

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 17, 2007
 Ellis Building – Koger Center
 1:00 pm

Attendees: **(TCC Members in Bold)** **(TCC Member Substitutes In Bold Italics)**

Rodney Cassidy	Phil Maher	Angela Richardson
Allison Stewart	Dave Bright	Debra Schiro
Theresa Heiker	Bill Little	Margie Quillman
Gabe Menendez	Randy Matheny	Ed Ringe
Tony Park	Gary Phillips	Autumn Calder
Vince Long	Doug Martin	
John Kraynak	Paul Hiers	

Phil Maher called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

Item #1: Capital Circle NW Completion and Ribbon Cutting

Margie Quillman provided an update to the Ribbon Cutting for CCNW. Ms. Quillman noted that the agenda item was in the final stages and that Blueprint would be polling in September by calling commissioners and others for a possible date for the ceremony.

Theresa Heiker discussed the need to review the As-Builts and operating permit application. Ms. Heiker asked that the CPI be reminded that it needed to include the County’s standard information. Ms. Heiker asked for a copy of the planting plans. Ms. Quillman replied that she would give Ms. Heiker a schematic of the planting plan.

Item #2: Capital Circle NW/SW Access Classifications/SIS Issues

This item was informational only.

Item #3: Capital Circle SW PD&E Update

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Wood Sink Parcel

This item was informational only.

Item #5: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Workshop

This item was informational only.

Item #6: Capital Cascade Trail Supplemental Services Approval

Theresa Hiker asked if the increase in cost for Capital Cascades Segment 1 was in the Agenda. Phil Maher stated that it was in the Master Plan agenda item. Ms. Heiker asked whether there would be separate discussion about Segment 2 in a separate workshop and whether it would address the modifications to the amenities as well. Ms. Heiker also inquired whether it would be deferred until the workshop. David Bright stated that they would get to it by the September workshop.

Tony Park followed up the discussion by asking if Blueprint had right-of-way money for Segment 2 and did they still require the right-of-way money by using it to design the amenities. Phil Maher said that they had 1.2 million in 2007 and \$1,280,000 for 2008 for right-of-way. They were looking at property in Myers Park at one point. At that time, no right-of-way funds were needed and Blueprint would use some of the additional right-of-way funds for supplemental design services.

Item #7: Real Estate Policy Revisions

Tony Park questioned whether the proposed real estate policy revisions complied with Fla. Statute 253.025(6). Mr. Park stated that he believed there was a state requirement as to when a second appraisal was required. Phil Maher stated that a second appraisal was required by FDOT if the appraised value exceeded \$1 million dollars. Mr. Park stated that he thought that Blueprint's requirement was a second appraisal was needed if the first exceeds \$400,000. Randy Matheny stated that FDOT's Right of Way procedure stated that parcels exceeding \$1 million **might** require a second appraisal, depending on the complexity of the parcel. Mr. Matheny stated that Blueprint was requesting the change to its real estate policy to be consistent with the Executive Director's authority in other areas of the Real Estate Policy and to mirror FDOT procedures. Mr. Park said Fla. Stat. 125.355 also addressed when a second appraisal would be required.

Debra Schiro reviewed the statute to address Mr. Park's concerns. She reported that while Mr. Park was correct in his assessment of the County's statute providing a need for a 2nd appraisal under certain circumstances, she did not feel as if the proposed changes in the Real Estate Policy would result in a waiver of the statute and the law would still apply if Blueprint choose to enter into an option contract. She stated that if Blueprint chose, like it typically did in eminent domain to provide a copy of the appraisal report at the time of the offer, then the statute did not apply. Under Chapter 253, which essentially applied to land purchased by FDEP, one could choose not to provide a copy of the appraisal when one entered into an option contract to purchase the property. If the first appraisal exceeded the threshold amount then the average of the two appraisal amounts

would be used for the offer, if Blueprint exceed that amount then the Board would be required to approve the purchase.

Under the County's Real Estate Policy the threshold amount for obtaining a second appraisal was \$500,000; at the City that amount was \$300,000. The current threshold amount for Blueprint was \$400,000, but the change to the real estate policy, if approved, would raise the threshold amount to \$750,000 and then whether to seek a second appraisal will be discretionary and not mandatory. Ms. Schiro stated that she thought the increase in the threshold amount to \$750,000 was in recognition of the amount the appraised values were likely to be on CCSW/NW and since that was a FDOT road there would not be a requirement to obtain a second report unless the first appraisal was weak. Ms. Schiro went on to explain that it was FDOT policy to require a second appraisal if the first one was over 1 million, however they had revised their policy.

Item #8: Capital Circle NW/SW Mitigation Parcels Acquisition & Resolution

This item was informational only.

III. Consent

Item #9: TCC Minutes: March 15, 2007

There were no comments regarding the March minutes.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #10: Mahan Drive Update and Funding

Phil Maher stated that the Board had reserved \$10 million for Mahan Drive with the understanding that when Blueprint received additional funding from FDOT, they could begin the public hearings to move it from a Tier 2 to Tier 1. In recent meetings with FDOT, they had indicated there was the potential for additional funding to become available. However, FDOT wanted a stronger commitment that the \$10 million would be available for match. That would actually start the public hearing process saying that it would be a Tier 1 project contingent upon FDOT coming up with the additional funding. Mr. Maher asked if there were any questions on this topic. Vincent Long stated that he did not have any questions and confirmed the County concurred with the outline as presented by Mr. Maher.

Item #11: Capital Circle SE Design Update (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)

Gary Phillips provided a presentation to supplement the Agenda item. He stated that Blueprint stopped the consultant at 60% design phase pending funding for right-of-way and construction. At that time the Master Plan indicated no funding for right-of-way or construction. However, staff was evaluating an interim improvement that would meet the demand in the corridor and would cost significantly less.

The typical section for Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway would be a four-lane interim improvement. Blueprint would complete the interim improvements with the ultimate improvement, which Blueprint would do to the inside, as was indicated in the transitions to the seven-lane section (60% design), when funding was available in the future.

It would cost approximately \$12 million to complete the interim improvements and it was significantly less because the E2 project would acquire a portion of the right-of-way beyond the Woodville Highway/CCSE intersection and the remaining right-of-way would be obtained through an easement with the U.S. Forest Service. This would provide significant savings by not having to acquire any right-of-way. Blueprint would then tie into the existing four-lane intersection improvements that were completed by FDOT in 2004 at Crawfordville Highway. That four-lane section would provide the capacity needed through 2030. Gabe Menendez with City Public Works raised the question whether Blueprint would have stormwater capacity for the full seven lanes. Mr. Phillips confirmed that they would. Blueprint spoke to FDOT in April 2007 to discuss the plan and FDOT was in agreement with the \$12 million and should be able to make it work quicker than with \$28.3 million.

Vince Long asked if Blueprint had capacity for the fairgrounds and Mr. Phillips assured him they did. Theresa Heiker asked that until such time as the fairgrounds were constructed, would FDOT own and operate the facility. Ms. Heiker asked whether DOT would have the easement. Mr. Phillips confirmed that was correct. David Bright asked whether the easement would be transferable to the County if the fairgrounds water went into it or would it be a constraint. Ms. Heiker stated that typically the County would, in the event that outside water was discharged to the roadside facility, FDOT would transfer the easement to Leon County to maintain with a reservation for treatment of their own water. Bill Little confirmed that was the standard procedure. Ms. Heiker stated that she wanted to ensure that it started off as a County pond in the event that there was a delay in construction of the fairgrounds and they were not in a position to maintain it. Tony Park asked if Blueprint was about to restart the design work to go to the four-lane section. Mr. Phillips stated that Blueprint was in a 'holding pattern' until they determined if funding was available. Phil Maher added that Blueprint had program management in the budget for next year in hopes of being ahead of the process by approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Bright informed the group of a couple of DRI's that had some mitigation being calculated South-side in South Brook. The impacts from them could be put toward that and when the CRTPA began their priority list in September, Blueprint would have the comment that one was ready. However, Mr. Bright stated that Blueprint did not have the

match for TRIP at this time. Mr. Park asked about the number one TRIP priority for CRPTA Committee. Mr. Bright stated that when it was submitted in 2006 it was Tram Road to Woodville Highway.

Item #12: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study: Approval of Evaluation Criteria

Paul Hiers started the discussion for Item 12 by stating that Blueprint had just concluded nine months of intense public involvement activities culminating in the very successful Concepts Charrette held Thursday, May 10 and Saturday, May 12. Per Mr. Hiers, the information gathered from the Charrette will enable Blueprint to start entering the analysis phase. Thirteen evaluation criteria with 31 topics will be used to try to compare the different alternatives. This criteria evaluation will be taken to the IA for approval so Blueprint can move forward and start analyzing and comparing the various alignments.

Mr. Hiers introduced Steve Godfrey of Kimley Horn & Associates, who provided a presentation which defined corridors that alignments might be considered in. The process began with the collection of information and concerns from residents throughout the six-district study area. Mr. Godfrey discussed the various alignments from the two-day session and reviewed the ranking system for the process.

Mr. Godfrey suggested that Kimley-Horn would probably narrow it to three alternatives – the best new alignment, the best un-existing alignment and a no-build. Mr. Godfrey asked if there were any questions from anyone and added that they had very strong support in the study of the alternatives.

Mr. Park asked if the “yellow” line depicted on the slide presentation was from the citizens group. Mr. Godfrey replied that it was a consensus alignment and explained that some of the citizens felt that the wetlands should be more impacted and others felt that the residential, as well as the wetlands, should be impacted. Mr. Godfrey further stated that he had not received any comments “not to touch the wetlands and to wipe out the residential,” as it was not a popular position among the groups who participated at the Charrette. The next step, he stated, would be to analyze the criteria using Federal guidelines so that it could be evaluated from a technical impact perspective.

Mr. Godfrey mentioned that part of the study was reviewing the cost and implications of widening Springhill Road on its existing alignment. One of the things discussed was that Springhill Road provided a gateway to the airport. The realignment that was under consideration would provide some interesting opportunities regarding the Springhill Road and Capital Circle intersection; if the new alignment prevailed. Vince Long questioned if one of the alternatives was to construct the new segment to the point where it met up with Orange Avenue. Mr. Godfrey explained that they would evaluate all options and put them together as to provide a new alignment alternative.

Theresa Heiker brought up discussion about doing education outreach with the neighborhood particularly about stormwater, water management and water quality issues.

She asked whether that had moved forward and if it was part of the presentation at the Charrettes. Mr. Godfrey replied that there had been considerable discussion about water management and water quality and the fact that they were looking at the overall picture. There had been a great deal of interest, even by citizens who are not immediately adjacent to or within the boundaries of the Chain of Lakes or Black Swamp; these citizens have a sincere concern for protecting and enhancing it. Mr. Godfrey further stated that he had received requests to educate those people who were in that area to help them understand the importance of preserving the area and not impacting it with trash and debris.

Ms. Heiker stated that she noticed some of the comments from the citizens addressed issues such as sediment control during construction and placement of the stormwater management facilities. She recalled hearing about a white paper on what stormwater 'Best-Management-Practices' were available and what that meant. Mr. Godfrey replied that it was one of the newsletters they had prepared in addition to ones for traffic noise, traffic volumes, water quality and water management, and construction impact avoidance. Mr. Godfrey further stated that Blueprint was conducting studies of previous construction projects to understand where some of the problems had occurred so that they would not be repeated in Blueprint projects. Mr. Hiers stated that Kevin Pope was responsible for the research. Ms. Heiker recalled talking about a white paper distributed and put on the website and she had not heard that it had gone out. Per Mr. Hiers, the white paper was available on the Blueprint 2000 website.

Item #13: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2008-FY 2012 Capital Budget

Phil Maher stated that there had been four major changes to the Master Plan that was approved in September and two were updates. The first one, was under City Water Quality. The City, like the County had originally requested they receive the dollars early but are actually receiving their allocation on a monthly basis. The second change was in regards to Capital Circle Southeast, Woodville Highway to Tram Road. What was reflected in the last Master Plan was the \$10 million for construction. Since that point in time, Blueprint had received a TRIP grant as well as \$1 million from DOT which they assigned from Southwood's mitigation. These funds have already gone to the Board and are appropriated.

Mr. Maher then discussed the Headwaters of the St. Marks, where Blueprint had received a grant for Booth II which the Board has already appropriated the funds. The only real change that happens in the year 2015 came about with discussions with City Growth Management on Capital Cascade Trail. It appeared that part of Capital Cascades Trail may be treated as a major road project, specifically Segment 1 going from Tennessee Street tying into Segment 2. If that occurred, then Blueprint would have to review the current impervious surface. Gabe Menendez asked if there was a major roadway project for Franklin Boulevard that would address that. Mr. Maher explained that the improvements to Segment 1 were considered a major roadway project. Therefore, staff would have to handle the stormwater from the existing roadway which was not in the

initial plans. The project was viewed as a water quality project. Ms. Heiker confirmed that was in response to the extensive amount of impervious area that existed in Segment 2. She further stated, Blueprint's initial concept for Capital Cascade Trail, Segment 2 was to provide treatment for Segment 1; that was no longer an opportunity.

Bill Little stated that most of the capacity of the ponds in Segment 2 would be used for permitting requirements of Segment 2 largely due to the classification of the perimeter roadway improvements in Segment 2 as "Major" Roadway improvements. Mr. Maher stated that at that time Segment 1 was going to require stormwater treatment; it could be done either at Segment 1 or Segment 0. Mr. Maher further stated that the Master Plan was trying to address a potential problem with Segment 1, whether or not the stormwater is taken care of in Segment 1 or above Segment 1. Mr. Maher stated that would not be until 2015.

Ms. Heiker raised a question asking about the \$13.7 million estimate. She asked if that was a percentage of the construction cost. Mr. Little replied that the \$13.7 million had two major categories, one that was drafted by staff. He further stated that staff evaluated the overall prices based on the method used at the time of the original the Master Plan. Mr. Little stated that he had taken the dramatic escalation of construction cost into consideration in the current estimate. Ms. Heiker asked whether part of the \$13.7 was escalation of the road construction costs and whether there was a feel for how that would be divided. Mr. Little stated that it would possibly be an 80/20 division with 80% stormwater. Mr. Maher agreed that he would amend the item and also stated that those were the major increases. Ms. Heiker asked whether Capital Cascade Trail costs were current for Segment 2 based on 50% design. She also asked whether the amenities were being funded by outside sources and if it was tracked on the Master Plan. Gary Phillips stated that many of the amenities were not funded. Ms. Heiker confirmed with Mr. Phillips that the additional design is funded.

Mr. Park noted that Blueprint was increasing everything and questioned whether projects were being dropped or had additional revenue become available. Mr. Maher explain that there were additional dollars mention in notes one and two in the agenda item, as well as dollars that had not be allocated in the out years (2015-2019).

Mr. Park confirmed with Mr. Maher that when grants were received that the dollars were reflected. Per Mr. Maher, he did not include the grants until he was certain that Blueprint would receive the grants. Mr. Park asked whether there was a report that reflected the right-of-way costs of the projects. Mr. Maher stated that Mr. Matheny could give more detail on that however he confirmed that Blueprint was within budget. Mr. Park asked if there were any reports that indicated what the appraisals were in comparison to what Blueprint was actually spending for right of way; if not he would like to have one created. Mr. Maher stated that staff would provide that information to him.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

Mr. Park asked when the kickoff for CC/Tram to Woodville. Per Doug Martin, we have the contract ready to be signed and we are waiting on a couple of things and we should try to issue it next week. Mr. Park asked if Blueprint will be having a groundbreaking. Per Mr. Maher, we want to time the groundbreaking, since this is a design-build we won't be breaking ground for awhile. The ceremony will be closer to the time we break ground. Mr. Martin predicted it will be close to September-October, 2007.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:03 pm.