

## Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 2, 2005

Ellis Building – Koger Center

2:00 pm

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:09 pm.

Attendees: (TCC Members in Bold)

<b>Jim Davis</b>	Hugh Williams	Jack Diestelhorst
David Bright	Chris Merritt	Nancy Miller
Phil Maher	Sally Dowler	Mark Llewellyn
<b>Michael Wright</b>	Wendy Grey	Doug Martin
<b>Gabriel Menendez</b>	<b>John Kraynak</b>	<b>John Kraynak</b>
<b>John Buss</b>	<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	<b>Wayne Tedder</b>
Shelonda Gay	Jim Shepherd	Jerry Oshesky
Tammy Peters	Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Angela Richardson		

### I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

### II. Information Items

#### **Item #1 – March 11, 2005 TCC Meeting Minutes**

Jim Davis stated there was only one correction he was aware of for the March 11, 2005 minutes; Mr. Olu Sawyer's name was listed incorrectly. When asked if there were any other changes there were no response from the committee.

#### **Item #2 – Capital Circle SW Corridor Study**

Jim Shepherd stated that the Capital Circle SW Corridor Study was underway already. Blueprint 2000 staff developed and conducted preliminary analysis on ten alternative alignments. Those ten alternatives were based on the EECC routes, the Lake Bradford Sector Plan as well as options for utilizing Springhill Road or Orange Avenue. A map of the proposed alternatives was distributed to the Committee. The intended purpose of the proposed realignment was to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that flowed into the Chain-of-Lakes, to provide easier, more direct access to Innovation Park and to provide additional economic development potential to the adjacent areas.

Mr. Shepherd further stated staff was working to finalize its recommendations regarding the alternatives to be advanced to the next phase, the Expanded Project Development and Environment (EPD&E) Study. The goal of staff was to reduce the number of alternatives to three or four for the EPD&E Study. Additionally, staff would present their recommendations to the IA at the September 19, 2005 meeting for review and approval.

Michael Wright asked which alternatives were staff eliminating. Mr. Shepherd stated that segment 4A (alternatives 6-9) and alternative 10 would most likely be eliminated. Mr. Davis stated staff had met with the Forestry Department regarding several parcels of land in the area they were agreeable to "land swaps." Discussions of the map followed including the mentioning of a sinkhole, approximately 10 feet off the current right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Davis further stated the project was controversial in that there were heated opinions and emotions regarding the alignment from the public.

Theresa Heiker asked for clarification on which segment would traverse Black Swamp. Mr. Shepherd stated segment 3A skirted Black Swamp to the west and segments 2A and 2B skirted the swamp to the east. Ms. Heiker asked if the impact of those alternatives on segment 4 design of Capital Cascades Trail had been considered. Mr. Shepherd stated not at that time however, it would be reviewed during the PD&E study.

Ms. Heiker commented that segments 3A and 3B appeared to pass through a mobile home park. Mr. Davis clarified that staff recommendation to eliminate segment 4A was, in part, due to Jackson Bluff development, Innovation Park and FSU intramural fields. He pointed out several viable alternatives on the map and stated the consultant performing the PD&E would be given a sector to work within and allowed to offer their expert opinion on which would be the best connector between (hypothetical) points A and B. Furthermore, Mr. Davis reminded the committee that staff intent was to narrow the study from a \$5 million PD&E with ten alternatives to a \$2 million PD&E with only a few alternatives. He continued by stating the current alignment was the most favorable amongst residents also, the Lake Bradford area residents prefer alternative 10. However, it would be incredibly expensive and a detriment to the environment by the impacts upon endangered species of fauna and flora.

When asked if there was further comment regarding the corridor study for Capital Circle SW there was no response from the committee.

### **Item #3 – Leveraging Update**

Phil Maher stated Blueprint 2000 has entered into a contract to acquire the Copeland Sink parcel (168 acres). The contract was for \$1,400,000 with \$660,000 coming from the Florida Communities Trust (FCT). The title to the property will be in the name of Leon County. Blueprint has also entered into an option contract for a conservation easement on 132 acres adjacent to Copeland Sink. The value would be determined upon completion of the appraisal process; it was estimated to be between \$200,000 and \$300,000. The Northwest Florida Water Management District would be responsible for 50% of the purchase price through the existing Agreement with Blueprint 2000.

Additionally Blueprint has submitted applications to FCT for grants for the Booth Property Phase II, which consisted of 160.5 acres in the Headwaters of the St. Marks River. The estimated total cost was \$1.4 million with a 60% share requested from FCT. Also Capital Cascade Segment 4, which consisted of four parcels totaling 24.8 acres. The estimated total cost was \$1,935,000 with a 50% match requested from FCT. John Buss asked which would have priority over the other. Mr. Maher explained the system

was based on points and if the applications were tied he was sure one would take precedence. Mr. Davis stated that was a good question; the Booth property would give Blueprint control of approximately 750 contiguous acres. It would be difficult to determine priority, Mr. Davis stated, both would require extensive review.

Theresa Heiker asked for clarification regarding cost; was it to secure the property only or to acquire. Mr. Davis stated it was only to acquire the property. David Bright stated the FCT grant would only fund the cost of the land, surveys, environmental, etc it does not allow funding to secure the property. There were other grants that could be applied for immediately thereafter to fund the amenities that were proposed in the FCT grant. Ms. Heiker and Tony Parks stated there had been complaints filed with the County regarding persons accessing the property for hunting and for dumping garbage. Mr. Davis stated that was one reason the owner of Copeland Sink was willing to let it go and that it would continue to be a problem.

Mr. Parks asked for clarification regarding "grant amenities." Mr. Bright stated with FCT grants proposed amenities earned extra points toward the overall score. After discussion with Craig Diamond and Steve Hodges, staff included passive amenities such as trails, boardwalks, a frisbee field or tetherball court, or a dog park. Staff would like to implement those types of amenities at some point in the future but there was currently no timetable for implementation. As for maintenance, Mr. Bright continued, that issue has been discussed from the beginning with the County Administrator and City Manager but it had yet to be resolved. Mr. Davis stated there was no funding for maintenance in the Blueprint budget merely capital funding for the projects themselves. He agreed that maintenance would be a major concern for everyone involved. Blueprint staff tried to be sensitive to that with each design, to minimize it as much as possible.

Mr. Davis, returning the conversation to the leveraging update stated there was approximately \$11 million in the House Reauthorization Act (federal legislature). Congressman Allan Boyd thought Blueprint would receive approximately half but, according to the latest word from the hill, it could be "most" rather than half. John Buss asked what it was earmarked for. Mr. Davis stated it was for Capital Circle NW, granted CCNW was fully funded by Blueprint dollars but that would allow staff to take that money out and divert it to other projects. Mr. Davis further stated there was approximately \$12.5 million in the house bill (state legislature), based upon a \$26.5 million request by both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County, as the number one transportation for both.

Mr. Davis stated the commitment from FDOT Secretary Abreu to assist with excess ROW cost on CCNW, pending additional federal funding that seemed likely, was still on the table. Additionally, District Secretary Ed Prescott designated CCNW from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue as the number one priority for additional funding for the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS); he has requested \$36 million from FDOT for SIS. Blueprint was significantly shortchanged on the first SIS allocation and have expressed that to many agencies.

Due to timing Blueprint borrowed \$22.5 million on a complete basis when the SIS funding was reviewed, the CCNW project appeared to be fully funded, although by a loan, it did not count in their analysis. Several elected and appointed officials are working to rectify that.

### III. Presentations/Discussions

#### **Item #4 – Approval to Award Contract for the Design of Capital Circle SE Woodville Highway to Tram Road**

Doug Martin stated that Dyer, Riddle, Mills & Precourt, Inc (DRMP) was the consultant selected for the design of CCSE.

Jim Davis stated there was funding for design but, at that time, no funding for ROW or construction. He explained that particular project was utilizing a “funds follows production” strategy approved by FDOT and the IA. Staff was positioning the project to be fully designed and ready to begin ROW acquisition or, better yet, construction, in attempt to compete for FDOT funding.

Mr. Davis segued into Item #5 in his explanation of the funding possibility.

#### **Item #5 – Design of Capital Circle from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway**

Jim Davis stated the IA originally approved both segments, Tram Road to Woodville Highway and Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway. After review staff elected to position one segment, Tram to Woodville, the afore mentioned strategy; realizing there was the possibility of Southwood providing funding or for donated ROW.

Mr. Davis continued by stating recently Governor Bush proposed an optional \$0.04 sales tax counties across the state could impose without public approval. That has the potential to generate \$9.5 billion over the next ten years. Based upon that additional **potential** influx of revenue for the state but not knowing how it would be distributed or allocated, staff has evaluated the position of only completing Woodville to Tram segment and ask for permission to award a design contract for the Woodville to Crawfordville segment. That would put the projects in the position to compete for the **potential** funding. Staff would like to select the second ranked consultant from the competitive selective process that was just completed for the Woodville to Tram segment. The second ranked firm in that process was URS. The president has been done before, with the attorney selection. Blueprint did a competitive selective process for attorneys and hired the top-ranking firm; the NPO hired the second ranking firm. Michael Wright asked if would meet CCNA statutes. Mr. Davis replied he thought it would but would verify that it actually did.

Discussion followed the optional four-cent sales tax. Mr. Davis clarified that Blueprint was not assuming Leon County would incorporate the additional tax but other counties would thereby generating excess money in the system. DOT could potentially have additional funding for alternative distribution or allocation. By utilizing the “funds

follow production” strategy and having both segments positioned to more efficiently compete for state funding was a reasonable risk.

Gabe Menendez asked what the estimated cost of both segments would be. Jerry Oshesky stated that together they were approximately \$25 million. Mr. Menendez confirmed that was for construction only. Mr. Oshesky agreed. Mr. Davis further stated in the Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway segment there was the possibility of an interim fix. Given the intersection designs at both Woodville Highway and Crawfordville Highway it was feasible to install four-lanes and expand to six in the future. That option, stated Mr. Davis, was save considerable amounts of money.

As a side note Mr. Davis stated there was an initiative underway with the National Forrest to acquire 103-200 acres south of the flea market. The County was also interested in it as a possible relocation site for the fairgrounds.

He further stated staff would appreciate comment from the committee regarding the possibility of this pursuing that strategy. Mr. Menendez asked if the scopes were similar. Mr. Davis replied they were the same. Tony Parks asked to be kept informed of the land acquisition process because any land Blueprint did not acquire the County would be interested in.

**Item #6 – Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E: Typical section approval and extend design south to Orange Avenue**

Jim Shepherd introduced Hugh Williams of HW Lochner the consultant conduction the PD&E study for CCNW/SW. Mr. Williams briefly discussed the typical sections for CCNW/SW that were distributed to committee members in the agenda. Michael Wright asked what the design speed was. Mr. Williams stated it was 45 mph. John Buss asked what circumstances the optional median treatment would be used. If the option were incorporated it would be a depressed swale with trees. Mr. Buss also asked if it would alternate between 22 and 36 feet in the median. Mr. Williams agreed. Mr. Davis stated that 36 feet was the standard and was used for CCSE. Theresa Heiker asked if Mr. Williams thought treatment could truly be accomplished in the medians. Mr. Williams stated it would not be the primary source of treatment but they would try for some in the more elevated sections. Mr. Davis stated it was not a lot of water but reminded the committee that every little bit helped.

Jim Shepherd stated the PD&E study covered the area south of Tennessee Street to south of Orange Avenue. In addition to the study Lochner would be designing approximately 60% plans, ROW maps and submit all the necessary permits for south of Tennessee Street to south of Blountstown Highway. He further stated that staff understanding of the IA’s direction form the 1/31/05 meeting was “to get to Orange Avenue as soon as possible.” That approach, he explained, would save both time and money as compared to advertising, selecting and bringing another consulting firm up-to-speed. Mr. Shepherd further stated staff intended to request the IA authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and supplement the existing contract with Lochner to prepare construction documents as explained above. However, because a final

decision had not been made regarding CCSW the work effort would be limited to necessary tasks only to meet the assigned schedule.

Jim Davis reminded the committee of the deal struck with the Federal Highway Administration. They mandated the PD&E be completed from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue, staff wanted to end the PD&E at Blountstown Highway because of the four way alternative. The agreed upon compromise was to complete the full PD&E but phase construct and end at Blountstown Highway. Mr. Davis stated the amendment was based on instruction from the Board to build to Orange Avenue to not loose the contract. Tony Park stated it was a minimal risk and Mr. Davis agreed.

Gabe Menendez asked in respect to the PD&E if public comment had been received. Mr. Shepherd stated the public meeting would be held in June 2005 but it was his understanding that the typical sections had to be approved by the IA and CRTPA. Mr. Menendez stated the CRTPA had NPO guidelines for the public hearing process. Michael Wright attempted to clarify by stating he thought Mr. Menendez was saying before staff stated the road had to be one way it should go through the public hearing process first. Mr. Shepherd stated he would follow up on that. Mr. Menendez stated if the process was not carefully followed the eligibility for federal funding could be lost. Mr. Davis stated staff would return to FDOT for guidance.

Theresa Heiker stated there was not a line item in the Master Plan for segment 2A for stormwater. She asked if that segment was not intended to have enhanced stormwater. It had been identified as a separate line item because it directly affected the Capital Cascades segment 4. She stated enhanced stormwater was critical to that constructions process. Mr. Davis stated that Lochner's contract indicated they were reviewing those potentials for enhanced stormwater. The \$11 million for stormwater and \$7 million for greenways were taken from that segment, by the IA, to fund construction of Highway 20 to Orange Avenue. Ms. Heiker stated the enhanced stormwater was listed as a line item for Blountstown Highway to Tennessee Street. Mr. Maher reminded Ms. Heiker the IA's direction was to move the money to construct the road, if any remained it was to return to the Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway segment. The funding for enhanced stormwater returned in the outer years on the Master Plan.

Ms. Heiker felt the IA did not understand that Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway was not as sensitive as Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue. Michael Wright stated, and John Buss agreed, the Board knew exactly what they were doing when that decision was made. Mr. Davis reminded Ms. Heiker the money shown in the outer years, beyond 2010, of the Master Plan was virtually "pie in the sky" figures. Ms. Heiker explained that was why she was concerned. She understood the funding associated with segment 2A was "hard money," finding out it was not she wanted to stress it was a known condition. Mr. Davis asked to table the conversation until Item #8's discussion on the Master Plan. There were no objections by the board.

Mr. Davis stated staff would verify the CRTPA and NPO guidelines for the public hearing process before moving forward to the next phase. John Kraynak stated he

understood from recent meetings regarding Gumm Swamp the goal was to reduce the footprint of the corridor. The typical sections presented to the committee were not consistent with that goal in his opinion. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Kraynak recommended the 10 foot meandering path, consistent with Blueprint design, be reduced to a 5 or 6 foot sidewalk. Mr. Kraynak responded if the sidewalk had to be included it should be reduced to at least those numbers. Mr. Davis clarified that was through Gumm Swamp only. Mr. Kraynak agreed. Mr. Menendez asked if there would be any side street access near Gumm Swamp. Ms. Heiker stated there was access at Gumm Road and Swamp Fox Road. Mr. Menendez stated it might be possible to reduce or eliminate the median, open it up at those two locations. Hugh Williams stated that would be possible with a long bridge but if a short bridge were installed there would not be enough room for the transition. Ms. Heiker did not want to see the access point at Swamp Fox Road eliminated. Mr. Davis and Mr. Shepherd briefly discussed the possibility of a service road through that segment but Mr. Shepherd stated he preferred to meet with committee members individually to discuss that option, as he did not have sufficient material with him at that time. Mr. Davis concluded with a summary of items staff would examine more closely.

#### **Item #7 – Capital Cascade Trail Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design**

David Bright stated the sub-committee had met to review technical reports 1 through 3 and while considerable progress had been made it was not yet ready for an IA vote. Staff hoped to have respond to all comments within the next 45 days and to have reissued the appropriate sections of the technical reports for the sub-committee to review again. The draft scope of services should be reviewed by the TCC by either the July or September 2005 meeting for the recommendations to move forward to the IA in September 2005. Mr. Bright also thanked the City and County Stormwater staff for the many hours of review.

Michael Wright asked if item(s) appeared to be a “deal killer.” Mr. Bright stated there were many outstanding issues mainly related to staging and velocity as well as permitting and pond sizes but it did not appear there were any issues that could not be resolved. Mark Llewellyn stated there had been significant effort put forth since the January 31, 2005 IA meeting. He agreed with Mr. Bright’s assessment regarding several issues that remain unsolved however there were no “deal killers” he could identify.

John Buss segued into Item #8 by reiterating concerns he had shared in the past. He felt the IA had “jumped the gun,” by adopting concepts, related to segment three before the TCC could come to closure on it. As a result he was not sure the Board heard people say that was not necessarily consistent with the original plan. Mr. Buss further stated he felt those issues became more germane in the context of budget however, in reviewing the Master Plan, he became confused. The cost estimates of the third (technical) report were substantially different from the Master Plan. Mr. Davis explained for the sake of consistency the numbers indicated in the Master Plan were based on the concept reports completed by Blueprint GEC staff, furthermore, the Master Plan was not updated with each new or changed concept. He further clarified he felt the Board gave a tacit approval of the concept for segment three but emphasized there was **not** an **approved** concept for

any segment of Capital Cascades Trail. Up to that point staff was working from multiple, contradictory directions and no longer knew how to proceed. The Board provided the necessary instruction staff needed to advance in the right direction. He further stated each concept would be presented to the Board in the future, either collectively or, probably, individually for approval. Based upon that the numbers could change.

Mr. Buss stated he felt the same way but did not want to “blindside” anyone. In his opinion, if the enhanced plan could be implemented for \$8.9 million more on a \$110 million project he felt it should at least be considered. Mr. Davis stated it was a \$180 million project. Mr. Buss stated it was with the numbers from the Master Plan but using Genesis’ numbers it was not. That was the question, what does the project cost? Mr. Davis stated when the project was narrowed to the approved concept staff would know better what the actual cost would be. Mr. Buss stated the project was estimated at \$90.5 million in 1995, adjusting those numbers for inflation, Mark Llewellyn’s project estimates were on budget. Mr. Davis stated he certainly hoped Mr. Buss and Mr. Llewellyn were correct. Mr. Buss stated he was certain the cost would increase but **strongly** felt concept B (or enhancements to concept A) should be considered for segment three for the reasons outlined in the comments regarding urban renewal, etc. Additionally, Mr. Buss’ comments regarding cost, in the report, were based on Mr. Llewellyn’s estimates. On behalf of those who may not have remembered, Mr. Davis clarified segment three was Monroe Street to Alberta Creek.

Mr. Menendez asked about Franklin Boulevard. David Bright reminded him that Franklin Boulevard, segment one, would be the last of the four segments to be completed. Mr. Davis reminded the committee of the sequence of construction, 2,4,3,1. Mr. Menendez questioned the \$15 million that was included in the Master Plan. Mr. Davis explained again, the sequence of construction and funding. He reminded the committee there was initially no funding allocated for water quality in segment four yet that was where most of the water quality for Capital Cascades Trail occurred. The Board instructed him to build segment four but there was no additional funding. That required moving segment four construction from tier 2 to tier 1 and a super-majority vote. In his opinion, because there was so much controversy regarding segment one, Franklin Boulevard the Board instructed Blueprint staff to reallocate the money from segment one construction to segment four, which would have left segment one un-funded. The SIB loans significantly reduced the amount of interest Blueprint was paying on the debt service thereby freeing up money for projects. When the Master Plan was organized it needed to be placed somewhere, it was not available until the out years, but staff arbitrarily put it in segment one. That was not consistent with the instruction of the Board but they did not know that money would become available. Of course, would have to be approved by them; thank again, they could direct Blueprint to use the money for Capital Circle.

Mr. Davis stated discussions with Leon County School Board (LCSB), regarding Leon High School (LHS) had begun and were going very well. It appeared very promising for stormwater treatment and attenuation at LHS. Details were not available at that time however Superintendent Montford was receptive to sacrificing some dirt to keep the remainder of the property high and dry as well as possibly moving the parking lot slightly



north of the current location and including a holding pond at the current parking lot site. John Buss asked if an engineer was involved with those discussions because in his opinion that did not sound permissible. Mr. Davis stated he did and by excavating the existing parking lot to capture and store the stormwater it would by default keep the other areas from flooding as much as they current do.

Displaying a map of segment two Jim Davis continued on with the Capital Cascades Trail discussion noting some differences from the earlier concept designs such as a plaza versus an amphitheater. He also pointed out, with Genesis latest work, the potential for an eight-foot fall to replicate the original cascades as well as five to eight-foot retaining walls, which allowed for the “flat” plaza area. Theresa Heiker and John Buss promptly voiced objections and concerns. Mr. Davis stated those were some of the on going amenities staff was reviewing that needed to be resolved.

John Buss stated that while not faulting at all, an extremely important part of any good preliminary engineering report should be able to go to the design contract and they know where everything was. Costs were important and if the numbers were not correct or some were omitted that need to be corrected, caught up or coordinated. It was difficult for committee members to comment on certain things...but they would get there. Mr. Davis stated he would not change the Master Plan numbers until such point in time as the concepts of Mr. Llewellyn's project were approved. Mr. Buss stated that was problematic because if the numbers used in planning did not match the engineering it caused him to question the other projects as well. Mr. Davis stated the most accurate numbers would certainly be the ones reflected in the Master Plan but until they were approved (finalized) the Master Plan would not change because he did not want to underestimated the cost of the project. Mr. Buss reiterated that with technical report #3 the project should be able to go to design and if staff did not know what the project cost was at that point there were problems. Mr. Davis stated there was not agreement on technical report #3. Mr. Buss stated it was close but... Phil Maher interjected it would be reconciled at some point. Mr. Buss asked if the option of the State of Florida funding a portion of the project still existed, based on an agreement to reduce flooding on South Monroe Street. Ed Ringe stated information regarding the stages in that area was not available yet but when it was it would be presented to the State. John Buss stated the State had been helpful in the past with cooperative projects. Mr. Davis asked if that was a topic of discussion at the sub-committee meeting. Ms. Heiker confirmed it was. Mr. Davis assured Mr. Buss that staff would pursue every possible funding source to assist with Capital Cascades Trail.

Wayne Tedder asked what the water levels of segment two would be during rain events, both normal and milestone events, and if there were illustrations available to detail them. Mark Llewellyn stated there were no illustrations available but the entire area of segment two was designed for storage during major rain events. Jim Davis stated there was a retaining wall along the southern pond. Ms. Heiker stated the “green area of the map and amphitheater” did not match the grading area she reviewed in technical report #3. Mr. Davis stated that would need to be clarified by Mark Llewellyn. Mr. Llewellyn stated that during major storm events a major portion of the lower park area would flood. The

trail itself would be above the water level and a few other places but that segment was designed for storage during major events. Mr. Davis stated the entire streambed was designed to flood as in the original concept but could it exceed the retaining wall. Mr. Llewellyn stated that during a 100-year flood, yes, the retaining wall would be exceeded but not during the smaller annual or multi-annual events. Mr. Davis asked if there was anyway to design it so the 100-year event would not flood. Mr. Llewellyn replied certainly but Mr. Davis confirmed the requirement of the project was to meet the 25-year flood levels.

Ms. Heiker stated the reason she specifically questioned that was in order to achieve the grading to hold the water from spilling onto Monroe Street would require 12 feet of fill. The concept design showed a gate from Monroe Street to the amphitheater site. She wanted to know how that would accommodate disabled access given that Gasden street access would also be raised six feet. That required a substantial grading effort and was completely contrary to the...she did not see, on the concept design map, a flat level area. Mr. Llewellyn stated he did not feel Ms. Heiker was correct in her analysis and would be happy to share with her the topography of the area. Ms. Heiker again asked how disabled persons would access the park, from Monroe Street, if there was a 12-foot elevation change. Mr. Llewellyn stated there was not correct. Mr. Davis interjected that her point was well taken and would be investigated further.

Mr. Davis stated the bottom line was the item was not ready to move forward to the IA because there were obviously many unanswered questions and more work to be completed. However, staff would like to take the item before the Board in September 2005 for approval of segment two. David Bright offered one last comment regarding the movement of segment four construction to tier one. Two public hearings had been held, one at a City Commission meeting and the second at a County Commission meeting. The Board would take a vote at the May 16, 2005 meeting following the third public hearing. It would be a required super-majority vote, which meant four City and five County Commissioners would need to vote in the affirmative.

Wayne Tedder asked one final question regarding pedestrian traffic at the railroad overpass. Was there any concern, through the public participation process, for the best fit for foot traffic at that location? Mr. Llewellyn stated due to grading requirement the footpath could not pass under the railroad bridge the best. Mr. Bright stated there were several public comments that preferred the path be above grade for the sake of personal safety in the evenings or after dark. Mr. Davis confirmed the footpath would cross over the railroad bridge. Mr. Llewellyn explained it would be at the existing grade and crossing Gasden Street.

John Buss stated he understood from earlier conversation that concept designs for all segments would be presented to the IA in September. Mr. Bright stated that was possible however, segment two was critical. Mr. Davis stated if staff was prepared to present all four segments then they would do so however they were prepared to go with segment two only for now.

**Item #8 - Blueprint 2000 Master Plan and Capital Budget**

Phil Maher reminded the committee of the staff presentation at the January 31, 2005 IA meeting of specific questions the Board needed to address prior the development of the revised Master Plan. Mr. Maher stated the first six items listed on the Master Plan handout, the water quality and sensitive lands section, were not affected by the direction of the Board. However, the Landbank was reduced by approximately \$600,000 from the September 2004 figure. Michael Wright asked for clarification of the Landbank. Mr. Maher stated it was a culmination of ... Mr. Wright interjected, what ever was needed? Mr. Davis stated that was correct; the Landbank allow Blueprint to buy property that was not budgeted.

Mr. Maher further stated construction of Capital Circle NW from I-10 to Highway 90 was fully funded but the allocations for stormwater retrofit and greenways was re-appropriated for construction of segment two, Blountstown Highway to Orange Avenue. Due to Blueprint generating additional dollars they were able to leave the funding in the project but it was moved to the outer years. The next segment, Tennessee Street to Blountstown Highway, remained the same with the exception of the greenways and stormwater dollars moving to the outer years. By doing so staff was able to incorporate beginning construction in 2006 and completing in 2009 that segment. As Ms. Heiker pointed out there was no enhanced stormwater for that particular section. Also, Capital Circle SE Connie to Tram segment remained unchanged.

The Board concurred with the strategy of “money follows production” therefore staff was able to maintain one segment under that philosophy which was Woodville to Tram. Mr.

However the following guidance was incorporated into the revised master plan:

1. The priority for funding of Capital Cascade Trail was set for segments 2, 4, 3, with no more than \$5 million for segment 1 until the construction of Capital Circle from Highway 20 to Orange Avenue was funded.
2. The dollars currently reflected for stormwater retrofit and greenways on Capital Circle from I-10 to Highway 20 be moved to fund the construction of Capital Circle from Highway 20 to Orange Avenue. Any remaining funds should go back to the funding for stormwater retrofit and greenways for that segment of Capital Circle.
3. There should not be any reallocation of dollars reflected for City and County water quality projects.
4. The sensitive land projects should continue to be fully funded.

Included in the revised Master Plan is an additional \$27 million in projects. These additional dollars are the result of the addition of the SIB loan for Capital Circle Southeast, \$1.3 million from SIS dollars in fiscal year 2008 in the Florida Department of Transportation work plan, and interest savings from less use of bonds in the earlier years.

Also attached is the proposed Capital Budget for FY2006-FY2010. This budget incorporates the funding necessary to implement the revised Master Plan. For contracting purposes dollars reflected in multiple years for design and construction have been combined.

#### **IV. Citizens to be Heard**

There were none.

#### **V. Items from Members of the Committee**

There were none.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

There being no further business      adjourned the meeting at approximately