and the County is contributing \$10.7M of their 10% set aside from the sales tax money, which came about through discussions on the downtown CRA. He stated that the State donated between \$6M and \$7M. He further stated that the current estimate is that Gaines/Madison will cost approximately \$17M and that FAMU Way is proposed to be extended

and the estimated cost is \$20M, therefore the project is \$3M short, however there are other funding options with a lot depending on right-of-way and of the final components of the design.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that he would like to speak in opposition to the substitute motion, which is an attempt to undo Blueprint 2000. He stated that the voters approved the program because they believed that there would be a combination of roadway projects, greenspace projects, bike-able and walk-able trails. He further stated that the maker of the motion and the seconder of the motion were the two Commissioners who actively campaigned against the sales tax extension. Commissioner Rackleff stated that if the motion was approved it would begin the unraveling of Blueprint and they would lose public support. He stated that green spaces are essential to economic development because people move to Tallahassee because it is a beautiful community with a variety of activities and ways to get around.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she would like to have the motion restated. She stated that the spreadsheet provided was difficult to understand. She further stated that she understood that the Atkinson property was an amenity of the Capital Circle NW project that was stripped away when the Board moved money to the next segment of the Capital Circle project. Mr. Davis stated that because right of way along Capital Circle is so expensive the decision was made that we would acquire floodplains and greenway that were not adjacent to the roadway, at an estimated cost of approximately \$22M. He stated that the Board directed staff to move the \$22M to the construction of Capital Circle SW, Highway 20 to Orange Avenue, and when money became available again that staff was to re-fund the acquisition of the greenway. He further stated that at the last meeting, as the #3 priority, the Board directed staff to move the greenway money forward. He stated that the Atkinson property is a part of the greenway and trails part of the Capital Circle Northwest package. Mr. Davis stated that it is consistent with the Greenways and Trails Plan that was developed by the Planning Department. Commissioner Lightsey stated that during the briefing she was told that staff hoped that these greenway funds would be place holders, and that they were applying for greenways and trails grants. They hoped not to have to use the money that is proposed to be allocated. Mr. Davis stated that that was correct, however, staff has been notified that they were classified a "B" project and may not receive the grant from OGT.

Commissioner Lightsey asked for a list of the money that was received through leveraging and how much was being withheld for administrative costs. She again asked someone to restate the substitute motion. Commissioner Grippa stated that the substitute motion was that the Board allocate the \$2.5M away from the Northwest Greenways and put the money towards Mahan. Others noted that the substitute motion was to start the process of moving Mahan to tier 1.

Commissioner Proctor stated that he was pleased that Secretary Prescott desired to move forward with Mahan Drive. He further stated that Mahan Drive has been designated by the County Emergency Management leader as an emergency evacuation route. He pointed out that there was over \$12.4M in the land bank and he requested that Commissioner Grippa amend the substitute motion to reallocate these funds also. He stated that \$5M could be allocated to FAMU Way and reallocate \$8M to Mahan Drive. He stated that he would like to take the opportunity to get a clearer commitment from Secretary Prescott.

Commissioner Grippa asked if the money were reallocated to Mahan, would the FDOT repay the money. Secretary Prescott stated that there is no agreement to do a payback. He stated that they are more interested in putting money toward a partnership rather than a project where there is no

local funding. **Commissioner Grippa amended his motion to include Mahan and FAMU Way.** Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mustian stated that when the program was conceived that there deliberately were not any percentages related to the percent of dollars for roadway projects versus greenway and trail projects. He stated that the greenway projects are being eliminated and that the program is becoming a roadway program. He further stated that he would like to see Mahan become a tier 1 project but not at the expense of the greenway.

Commissioner Sauls asked what the process would be to move the projects from tier 2 to tier 1. Mr. Davis stated that to move a project required a recommendation from the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the Technical Coordinating Committee and the IMC, 2 public hearings and a supermajority vote of both Commissions.

Commissioner Thaelle asked Mr. Davis to describe geographically where the Atkinson property was located. Mr. Davis stated that the intersection of West Tennessee Street and Capital Circle could be used as a reference point, continuing west ¼ of a mile on the north side of West Tennessee, about 1,500 feet of the property fronts West Tennessee Street and extends north to I-10 and it abuts the Lake Talquin State Park to the west.

Commissioner DePuy that he would support the substitute motion.

Commissioner Grippa stated that greenways have been made priorities, for example Capital Cascade Park and Atkinson is only a small part of the greenways project. Commissioner Grippa asked where in the Blueprint program it stated that I-10 and Capital Circle would be connected via greenway. Commissioner Rackleff stated that is was written in the interlocal agreement.

Commissioner Grippa asked Mr. Davis to explain the Land Bank. Mr. Davis stated that the Land bank was presented to the Board very early in the program and allows staff to have money available to acquire properties from willing sellers along the alignment of the projects if money was not yet budgeted and available for right of way acquisition. He stated that the money in the Land Bank gives staff the ability to purchase the property early and at a lower cost.

Commissioner Grippa asked how the figures listed were arrived at. Mr. Davis stated that the numbers were backed into when staff took what was funded and what was not. Commissioner Grippa stated that if there were a project that was ready to go then that would save money also.

Commissioner Thaelle stated that he would not support a motion that completely goes against what the voters voted on. The question on the substitute motion was called. **The motion failed 4-5 (22-29).** (Yes: Gillum, DePuy, Grippa, Proctor. No: Lightsey, Mustian, Rackleff, Sauls, Thaelle.)

The original motion to accept the staff's recommendation was voted on. The motion carried 5-4 (29-22).

Commissioner Mustian asked that staff look at the issues that were raised about Mahan Drive and FAMU Way and bring them back for discussion.

Commissioner Grippa asked staff to also bring the document that says that one of the objectives is to connect the greenways and trails.

Commissioner Lightsey asked that the spreadsheet that was provided be brought back to the Board in greater detail, for example the sources of the money and the suggested expenditures.

8. Capital Circle Northwest/ Southwest Expanded PD&E Study: Frontage Road south of Jackson Bluff Road

Mr. Davis stated that the staff has been approached by a property owner with a request for a frontage road north of the Delta Industrial Park on the east side of Capital Circle. He stated that the owner of the proposed development is willing to share some of the cost for the frontage road by partnering with Blueprint by donating the right of way.

Commissioner Lightsey asked staff to provide a full set of plans for the roadway.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Authorize the IMC to approve the frontage road, if terms can be reached with the property owner.

Commissioner Lightsey moved approval of staff recommendation. Commissioner DePuy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Blueprint Retreat: Commissioner Thael announced that there will be a Blueprint 2000 retreat at the Wakulla Springs Lodge at noon on April 18, 2006. He stated that the purpose of the event was to discuss Blueprint accomplishments and discuss strategies, areas of interest and emphasis in the future.

9. Capital Cascade Trail Design Team

Mr. Davis stated that previously the Board had approved a team to design Segment 2 of the Capital Cascade Trail which included include Hargreaves Associates. He stated that Hargreaves had notified Genesis Group that they would be unable to participate in the project due to other project commitments. Mr. Davis stated that they proposed to reassign the tasks that would have gone to Hargreaves to Carr, Lynch and Sandell who are currently on the team.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he could not support the staff recommendation but would recommend the tasks be assigned to Moore Bass Consulting, which is a local firm. He stated that Moore Bass has the capability to do the tasks that were assigned to Hargreaves. Mr. David Bright stated that Hargreaves was included on the design team because of their vast knowledge of urban downtown redevelopment and their experience on a large-scale project such as the Capital Cascade Park. He further stated that the Board had requested that the Capital Cascade design team include some of the firms that worked on the Chattanooga Tennessee Riverfront redevelopment. Mr. Bright confirmed that the design manager would be the Genesis Group.

RECOMMENDED OPTION:

Option 1: Assign proposed Hargreaves tasks to Carr, Lynch and Sandell, Inc. and other Team consultants.

Commissioner Grippa moved to have Moore Bass Consulting complete the tasks that were originally assigned to Hargreaves if they are available. Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she could not support the motion, even though there is a push to spend money locally. She stated that from the beginning of the project the Board and the citizens stated that they wanted a firm with nationally known and documented expertise on passive park and urban park planning to participate.

Commissioner Mustian asked if there were separate contracts for the sub-consultants or if they worked under the Genesis contract. Mr. Davis stated that they were contracted with Genesis and that Genesis would assign the tasks to the sub-consultants. He further stated that staff was attempting to put together a world-class design team and that when he spoke with the developers of the Chattanooga project; they stated that Hargreaves and Carr, Lynch and Sandell were the best.

Commissioner Proctor referenced Attachment #2 and stated that Moore Bass Consulting does not have an assignment in this phase of the project. He stated that he would urge the support of Moore Bass as a local MBE vendor who can provide the services.

Commissioner Mustian referenced Attachment #2, Option 3, which proposed Carr, Lynch, Sandell continue as the lead with Moore Bass providing production support. **He asked if Commissioner Grippa would amend his motion to that option. Commissioner Grippa stated that he would.** Mr. Davis stated that he understood that Moore Bass would do the legwork and Carr, Lynch, Sandell would have final authority. He further stated that Moore Bass would have a prominent role. Commissioner Grippa asked that staff bring back the scope of services for the contract and what each firm would be doing. Commissioner Lightsey asked for clarification of the motion. **Commissioner Grippa stated that he would stick to his original motion to have Moore Bass Consulting complete the tasks that were originally assigned to Hargreaves if they are available.** The motion failed 4-5, (20-31) with Commissioners Gillum, Lightsey, Mustian, Thael and Sauls casting the dissenting votes.

Commissioner Mustian moved to accept the recommendation shown on Attachment #2, option 3, which proposed Carr, Lynch, Sandell, continues as the lead with Moore Bass providing production support. Commissioner Gillum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no citizens to be heard.

VI. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Commissioner Proctor asked that the Intergovernmental Agency (IA) slow down in placing a stormwater facility in the Frenchtown Community. He stated that he would be attending a town hall meeting that evening and invited others to attend. He moved that the Board not spend the \$10M for the holding pond off of 4th Avenue and Old Bainbridge Road. Commissioner Thael stated that the project was a City project and not an Intergovernmental Agency project. Assistant

City Manager Michael Wright stated that the \$10M was earmarked for the Frenchtown project during the original negotiations of the Blueprint program as part of the City's \$25M set-aside and it is specifically listed in the interlocal agreement. Commissioner Proctor asked if the County or the IA had any say over how the money is spent.

Commissioner Lightsey clarified that this is City sales tax money and not Blueprint 2000 money. She stated that this \$10M was a part of the City's 10% over which the IA does not have control.

Mr. Wright corrected that comment stating that the \$10M was a part of the 80% of sales tax money that was overseen by the IA. He stated that there was \$25M designated to the City and for the County, respectively, to put toward water quality projects, of which \$10M was specifically designated to the Frenchtown project in the original agreement. He further stated that that remaining money for the project was coming from other city sources and grants.

Commissioner Proctor stated that a publisher called the project "ethnic cleansing of a neighborhood and community". Commissioner Thael recommended that the item be put on the IA agenda for the next meeting. **Commissioner Proctor moved to agenda the item for the next IA meeting.** Mr. Davis referenced the Interlocal Agreement, Part V, Section 8d, and stated that the funding for Frenchtown is listed for water quality retrofit. Commissioner Proctor stated that the decision to do the Frenchtown project needed to be reviewed by the IA because this would destroy a historic neighborhood and many of the neighbors did not understand this part of the referendum when the vote was taken.

Commissioner Gillum stated that what destroys neighborhoods is extreme neglect and flooding. He stated that people become used to a condition and that what is needed is education on the benefits of the project.

Commissioner Proctor moved again to bring the issue before the IA for review before the project begins. He stated that this was not the same situation as in New Orleans and that no one is in danger of loss of life. He stated that the people in the neighborhood understand that there is a flooding issue; however they do not believe that it warrants the destruction of the neighborhood. Commissioner Gillum stated that it was unacceptable for the people of a community to become used to third world conditions.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that this was a topic for a Mayor/Chair discussion. She stated that staff has tried to minimize the impact on the neighborhood, both social and human, while trying to eliminate the continual flooding. She further stated that this was a long unaddressed issue that effected the revitalization of the neighborhood. Commissioner Lightsey stated that this item should be placed on the County Commission agenda for presentation and with the benefit of staff input.

Commissioner DePuy asked for legal advice on the issue that the County has regarding this project. Ms. Nicholson-Choice stated that the Interlocal Agreement addresses the \$10M and that it was the result of negotiations on the agreement. She stated that it would be out of order to take any action on the item because (1) it is not on the agenda (2) it may require an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Thaelle adjourned the meeting at 5:17 pm.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Mark Mustian
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA

Shelonda Gay
Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA