

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 28, 2006
Ellis Building – Koger Center
2:00 pm

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

Jim Davis	Tony Park	Mark Llewellyn
Rodney Cassidy	<i>Roxanne Manning</i>	Debbie Dantin
John Buss	Dave Bright	Jack Diestelhorst
John Kraynak	Phil Maher	Olu Sawyer
Theresa Heiker	Randy Matheny	Margie Pelkey
Gabe Menendez	Gary Phillips	Angela Richardson
Michael Wright	Allean Brown	
Jack Kostrzewa	Paul Hiers	

Jim Davis called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

There were none.

III. Consent

Item #1: TCC Minutes: May 22, 2006

There were no comments regarding the May minutes.

Item #2: 2007 Proposed CAC and TCC Meeting Dates

There were no comments from the Committee regarding the proposed meeting dates. Dave Bright noted that the meeting day and time would be different beginning in 2007 with the TCC meetings moving to Thursdays from 1:00 until 3:00 PM.

IV. Presentations/Discussions

Item #3: Capital Circle SE (Tram Road to Woodville Highway) Funding Shortfall

Jim Davis offered the following to remind the Committee of what had occurred previously regarding the Tram Road to Woodville Highway section of Capital Circle. He stated that staff had \$10 million identified in the Blueprint program that was identified as match for TRIP funding from FDOT. The IA previously approved the agenda item that authorized staff to move forward with the design build portion of the project. However, several issues had arisen that resulted in the funding shortfall.

Mr. Davis stated that the cost for the project had grown from \$20 million to \$26 million. Furthermore, Blueprint initially received \$4.3 million for ROW, from TRIP. Later on, when FDOT allocated the remainder of the TRIP funds, Blueprint received an additional \$7 million, for a total of \$11.3 million from FDOT TRIP funds for the two projects. He also noted that there were extractions from Southwood for Southside (Southwood Phase II); \$1 million to FDOT who pledged it to Blueprint for use on the roadway. That left a delta of \$8 million before the project was completely funded.

Mr. Davis stated that staff thought they “had a string on an additional \$4 million.” Also, due to activities that were on going with the new DRI for Southside and the Capital Office Complex expansion where there was an opportunity to acquire additional funding. Staff hoped that would be where the additional \$4 million, they were short, would come from. Furthermore, he stated, there was \$2.5 million that the County had available. Mr. Davis stated that he had spoken to Commissioner Bill Proctor about the “Woodville money,” and explained that if Blueprint did not receive the additional \$4 million and because they must award a contract for that segment of Capital Circle or loose the \$7 million in TRIP. He further explained that Blueprint intended to award a design build contract with an option to stop short of Woodville Highway. In other words, only build \$22 million worth of the project. If the additional funding was secured Blueprint would not exercise that option. If it was not secured and the project stopped short of Woodville Highway that intersection would be added onto the next segment of the project. Mr. Davis stated that Commissioner Proctor had been receptive to supporting Blueprint’s use of that \$2.5 million.

Mr. Davis stated that consequently that was where Blueprint was in the process and the strategy outlined was the strategy staff would take. It was imperative that staff took action or they risked loosing \$7 million. He acknowledged that the above strategy was not the perfect solution but staff felt there was the least amount of risk associated with it.

Mr. Davis stated, regarding the design build concept, that it would be similar to the Connie Drive to Tram Road segment. Southwood owned the majority of the right-of-way (ROW) on the south side of the roadway therefore that is where Blueprint would begin construction while they acquired the remaining ROW. He further stated that there were several issues at the intersection of Woodville Highway and Capital Circle Southeast concerning the proposed apartment complex and the mast arms for the signals. Blueprint was trying to incorporate all of those issues in to the design build and be as proactive as possible.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had advertised for the CEI and there were only two respondents. David Bright stated that Greenman Pedderson and Parsons Brinkerhoff Construction Services had submitted RFQ’s for the CEI for the project. Staff would short list on the technical proposal on Wednesday, August 30, 2006. Oral presentations would occur on September 14, 2006 and the final scores would be posted on September 15, 2006. Mr. Davis stated that this one would be different from the last design build project

in that the CEI would, rather than be apart of the design build team, they would report directly to Blueprint.

Mr. Bright stated that there might be the possibility of calling a special meeting to review and approve the scope for the design build. Phil Maher stated that because the next TCC meeting was scheduled for October 30, 2006 it would most likely be moved to an earlier date rather than hold a special meeting so close to a regular meeting date.

Item #4: Capital Circle SE (Tram Road to Woodville Highway) Right of Way Acquisition

Randy Matheny stated that staff would request authorization from the Board to move forward with the acquisition of 13 parcels in the Woodville Highway to Tram Road segment; eight fee parcels and five perpetual easements. The perpetual easements for pond site one an individual property owner. However the other four pond sites were currently owned by St. Joe; staff would continue to work with St. Joe on property donations.

Theresa Heiker asked if the acquisition would be on the south side of the existing Capital Circle. Mr. Matheny stated that ROW would be acquired on both sides of the roadway from just south of Tram Road to just west of the curve. The remaining portions would all be on the south side of the roadway. Ms. Heiker stated that the County had a small lot and a very small pond, that frequently flooded, in the residential neighborhood near the intersection of Woodville Highway and Capital Circle. During the recent intersection improvements the County was extremely cautious as to what could be accommodated without increasing the existing flooding. Allean Brown, the project manager, noted Ms. Heiker's concerns.

Mr. Davis noted that a portion of the ROW donations from St. Joe would include the pond site which would be significant and oversized. Additionally, Blueprint would use the fill for the roadway and Southwood would have excess capacity as a result.

Item #5: Capital Circle NW/SW (Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street) Right of Way Acquisition

Randy Matheny stated that staff would request authorization from the Board to move forward with the acquisition, or eminent domain if necessary, of 61 parcels on the Orange Avenue to Highway 90 segment; 49 fee parcels and 12 temporary construction easements.

Michael Wright asked for a status update of the Delta Industrial Park parcel. Mr. Davis stated that staff met earlier that morning with Bartow Rainey and Jim English to discuss the history and the difference in appraisals. The Blueprint appraisal came in at \$3.4 million. Mr. Rainey's appraisal came in at \$9.3 million. Mr. Rainey graciously offered to "split the difference" at approximately \$6.3 million. Mr. Rainey's appraisal was based upon his hopes of the property being rezoned to commercial or multi-family residential as compared to the light industrial it currently was. Oddly enough, Mr. Davis stated, Mr. Rainey was pursuing the rezoning to multi-family residential until January 2006.

Blueprint was evaluating alternative property, such as the Airport property, however, all agreed that the Delta Industrial Park site was the best location.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint had a similar quandary with the Booth II property and Hurley Booth. The Blueprint appraisal came in at \$1.4 million. Mr. Booth's appraisal came in at \$2.4 million. He stated that there comes a point in time where no matter how much Blueprint might like to acquire certain parcels, it simply was not feasible to pay the inflated asking price. Regarding the Delta Industrial Site staff retained the option to condemn. However, that was not possible with the Headwaters of the St. Marks. Furthermore if Blueprint paid the inflated asking prices for either of those parcels it would set a precedent for all future purchases.

Mr. Davis noted that the Real Estate Policy that was adopted by the Board continued to work quite well. On Capital Circle Southeast there were 13 parcels and staff settled all but two of them.

Item #6: Capital Cascade Trail Preliminary Design Approval

Gary Phillips stated that Mark Llewellyn of Genesis Group would present the proposed concepts for the park design. Also if time allowed, Debbie Dantin would be discuss traffic at the Lafayette Street and Franklin Boulevard intersection, specifically the roundabout versus a traditional intersection design analysis.

Mark Llewellyn stated that Peter Martin with Carr, Lynch, and Sandell had done an exquisite job of communicating with the various local interested parties. The most important item that everyone involved had emphasized to the public and special interest groups was that Capital Cascade Trail was a stormwater management project cleverly disguised as a park. The theme that Carr, Lynch, and Sandell have developed for Capital Cascade Trail is "A regional Capital City park that celebrates and interprets the rich cultural history of Tallahassee and its unique natural setting." He further stated that many of the elements and educational opportunities that had been identified would be incorporated as "surprises" within the park. That effort of information gathering resulted in two schematic plans or design concepts for the park. Mr. Llewellyn explained the concepts and discussed their differences.

Concept A

- A. Relocated and Restored Lake Hall School House with New Annex
- B. Shallow Water Area
- C. Tallahassee Timeline Fence
- D. Fish and Wildlife Plaza
- E. Repositioned DOT parking
- F. Misting Fountain "Smokey Hollow"
- G. Gaines Street Link Built to Accommodate Emergency Vehicles
- H. Korean War Monument (Existing)
- I. Cascades Move to Urban Edge
- J. Meridian Plaza Map with County Information and Interpretation

- K. Restored or new "Market" Building: Bike, Skate Rental, Take-out Food, Park Bathrooms, Maintenance Area
- L. Industrial Heritage Interpretation
- M. Small Structured Amphitheater; Holds 100-150 People
- N. Natural Amphitheater; Holds 1200-1500 People
- O. Cascading Vegetation and Flood Control Interpretation
- P. Iconic Sculpture at Water Outflow "Boca Chuba" (Big Mouth)
- Q. Apalachee Ball Field and Centennial Field Interpretative Path
- R. Possible Building Development Forms Water Barrier
- S. Enclosed Dog Park
- T. Realign Gaines Street

Concept B

- A. Relocated and Restored Lake Hall School House with New Annex
- B. Shallow Water Area
- C. Tallahassee Timeline Fence
- D. Fish and Wildlife Plaza
- E. Realigned Suwannee Street and Relocated FDOT Parking
- F. Misting Fountain "Smokey Hollow"
- G. Gaines Street Link Built to Accommodate Emergency Vehicles
- H. Korean War Monument (Existing)
- I. Cascades Move to Urban Edge
- J. Meridian Plaza Map with County Information and Interpretation
- K. Restored or new "Market" Building: Bike, Skate Rental, Take-out Food, Park Bathrooms, Maintenance Area
- L. Industrial Heritage Interpretation
- M. Small Structured Amphitheater; Holds 100-150 People
- N. Natural Amphitheater; Holds 1200-1500 People
- O. Cascading Vegetation and Flood Control Interpretation
- P. Iconic Sculpture at Water Outflow "Boca Chuba" (Big Mouth)
- Q. Apalachee Ball Field and Centennial Field Interpretative Path
- R. Grand Stair up to Park and 10'-12' Cascade Visible from S. Monroe
- S. Enclosed Dog Park

Regarding FDOT parking, Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint staff had pursued the possibility of a parking garage or parking deck on the east side of Suwannee Street approximately two years earlier and they were absolutely against the idea. However, now they have become quite supportive of it, in fact they are investigating their costs. He stated that Blueprint had made a concession that they would participate in the construction to the extent that either of the options (listed above) would have cost them. Clearly, it would work to Blueprint's advantage to have more park space and remove the parking area from within the park.

Regarding the misting fountain and interactive play area, Mr. Llewellyn confirmed that water for those features would be augmented by a well. Water would not be taken from the ponds to supply those features. He further stated that it had been recognized all along

that in order to maintain the minimum water levels in the stream and ponds augmentation would be necessary. The misting fountain would be included in that augmentation system. John Buss clarified that, in terms of purity, the mist would be potable water not stormwater. Mr. Llewellyn concurred. He further stated that in speaking with the public over the past few years, one reoccurring request was access to the water. He noted that there were significant health and safety concerns surrounding the possibility of access.

Tony Park asked if the water from Franklin Boulevard would be flowing through the same area. Mr. Llewellyn stated that there would be a base flow. However, part of the Genesis contract was to evaluate an over-flow by-pass to try to reduce the velocity of the flow in the channel. The higher flows could possibly be captured and placed in a boxed culvert that would by-pass that area and emerge in the lower pond. Mr. Park asked if that was under Concept A or B. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it was a design consideration for the higher flow conditions and would be completed regardless of the park concept selected.

Dave Bright stated that it had long been a concern of staff's that the occasional high velocity would erode the stream and wreak havoc on the habitats. The by-pass culvert was one way of reducing those velocities. He further stated that there would be a TCC sub-committee formed to begin discussing those issues once staff was past the park programming issues. Theresa Heiker stated that the option presented stated that the design met the 100-year storm. She asked if it had been factored into the concept at that point. Mr. Bright stated that the options that were presented had as much storage as the previously approved Concept E. Mr. Llewellyn stated that Genesis had not yet modeled the complete stage storage at that point. He stated that in the upper segment there was actually more storage than was previously approved.

Gabe Menendez asked if the misting fountain would be under water with run off. Mr. Llewellyn stated that, potentially, during the higher flow conditions. He further stated that the exact placement of the misting fountain had not yet been determined. It could possibly be in the 'valley' as an abstract interpretation of Smokey Hollow. If it was to be an interactive play area it could potentially be up hill out of the floodplain.

Regarding the dog park, Mr. Buss stated that he was not certain it would be in the best interest or is the best place for a dog park due to coliform bacteria and TMDL's unless there was some type of treatment facility, which did not seem practical. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it was a given that there would be dogs in the park. The 'dog park' was one possible solution to controlling waste in the main park area. Mr. Davis asked if he was correct in assuming that Mr. Buss's concern was for the solid waste rather than liquid waste from the dogs. Mr. Buss confirmed that it was. Mr. Davis stated that if the park was self policing then it should minimize the impact; that was the arrangement staff had discussed with Parks and Recreation Department. Furthermore at Tom Brown Dog Park, signs were posted and bags were provided placing the responsibility on the dog owner. The consensus amongst the committee was that it was an effective method of controlling the waste. Mr. Buss suggested as the design moved forward, staff or Genesis might

consider bacteria sampling at the Tom Brown Dog Park to have an example of long term usage effects and the potential need for a treatment facility for runoff even with cleanup.

Traffic Analysis: Debbie Dantin spoke to the committee regarding the traffic analyses performed by Genesis. She stated that they ran two analyses, one for 2010, the opening year, and one for 2030, the design year. None of the available roundabout software programs for traffic modeling were ideal for replicating the intersections at the Apalachee Parkway on-ramp at Suwannee Street and Lafayette Street nor the Franklin Boulevard - Lafayette Street intersection. Furthermore, she questioned their reliability due to the fact that they could not model precisely the scenarios needed for those intersections.

Ms. Dantin noted that in the models for 2010 the intersections worked well. However, improvements would be necessary by 2030. She discussed the pros and cons for signalized dual left lanes, a roundabout with right-turn slip lanes and a signal, or double roundabouts with a merge between the two. The committee expressed their concern with the rapid merging of two-lanes of traffic into one. Ms. Dantin stated that one of the problems with the programs was that while it considered typical motorist patterns, in reality, motorists might not yield as well therefore they might prefer or it might be easier if they were to stay in the left lane. The queue was the single most critical issue at the Lafayette/Suwannee Street intersection.

Olu Sawyer asked if it might be better to signalize the on-ramp rather than have a second roundabout there. Ms. Dantin stated that there were differences between the two but each came with its own pros and cons. Gabe Menendez stated that the signage problem would still exist and Ms. Dantin agreed. Mr. Menendez asked if the efficiency of the roundabout was likely to deliver traffic faster than a signal could handle. Ms. Dantin stated that she had received different results from different programs.

Ms. Dantin reiterated that each scenario worked well in 2010; however she was concerned with how well it would accommodate the traffic growth by 2030. She stated that the traffic engineers were using a "worst case scenario" forecast for 2030. It was not a situation to assume that traffic would find another route, like many other projects.

John Buss acknowledged that he was not intimately familiar with traffic engineering and stated that it seemed to him that separating the traffic movements would be beneficial. He suggested using Meridian Street and Pensacola Street to assist with moving traffic through that area. Ms. Dantin stated that Genesis original concept work showed something similar to that as an option; using roads between the Apalachee Parkway overpass piers, making it a much larger circle. That option was not viable because the portion of Meridian Street south of Apalachee Parkway would be removed. Mr. Menendez asked why it was closing. Mark Llewellyn stated that it created other conflicts in the park and roadway design. Mr. Buss stated that it created conflicts in the options Genesis was presenting. However, in his suggestion traffic would have, essentially, one city block as the queue for the on-ramp. Ms. Dantin stated she would model whichever options were on the table.

Mr. Buss stated that he understood that the design concept included amenities under the Apalachee over-pass. He expressed concern about the potential noise level from the roadway overhead as well as the dampness in the shade. He felt that the improvement in traffic flow would warrant forfeiting that space.

Ms. Dantin stated that the roundabouts definitely helped with traffic delays in the early years however the forecasted rates for 2030 were significantly higher. Mr. Menendez stated that would be the case with either of the options. She stated that she agreed but did not feel that the second roundabout would not work because the forecasted volume in 2030 was approximately 2700 cars per day. That was the threshold of a two-lane roundabout or a one-lane with slip lanes.

Theresa Heiker asked if Genesis staff was considering Suwannee Street as the connector to Bloxham Street with Gaines Street being closed or was it in the current grid system. Ms. Dantin stated that Gaines was closed between Meridian Street and Suwannee Street. The Suwannee Street extension, she continued, was a recent concept and was not included in the models. The main issue with Suwannee Street however, was that it increased the northbound movement. If the signal remained at the Apalachee Parkway on-ramp, it would be one more roadway that was vying for signal time.

Mark Llewellyn stated that the goal was to initiate design in October 2006. Therefore decisions would need to be made in the month of September. Mr. Menendez asked Ms. Dantin to confirm that she had not completed any traffic analyses of the option suggested by Mr. Buss. She stated that she had not. Ms. Dantin, Mr. Buss, and Mr. Menendez discussed on the map details of Mr. Buss' suggestion. Ms. Dantin asked Mr. Llewellyn to elaborate on why that option was taken off the table. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it was because of the impact to the park.

Jim Davis stated that Blueprint had received a considerable amount of pressure related to the connection to the Riley House. Staff was trying to incorporate the Riley House into the park design near the Lake Hall Schoolhouse Museum. There was concern about pedestrians or groups of school children crossing a busy street. Michael Wright suggested purchasing two to three lots north of the park as a place to relocate the Lake Hall School to. Mr. Llewellyn noted that there was also discussion of placing it at Maclay Gardens. Mr. Davis reminded the committee though of how the heritage of Smokey Hollow, the Lake Hall School, and the Riley House complimented each other.

Ms. Dantin continued with the traffic presentation with the scenarios of possibly closing segments of Bloxham Street, Gadsden Street, and/or Gaines Street. She stated that the existing conditions of the intersections in that area were deficient (at a LOS E). Michael Wright asked what lane configuration she used in the model for Gaines Street to the west. Ms. Dantin stated she used the current configuration. Mr. Menendez stated that it would be changing to a two-lane roadway, one-lane in each direction, from Monroe Street west to Woodward Avenue. The committee discussed how that would affect the 2030 traffic forecast. Ms. Dantin stated that she had a 2028 Gaines Street model that she could use on a two-lane roadway as a base and that they could discuss that further.

The committee discussed how traffic flows would change and how the traffic design concept would change if the City closed the additional blocks that Ms. Dantin's analysis had not previously considered. Mr. Menendez stated that the existing conditions at the intersection of South Monroe Street and Gaines Street show Gaines as a four-lane roadway. However, by 2030 it would only be a two-lane roadway. Ms. Dantin stated that there was not other model to use for that roadway unless Mr. Menendez was asking Genesis to create one. Mr. Menendez stated that he was not sure how she would go about that however, in the future, her numbers, etc would be extremely misleading. Ms. Dantin asked if she could have the numbers that were used by the City Commission in their decision making process. Mr. Wright stated that they did not use any numbers; they just did it.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that what Genesis staff had tried to accomplish was to identify separately what the problems or impacts would be with and without the closures. Mr. Menendez stated that he was concerned for the Genesis staff if they were using incorrect data. Ms. Dantin stated that what Genesis staff was concerned with was if the City had already made those decisions, what improvements were they, the City, then responsible for that were not identified on any of the analyses. Jim Davis asked Michael Wright if the City had made any plans for any improvements. Mr. Wright stated that there would basically be four parallel roads that ran between Monroe Street and... Ms. Dantin interrupted and stated that four parallel roads would not make any improvements for diverted traffic. That was making operational changes based on a decision that was made without numbers. She stated that those operational changes would appear as deficiencies in ten to fifteen locations around town. That was why, she stated, that their staff was trying to separate what the problems would be with and without closures.

The committee discussed the impacts and potential deficiencies of the changes to Gaines, Madison, and Pensacola Streets and with the proposed road closures by Blueprint as well as the improvement to by-directional traffic on Call and Virginia Streets. Ms. Dantin stated that she could overlay the Gaines Street 2028 model so that everyone would know all of the deficiencies that would be created by making Gaines Street a two-lane roadway and Pensacola and Madison Streets by-directional. She stated that they were trying to analyze, using the current road conditions, what the impact would be with the proposed closures. The biggest impact was to the east-west traffic movement, which would essentially create gridlock. It would be necessary to widen it from Monroe Street to Meridian Street.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that the issues were complex. When Genesis moved into the permitting process to officially close those roadways they wanted everyone, the City and the County, to be satisfied with the modeling and the design of the intersection at Lafayette Street and Franklin Boulevard. Ms. Dantin stated that realistically, if Gaines Street were only two-lanes, would it be used? With the development of condos downtown and multi-modal traffic improvements...how much multi-modal traffic did they anticipate? Would it truly move traffic off the roadway? Might the state offices

relocate to their complex at Southwood? With that many variables it was difficult to forecast the traffic growth.

Mr. Menendez asked if staff (Genesis or Blueprint) was looking to make the improvements suggested by the traffic analyses. He further stated that what he understood them to have said, as a result of the analysis, was that they would increase the capacity and volume of traffic adjacent to the park. Gary Phillips stated that staff was simply evaluating the impacts the road closures would have on the traffic. However, with the information that Gaines Street would be reduced to two-lanes it would change the analysis considerably. He stated that there were improvements planned for the roadways that were adjacent to the park and at the intersections that remained along Gaines Street west to Monroe Street.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Dantin to recommend persons or departments that should participate in the sub-committee. Ms. Dantin stated that she would like both City and County traffic folks to be involved and possibly an FDOT representative. Mr. Davis suggested possibly, Olu Sawyer and Joe Brown or Tony Park and someone from the CRTPA as well. Mr. Menendez stated that a FDOT representative was not necessary.

Mark Llewellyn reminded the committee that they had a due date of December 2006 for 50% plans submittal therefore they would need to make decisions quickly. Mr. Davis stated that it needed to be as soon as possible. Mr. Davis stated that the agenda item would be presented to the Board on September 11, 2006 (following the TCC meeting the IA meeting was postponed to September 18, 2006) to request authorization to move forward into the design of certain aspects while staff continued to work on others. Additionally, staff would request that they delegate some of the decisions on the roundabout, traffic, etc to the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC). This would allow staff to continue to move forward since the next Board meeting would not be until January 2007.

Mr. Davis asked if there were any additional comments or concerns that had not yet been addressed regarding the park. John Kraynak stated that while he understood the desire to keep the water flowing through the stream, however, he was concerned by the idea of augmentation during low water times. Once the water was past Lake Munson there could possibly be the argument as to whether or not that entire basin should be volume controlled because of flooding at the Oak Ridge Road area. He felt that whether or not it affected flooding further south was a significant issue. He asked if it was possible to utilize a low-flow, re-circulating system for the majority of it. Mark Llewellyn stated that the intent of the augmentation was to maintain the low water elevation in the pond, not to keep water flowing downstream. It would only maintain the low water level in the lower pond. Mr. Davis stated that the interactive water area would have its own reservoir that would recycle the water it used.

John Buss asked if the Board would approve a general concept or would they be locked into amenities such as the dog park because "the Commissions approved that." Mr. Davis stated that staff would request the Board to approve the concept and delegate final

authority for some of the details to the IMC. It was necessary to have something approved because some of the issues could not be resolved until work was underway. He further stated that issues, such as the inclusion of the dog park or not, treatment for it if it were included, did not, in his opinion, require Board approval. Those issues could be resolved by staff or the IMC. In regards to the aesthetics of the ponds, Mr. Buss stated that it was highly probable that some form of treatment would be needed similar to Lake Ella. Mr. Davis stated that he did not feel it necessary to take those types of details to the Board.

IV. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

V. Items from Members of the Committee

John Buss asked if Blueprint staff had received comment from FDEP regarding jurisdictional severance because he felt it was important to keep the momentum. Gary Phillips stated that he had not heard from them but would follow up on it.

Mr. Davis stated that regarding Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest staff has proposed a frontage road on the south side of Highway 20 and east side of Capital Circle. The frontage road would run down in the vicinity of the Delta Industrial Park. Josh Casper, who was developing the corner at Jackson Bluff Road and Capital Circle, was originally in favor of the frontage road had become vehemently opposed to it due to the fact that Blueprint would not give him an intersection at Capital Circle and Jackson Bluff because the Signal Study did not warrant placing a signal there.

Mr. Davis asked what the status was on the renovation of the former Incinerator and Electric buildings, the old water works, and the acquisition of the two blocks downtown. Mr. Wright stated that the Incinerator building was not salvageable and would be demolished. The City would restore the Electric building but he did not have a timeframe for the work. As for the two properties, the Old Jail site and the Bloxham annex site, he felt they would be under contract by Thanksgiving 2006; acknowledging, of course, that there could be a different cabinet by the time the Commission actually voted on it. He further stated that there was a non-profit organization that was interested in restoring the old water works.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:37 pm.