

**Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, August 24, 2001**

Meeting Attendees: Dinah Hart
John Buss
John Davis
Edgar Grant
Theresa Heiker
Michael Wright
Rodney Cassidy
Kevin Pope

Guest(s): Bruce Barrett
Jack Kostrzewa
Anil Panicker

Recording Secretary: Glenda Francis, Planning Department

Meeting called to order by Dinah Hart at 10:40 A.M and group agreed to move past the informational items and begin with Agenda Item #5—Role of the Intergovernmental Agency TCC. It was agreed that Ms. Hart would chair the first meeting and then election of officers would take place at the next meeting.

Item #5 – Role of Intergovernmental Agency Technical Coordinating Committee

Dinah Hart mentioned that the inter-local agreement specifies the members of this committee and specifies the role which is basically to provide professional and technical expertise as needed on BP2K projects and to provide a coordinating function, hence the reason it is “inter-governmental” so that we do have that function with city, county, state and BP2K projects. Ms. Hart indicated that it is anticipated by-laws would be brought back at the next meeting. MPO/TCC bylaws have been used as the basis for IA/TCC bylaws. Michael Wright stated that part of the reason for having a separate group is that we didn’t want it to be completely transportation-oriented because we get a lot of stuff that’s not transportation related. Ms. Hart asked members to take a look at the bylaws and to provide input and/or send her any questions.

Agenda Item #1: July 9, 2001 IAC Follow-Up

Dinah Hart stated that the purpose of these materials is to provide a very short summary of what took place at the last Intergovernmental Agency meeting.

Agenda Item #2: Draft BP2K Intergovernmental Agency Agenda for September 17

Dinah Hart stated the draft agenda for the September 17 IA meeting is attached, with the most significant item being the discussion of strategies for BP2K project implementation.

**Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, August 24, 2001
Page 2**

Agenda Item #3: Update on Citizen Communications

Dinah Hart started by updating everyone on where we are related to the [sales tax update.com](http://sales.tax.update.com) website that we had that before the sales tax issue was put to the public for vote in November.

Agenda Item #4: Status Report on Roadway Design Standards

Dinah Hart updated the committee on where we are on the initial committee of John Davis, Tony Park, Rob Palmer and planning staff who have been working on this assignment for several weeks.

Agenda Item #5: see top of page

Agenda Item #6: Clarification of “Significant Changes” in IA By-Laws

Dinah stated that a super-majority vote was required when significant changes took place, but the bylaws did not define significant changes. The proposed definition is to mean a re-prioritization of projects either advancing or delaying, a deletion, addition, or change in project scope that alter the original intent or location, or that cost beyond 25% or \$1M, whichever is less, of the original cost projections. Staff considered including definition of water quality funding, also as a significant change. Michael Wright asked if land use actions require a “super majority” vote. Theresa Heiker inquired if we were looking at land acquisition projects for purchase of large projects.

Michael Wright motioned that the designation of water quality projects would require super-majority vote of the commission. There was no second. It was agreed that the committee would come back to this issue pending discussion of the water quality program funding agenda item.

Agenda Item #7: Process for Review of Requests for BP2K Funding

Dinah stated that purchase of St. Marks’ headwaters was the impetus for this item. Wendy added criteria to be considered to ensure that a process was considered when these requests came up. Wendy recommended approval of Item #7 as written (tier one projects) with the attachment. Michael seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor of the staff recommendation.

Agenda Item #8: Discussion of Strategies for BP2K Project Implementation

Michael stated that there has been preliminary work going on behind the scenes to see what can be done and how fast projects can get up and running, indicating that there is a great deal of concern by the City Manager, County Administrator, and joint commissions who want to see some action. Planning staff mapped out a work program (graph distributed) and provided an overview of the plan. John Davis stated his concern that the proposed fast tracking of projects is unrealistic. Michael Wright stated that the mission is to identify other funding such as TOPS (Transportation Outreach Program) and not to show Blueprint funding for Capital Circle NW. Bruce Barrett added that the total cost of construction without the interchange is \$16M. It was recommended that the PD&E study for Franklin Boulevard/Cascades/St Augustine Branch be reflected on the draft plan and being funded from Blueprint 2000 dollars. Several revisions to the operational plan were

Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, August 24, 2001
Page 3

recommended, and it was agreed that staff would meet again in the next few days to revisit the implementation plan once the changes had been incorporated.

Agenda Item #9: Discussion of Advanced Funding

Greg discussed the need for adopting more stringent access management standards to protect the functions and safety of the roadways proposed to be improved with BP2000 funding. Staff has been in contact with CUTR (Center for Urban Transportation Research) and the FDOT Central Office about developing improved access management standards for Tallahassee-Leon County. Wendy stated that funding for this project needs to be identified. Michael stated that everyone agrees that access standards are needed for capital circle. Michael further stated that we can not fund from BP2K. Tony Park seconded to find an alternative; continue to next meeting.

Agenda Item #10: Discussion of Joint Water Resources Plan

Theresa Heiker stated that generic criteria for projects to be funded with water quality program funding should be established by this committee for approval by the Intergovernmental Agency. She stated that by following criteria, they could do studies within the general criteria. John Buss stated that typically planning or studies are not funded with sales tax revenue—those funds are for project implementation. In the absence of any further direction, the committee voted to move forward with the conceptual agenda item for discussion at the September 17 IA meeting.

Agenda Item #11: Items from IATCC members and staff

None.