

# Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

SunTrust Bank Building  
2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200  
Thursday, August 28, 2014

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

<b>Tony Park</b>	Wayne Tedder	Linda Figg
<b>Gabe Menendez</b>	Charles Hargraves	Dwight Dempsey
<b>Rodney Cassidy</b>	Dave Snyder	Manuel Feliciano
<b>Theresa Heiker</b>	Gary Phillips	Cameron Snipes
<b>Cherie Bryant</b>	Autumn Calder	Casandra Jackson
	Angela Ivy	

Wayne Tedder called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm.

## I. Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications.

## II. Information Items

### Item #1: Advance Fund FDOT and Accept Repayment for Bold Initiative Landscape in the Capital Circle Southeast Woodville Highway to Tram Road Corridor

This item was provided as information only.

Gabe Menendez stated that City Public Works was requested to take over landscaping immediately after planting and handle the maintenance of establishment period.

## III. Consent

### Item #2: TCC Meeting Minutes: December 5, 2013

There were no comments.

Tony Park questioned if delegation of responsibilities on permitting on Capital Circle Southwest (W1) had come to fruition. Cameron Snipes stated that the City of Tallahassee permitted the segment of the project that Kimley Horn was designing, Springhill Road to Orange Avenue. He was not certain about the segment under design by Novia, Crawfordville to Springhill Roads. Wayne Tedder requested that it be confirmed with the response emailed to the TCC members.

#### **IV. Presentations/Discussions**

Gary Phillips gave a brief overview of the item and introduced Linda Figg who shared a presentation of alternatives for re-bidding the project. A copy of the presentation is on file at the Blueprint offices.

Wayne Tedder questioned if it might be possible to reclassify the project from a major to minor bridge and in doing so, allow for local firms to bid on it. David Snyder stated that the reasoning behind the major bridge classification was the span length and post tensioning. It could be possible to lobby FDOT for a reduction. Or that the prime contractor could have a sub with a major bridge qualification. In that scenario, the prime would construct everything but the bridge itself.

Linda Figg stated that it was designed with the idea that local contractors would be able to construct it. The post tensioning systems were straight forward similar to that of a concrete slab in a building or parking garage. She felt that it was worth meeting with FDOT to discuss a waiver or recertification for the next bidding round. The members of the committee concurred.

Cost was discussed and was simply too large a variable to say what or how much could be saved through a potential recertification. Eliminating mobilization expenses by allowing local contractor to bid on the project could have tremendous impacts to the overall bid total, stated Dwight Dempsey with Figg Engineering. Mr. Snyder stated that quantifying specific line items, such as clearing and grubbing or embankment work, also had the potential for significant reductions to the bid price. Of the bids received, those particular line items were 10 times higher than average because they were bid as lump sum items, stated Cameron Snipes.

As the committee discussion options for reducing the overall costs, Ms. Figg questioned if it was necessary to carry a 10% contingency. It was confirmed that the risk of problems was amplified because of working in the landfill of inappropriate material or other unknown variables was high. Mr. Snyder stated that Blueprint excavated and replaced material at the landfill. URS was on staff for post design services to ensure that the liner was reinstalled correctly.

Gabe Menendez stated that the savings would have to come from a recertification because the \$1M delta was for contingencies, post design services, CEI, solar, etc. Wayne Tedder stated that an alternative to that was to request the Board to allocate more funds to the project. However, the wanted to ensure that staff had thoroughly reviewed the material and exercised cost saving measures before doing that. While, of course, maintaining the integrity of the project.

Wayne Tedder stated that the strategy was to present all the options, resolve all the issues, and rebid the project prior to the February 2015 IA meeting. He felt it was likely that Blueprint would still be asking the Board for additional allocation however, it would be based on timing.

Furthermore, Mr. Tedder stated that FDOT contributed \$1.4M to the project therefore Blueprint was required to follow their requirements. He suggested the evaluation of the state and local process side-by-side to determine if it was possible to reduce the bid price if FDOT requirements were not a prerequisite. Essentially, he stated that he felt it was worth evaluating the process to determine if the bridge could be cheaper without FDOT funds involved.

Ms. Figg stated that while South Monroe Street was a state roadway, FDOT had previously approved the design of the bridge and how it would be handled. It was possible however it would depend on if the money had not yet been provided, was tied specifically to construction, and FDOT did not mandate that the contractor had to be a state contractor with a major bridge classification. Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint would present the item to the CAC and IA and would be scheduling a meeting with FDOT to discuss options.

The TCC concurred with staff recommendation for bid alternatives with reaching out to FDOT as discussed.

#### **Item #4: Capital Circle Southwest Joint-Use Stormwater Facilities**

Charles Hargraves spoke briefly about the item.

Gabe Menendez questioned the location of the ponds and the reason for it. Mr. Hargraves stated that the location was selected based on the topography of the area. It was naturally low with a draw to it. Locating the kiosk there also would allow for one parking lot with the added visual amenity of the pond. Mr. Menendez asked if it was part of the County's Scenic Byway. Tony Park confirmed that it was and stated that there were 21 kiosks over 300-miles through out three counties. The US Forest Service concurred with the location.

Cameron Snipes stated that the pond would primarily be for roadway runoff. He confirmed that it was located in the natural low point in the roadway as it was currently designed vertically. The parking lot at the airport drained to ponds on airport property. The future development areas of the airport were along the north and eastern sides.

Mr. Hargraves stated that there was a time constraint on the project because of funding obligations by the County as well as FDOT design timeframes for the roadway. Blueprint believed that a JPA would facilitate coordination of construction. Allocated funding, \$5,000, was for the construction of the kiosk itself.

The facilities would be FDOT ponds. Therefore maintenance would fall to City Public Works. Wayne Tedder stated that Blueprint would argue that it was roadway pond funds received would go toward maintenance of it. Mr. Menendez concurred and stated it would be similar to Capital Circle Southeast (E2). However, those funds did not cover enhanced landscaping or trail maintenance. Mr. Hargraves stated that US Forest Service wanted native plants. Rodney Cassidy stated that given the habitat which was mostly

xeriscape, there were limited types of trees that would grow there. Native plants were crucial one, to survive, and two, to curtail invasive species in the national forest.

Mr. Tedder stated that as he understood it, the maintenance expectation of the US Forest Service from the City or County was for the pond only; not the trail system. There were also discussion about a clear zone, a pre-determined distance from the edge of the pond to meander the trail through the existing trees. He anticipated that mowing would be the only maintenance. And ensure that it worked, stated Theresa Heiker.

Mr. Hargraves stated that at some point in the future, the US Forest Service wanted to harvest the timber. They wanted to identify the area of impact to move that process along. He wanted to begin conversations with the City, on US Forest Service behalf, regarding harvesting from the City parcel as well. Mr. Menendez stated that conversation was fine though, harvesting trees would change the entire landscape of the pond. Mr. Hargraves stated that a few trees would remain. However, there was talk of planting longleaf seedlings.

Mr. Tedder stated that one of FDOT's requirements was that all join-use facilities be constructed before roadway construction began. Blueprint felt that the facilities were within Blueprint's share of the roadway project and if constructed would allow for a credit in the future. It would take some work to identify whose share was whose however the consistent message to FDOT from Blueprint was that anything above their typical design would be a fair share for Blueprint. Of course, all of it was contingent upon the sales tax extension passing in November 2014. If it did not, Blueprint staff would have to get creative with budgets. He felt comfortable however that it could be possible.

Theresa Heiker questioned if there was a reason Pond 4 was located close to Lake Cascade. Mr. Snipes stated that it had been brought up as a concern and was still under evaluation. From the roadway perspective, it was the low point and where FDOT was looking in the pond. Ms. Heiker stated that the bulk of the flow was from a higher elevation at the redevelopment and could be achieved with a step-down flow.

#### **V. Citizens to be Heard**

There were no speakers.

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

There were none.

#### **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:08 PM.