

TALLAHASSEE-LEON COUNTY
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

ITEM #8

Meeting Minutes
September 19, 2005

5:00 pm, City Commission Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

County

Commissioner Ed DePuy
Commissioner Tony Grippa
Commissioner Bill Proctor
Commissioner Bob Rackleff
Commissioner Jane Sauls
Commissioner Cliff Thael, Chair
Commissioner Dan Winchester

City

Commissioner Andrew Gillum
Commissioner Allan Katz
Commissioner Debbie Lightsey
Mayor John Marks
Commissioner Mark Mustian, Vice-Chair

CITY/ COUNTY STAFF

Parwez Alam, County Administrator
David Bright, Blueprint 2000
Jim Davis, Director, Blueprint 2000
Shelonda Gay, Blueprint 2000
Vince Long, Asst. County Administrator

Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000
Angela Richardson, Blueprint 2000
Patrick Twyman, City of Tallahassee
Bill Woolery, City Engineering

OTHERS PRESENT

Lee Allman, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
David Armstrong, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Matt Aresco, Friends of Apalachicola National Forest
Rolland T. Baldwin, Jr., Homeowner
Kim Bittle, US Forest Service
John Burkett, DRMP
V. T. Conner, Myers Park
Karen Cooley, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Jeff Courtemanche, Homeowner
Michael Clow, Tall. Regional Airport
Jack Diestelhorst, Capital Cascade Council
Donald Downey
Bob Dunlop, Civil Air Patrol
Paco de la Fuente
Eric Fauder
Eric Favier, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Marcia Fenn, Lake Bradford Homeowner Asso.
Mark Fletcher
Brant Foster
Dennis Hardin, Florida Division of Forestry
Manley Fuller, FL Wildlife Fed/ Cap. Circle SW
Linda Jamison, Sierra Club
Denice Jones, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Michael Kasha
Bryant King, DRMP
Kary Kublin
Bill Little, Jacobs Engineering*

Stan Makielski, Myers Park
Patricia Malarney, Lake Bradford/ FSU Reservation
Doug Martin, The LPA Group*
Kevin McGorty, Tall Timbers/ CAC
Jon Meadows, DRMP
Bruce Means, Coastal Plains Institute
Ryan Means, Coastal Plains Institute
Marjorie Menzel
Chris Merritt, PBS&J
Keith Mille
Bill Norwood, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Dianna Norwood, Lk Brad. Homeowners Asso./CAC
Jerry Oshesky, The LPA Group*
Bill Peebles
Bonnie Pfuntner, The LPA Group*
Gary Phillips, The LPA Group*
Wendell Poggie
Ed Ringe, The LPA Group*
Wanda R. Rogony
Jim Shepherd, Jacobs Engineering*
Mike Sheridan, CAC
Alice S. Simmons, Homeowner
Kathy Steinheimer, Coastal Plains Institute
Del Suggs, Lake Bradford Homeowners Asso.
Mark Thomasson, Genesis Group*
Martha Wellman
Ryan Wetherell, Kimley Horn

Shuli Leonard, Bateman Harden
Mark Llewellyn, Genesis Group*
Denise Redgrave

Ray Youmans, THC*
Rebecca MacKay

* Indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

Chairman Cliff Thaeff called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. Commissioner Thaeff recognized Commissioner Mustian for his past service as the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Agency. He further stated that Item #1 provided the results of the Citizen Advisory Committee election and that Mr. Mike Sheridan had been elected Chairman and Jess Van Dyke had been elected Vice-Chairman.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Prior to the meeting item number 19, Capital Circle NW/SW E-PD&E: Typical Section, Recommended Mainline Alignment, and extend Design Limits Approval was removed from the agenda to be discussed at a special meeting in October. The date of the meeting had not been determined.

Commissioner Grippa moved to remove Items 7, 8, & 9 from the consent agenda to be voted on by the Board since they are contract items.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

The following items were presented to the Board for information only, therefore no action was requested. The Board did not discuss the items. For further information on these items, please refer to the agenda items which are available at the Blueprint 2000 offices.

1. **CAC Election Results**
2. **Capital Circle Southeast Design Consultant Selection (Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road)**
3. **Capital Circle Northwest (I-10 to US 90) Update**
4. **Atkinson Property - OGT Grant Application**
5. **Scope of Work Activities / Information Request**

III. CONSENT

6. **IA Meeting Minutes: May 16, 2005**

IA Meeting Minutes: May 16, 2005
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Minutes as presented

7. **Appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee**

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve the two nominations provided by the EECC (Kevin McGorty and Charles Pattison), the Better Transportation Coalition/Ability 1st (Paul Martell), and the Economic Development Council (Kathy Archibald).

8. Intergovernmental Agency Bylaws Revision

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Revise Section B-4 (1) of the IA Bylaws to state: "Agency meetings shall be held in the Tallahassee City Commission Chambers, or be held at another location designated by the Chairperson."

9. 2006 IA Meeting Schedule

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Concur with the dates for the 2006 IA meetings.

10. Authorization to Administratively Shift Funding Sources between Approved Projects

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Authorize Blueprint to administratively shift funding resources between approved projects **without exceeding approved limits.**

11. Extension of Disclosure and Bond Counsel Contract

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Exercise the extension of both contracts for 2 years or through the sale of Blueprint's second bond issue, whichever occurs first.

13. Reimbursement Resolution for State Infrastructure Bank Loan for Capital Circle Southeast

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Adopt the proposed Reimbursement Resolution

Mayor Marks requested the removal of Item 12 from the consent agenda for discussion.

Commissioner Rackleff moved approval of the consent agenda as modified. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 10-0.

12. Blueprint In-House Attorney

Mayor Marks asked Mr. Davis to explain the rationale of hiring an in-house attorney. Mr. Davis stated that over the last six or seven months the City Attorney has been providing legal support for Blueprint on various issues. Recently while working to develop Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) with City Water Utilities and Blueprint for Capital Circle SE a conflict of interest was identified. The City attorney office was not able to represent both City Utilities and Blueprint. He further stated that a cost benefit analysis was conducted regarding the developing legal workload and it was determined that it would be beneficial to hire an in-house attorney that would be housed in the Blueprint offices. Mr. Davis stated that the contract with Greenberg Traurig would be renegotiated.

Commissioner Katz asked why the contract with Greenberg Traurig would need to be renegotiated. Mr. Davis stated that the scope of services would change because of the duties of the in-house attorney and that Greenberg Traurig would only be serving as an advisor to the IA only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1:

1. Hire a Blueprint in-house attorney with legal support staff
2. Appropriate \$200,000 in operating funds
3. Renegotiate the Greenberg Traurig contract to reduce the scope and defer any decision on the exercise of the option years until after the three year contract is completed.

Commissioner DePuy moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 10-0.

Commissioner Thael stated that there was a scheduled public hearing for the evening that would begin at 6:00 pm and that there would be a dinner recess. He further stated that there were numerous citizens present to speak regarding item #18, Capital Circle SW Corridor Study/PD&E Alternatives (SR 20 to Springhill Road), therefore the agenda would be reorganized to allow them to address the Board prior to the dinner recess.

IV. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

18. Capital Circle SW Corridor Study/PD&E Alternatives (SR 20 to Springhill Road)

Mr. Davis stated that staff was presenting the item to the Board to obtain approval to proceed with a contract for a PD& E study for this segment of Capital Circle. He stated that Blueprint had conducted 4 public meetings and 4 citizens group meetings. 17 routes had been proposed within three corridors. He further stated that staff recommendation was to study 2 of the 3 corridors, eliminating corridor 2, which goes through the National Forest. He mentioned that the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) agreed with this (staff) recommendation. Mr. Davis stated that the CAC voted to eliminate corridor 1, the existing Capital Circle. The CAC voted to only submit corridor 3 with an expansion toward Segment 4A, but no closer than 200 yards to existing residences to the north in Seminole Manor and Mabry Manor.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that the Board had already decided to move forward with the design of Capital Circle SW to Orange Avenue and because of that, alternate 4A was not feasible. Mr. Davis reiterated that the CAC recommendation was to go up to the vicinity of segment 4A but not closer than 200 yards from existing residences within the subdivisions. He stated that staff has no objection to this portion of the recommendation, however staff believes that the existing route does need to remain in the study based upon conversations with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Commissioner Katz asked Mr. Davis if he had been told by these agencies that we must study the existing corridor. Mr. Davis stated that FDOT has strongly recommended that it be studied and FHWA has recommended that staff study all feasible routes. Commissioner Katz stated that the agencies should not be ignored, however the Board should do what is best for the community.

Commissioner Grippa asked if delaying item 19 would delay the construction to Orange Avenue. Mr. Davis stated that it would not delay the construction if we could reschedule the items for a meeting in October.

Mayor Marks asked if there were statements to the community regarding studying the existing roadway. Mr. Davis stated that there were no commitments that the existing route would not be studied. He further stated that the EECC specified an alternate alignment and stated certain goals to consider related to that alignment. Commissioner Rackleff stated that there was a commitment not to 4-lane the existing roadway near the airport in order to protect the Chain of Lakes from pollution. He further stated that he felt that there was a commitment. He added that he did not believe that this route should be studied if the Board did not intend to use this route. Commissioner Gillum asked if not studying the existing route would be less costly and save time. Mr. Davis stated that not studying the existing corridor could save approximately \$250,000.

Mr. Jim Shepherd, GEC staff, provided the Board with narrative of the information provided to the Board.

The Board began taking public comment at this point.

Mike Sheridan, Chairman of CAC, stated that he and Kevin McGorty would like to speak to the Board on behalf of the CAC. Mr. Sheridan stated that several members of the CAC had gone to the public meetings and he would like to emphasize the feelings of the CAC. He stated that there was only one dissenting vote regarding the removal of corridor 2 from the recommendation. He stated that the majority of the members felt that going through the National Forest would be environmentally unsound. He stated that the vote was to eliminate the existing route (corridor 1) and to submit corridor 3 with an expansion toward Segment 4A, but not going closer than 200 yards to existing residences within Seminole and Mabry Manors.

Kevin McGorty, member of the CAC and EECC, stated that when the promotional material went out to the voters the EECC had an alignment in mind that would protect the Chain of Lakes and promote economic development for the south side.

Alice Simmons, suggested that the route go from Orange to Tyson and onto to Springhill. She stated that this could be a cost savings and protect the lakes.

Marcus Beard, US Forest Service, District Ranger, stated that the Apalachicola National Forest objects to the corridor 2 alignments as stated in numerous letters. He stated that the position of the US Forest Service is that its lands should not be used for transportation systems or to provide for growth and development.

Jeff Courtemanche, stated that he lived along alternate 3A which is near Black Swamp. He further stated that there would be an equality of dissatisfaction and that it would be better for a few people to be hurt rather than a large majority.

Dr. Bruce Means, Coastal Plains Institute, stated that he agreed with Mr. Beard. He further stated that the eastern United States has very little national lands, and that the Forest was purchased specifically for public use. He mentioned that there was a high biotic diversity in the

Apalachicola National Forest and that it would be wrong to chip away at this pristine forest and it should not be considered as a route.

Matt Aresco, stated that he opposed corridor 2 as a route because this would cause a devastating effect on the ecosystem of sandhills in the National Forest. He further stated that it was a restoration area for the National Forest and there were a number of endangered species in the area as well. He further stated that because these species exist there, it would require at least 10 years of studies by the Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and there would be a NEPA review. Mr. Aresco stated that this route would also degrade the water quality because the springs that feed the Chain of Lakes originate in this area of the National Forest.

Manley Fuller, stated that he would like to see corridor 2 removed from consideration. He further stated that he has written a letter to the Tallahassee Democrat recommending alternative 1A with the understanding that there would be extensive stormwater treatment and bridging. He further stated that since the roadway would be 6-laned that this suggestion is problematic, however he stated that he would still like to see these suggestions made for the existing alignment.

Sean McGlynn, Florida Lake Management Society, stated that any route through the National Forest, route 1A and/or corridor 2 would damage the Bradford Brook Chain of Lakes. He stated that the sandhills lack nutrients and the chemicals from the roadway would damage the lakes.

Brant Foster, stated that he lived between Black Swamp and Lake Bradford. He stated that he was against corridor 2, and the realignment of Capital Circle from Springhill to Tyson Road because it would destroy his home and neighborhood. He stated that he was in favor of the existing alignment.

Linda Jamison, Chairperson of the Sierra Club, stated that the Sierra Club endorsed corridor 3 with the inclusion of alternative 4A because it moved the road away from the lakes. She stated that the properties along the lakes were being sold for commercial purposes and this needed to be curtailed to protect the lakes.

Karen Cooley, Lake Bradford Homeowner's Association, stated that providing economic development, protecting the lakes and moving traffic could be done using corridor 3 and specifically 4A & 4C. She read from an article that was printed in a national magazine to the Board.

Michael Kasha, stated that the Tallahassee Democrat stated that there should be scientific studies made. He stated that he had been on a City/County Committee and he had conducted a 2-year study sponsored by FSU and a California firm. He stated that based on the scientific studies the best routes would be 4C and 3A and that the other routes would not only hurt the environment but also hurt neighborhoods.

Bill Peebles, stated he felt that there was a commitment to realign Capital Circle. He stated that this decision was not only to get to the airport. He further stated that if the existing roadway was not feasible then it should not be studied. He stated that if it is determined that a study needs to be done on the existing route that there will be plenty of time to complete it because the first money on right-of-way is not scheduled to be spent until 2018.

David Armstrong, stated that he voted for the Blueprint program because he felt that there was a commitment to stay away from the Chain of Lakes. He read from the promotional materials that went to the voters. He stated that the existing route did not allow for economic development because of the National Forest and that only corridor 3 allowed economic development.

Commissioner Thael stated that this would be the close of the public comment regarding Capital Circle SW until after the public hearing on the 2006 budget. He further stated that following the public hearing the public comment would resume and then there would be a dinner break following the vote.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: 6:00 pm

20. Adoption of FY 2006 Operating Budget and Resolution

There were no speakers and no discussion on the FY 2006 Operating budget and resolution.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Adopt FY 2006 Budget and related Budget Resolution

Commissioner Grippa moved staff recommendation. Mayor Marks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 12-0.

21. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2006-2010 Capital Budget and Resolution

There were no speakers and no discussion on the fiscal year 2006-2010 Capital Budget and resolution.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the FY 2006-2010 Capital Budget as presented, and appropriate fiscal year 2006 of the Capital Budget and related budget resolution.

Commissioner Grippa moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 12-0.

The public comment on Capital Circle SW resumed.

Del Suggs expressed his thanks to the Board for hearing the public comments. He stated that the EECC originally submitted the alternative within corridor 3 and that no one had spoken against this corridor. He asked the Board to approve corridor 3 for study.

Rebecca MacKay, President of the Lake Bradford Homeowner's Association, stated that at their last meeting there was a unanimous vote against corridor 1.

Denise Redgrave stated that she wanted to reiterate what was said earlier, to not go through the National Forest and to not go along the existing roadway and impact the lakes.

Commissioner DePuy stated that he had toured Lake Bradford and he agreed that it is a beautiful Chain of Lakes. He stated that FDOT and FHWA had advised the Board to study the existing alignment and that currently there was no stormwater treatment of the water that is coming off

the roads. He asked if Blueprint money could be used to provide water quality treatment if the road was rerouted. Mr. Davis stated that in his opinion it could not because the Blueprint money is to be used for Capital Circle and if the road is rerouted then the current road is no longer Capital Circle and therefore not eligible for Blueprint funding. Commissioner DePuy stated that he would never vote to put Capital Circle in the National Forest.

Commissioner Sauls stated that she understood that the existing alignment needed to stay on the table so that federal funding is not jeopardized. Mr. Davis stated that FHWA has not directly stated that it would be jeopardized; however in his opinion it would be jeopardized. He stated that FHWA stated that they do control the location design approval and that if they were not satisfied they could withhold this approval.

Commissioner Katz asked if there had been consideration of a land swap for the land behind the airport for other land the Forest Service desired. Mr. Davis stated that staff had not looked into this specific swap.

Commissioner Grippa stated that the National Forest is not an option for the alignment of Capital Circle SW. He asked Mr. Davis if there was any stormwater treatment on the existing alignment from Orange Avenue to the airport. Mr. Davis stated not to his knowledge. Commissioner Grippa asked if anyone had provided information that taking the road along the current alignment would improve water quality. Mr. Davis stated that to date no study of this had been conducted by his staff; they had only tried to narrow down the corridor. Commissioner Grippa asked if the current alignment were used and additional impervious surface were added would the water quality be better than it is currently. Mr. Davis stated that the water quality would be better because all the runoff would be treated. Commissioner Grippa asked why the Board would not look at the existing route if it would improve water quality. He further stated that it was important that the Tallahassee Airport be able to compete with Panama City for moving cargo.

Commissioner Proctor came to the table at this time.

Commissioner Mustian moved the CAC recommendation to only study corridor 3 with the caveat that staff writes to FDOT and FHWA letting them know the Board's intentions. He further stated that if the response was that the existing corridor must be studied, then the Board would reconsider their actions. Commissioner Winchester seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gillum asked for clarification that this was the expanded corridor 3. Commissioner Mustian stated that he was moving to include the expanded corridor. Commissioner Gillum stated that the study should also go to the intersection of Springhill and Orange Avenue. Mayor Marks stated that he was concerned with impacts of the alignment in the area of 3A & 3B. **Commissioner Sauls asked for clarification that the alignment should not come within 200 yards of a residence. Commissioner Mustian stated that it did (no closer than 200 yards from existing residences in Seminole Manor and Mabry Manor).** **Commissioner Thael** asked if Commissioner Mustian's motion included the intersection of Orange Avenue and Springhill Road. **Commissioner Mustian stated that it did.** **Commissioner Proctor asked if the intersection of Capital Circle and Springhill Road would be included in the study. Commissioner Thael stated that it was included.** Commissioner Proctor asked if this intersection would be considered equally with all other alignments. Commissioner DePuy asked what happens if the directive of the FDOT and FHWA

is not clear. Commissioner Mustian stated that if the directive was not clear that it would be brought back to the Board. Commissioner Proctor asked if the contract would use the City's MBE policies. Mr. Davis stated that it would.

The motion carried unanimously 12-0.

15. Priority Guidance for Additional Funding

Mr. Davis stated that staff needed guidance for what to do with any additional money that Blueprint received, for example the \$16M in Federal Funds. He referred the Board to the staff recommendations:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Guidance for the staff for the tentative allocation of new funds as follows:

1. Priority for all money is to leverage, i.e. TRIP and any grant program where a match is required.
2. Conduct EPD&E study for remaining segments, Capital Circle from Orange Ave to Crawfordville Road
3. Accelerate full funding for the stormwater and greenways for Capital Circle Northwest. (Currently an opportunity exists to acquire 214 acres, the Atkinson property, not to exceed \$6.5M. A FDEP Office of Greenways and Trails grant has been submitted to offset this amount. This is consistent with a leveraging opportunity.)
4. Enhance land bank funds to allow for early opportunity ROW purchases from willing sellers

Commissioner Mustian moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Katz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 10-0 (Commissioner Grippa nor Commissioner Proctor were not present for the vote).

14. Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4: Advance Construction to Tier 1

Mr. Davis stated that Capital Cascade Segment 4 construction is currently a Tier 2 project, however, at a previous meeting the Board voted to move this segment to Tier 1. He further stated that there had been 2 public hearings and that it was back before the Board for the super-majority vote that is required to move this segment to Tier 1 of the Blueprint 2000 program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the movement of Capital Cascade Trail Segment 4 construction from Tier 2 to Tier 1 of the Blueprint program.

Commissioner Katz moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 11-0 (Commissioner Grippa was not present for the vote).

16. Capital Circle Southeast-Potential Design Build (Tram Road to Woodville Highway)

Mr. Davis stated that this proposal fits into the Blueprint 2000 leveraging policy. He stated as proposed this project would be changed to a design build so that it will be ready for construction by June 2006 in order to get first year TRIP money. He further stated that if this is not the

Number 1 project on the CRTPA project priority list then the probability of getting the TRIP money is slim. He mentioned that the TRIP funding could be potentially as much as \$14M. Mr. Davis stated that the current design contract with DRMP is structured to be stopped at 60% design; if the money from TRIP does not materialize then the design build process will stop or the project would move forward as a standard design, bid, build.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Pursue a Design-Build Contract this Fiscal Year for the Tram to Woodville segment of Capital Circle Southeast, subject to a commitment from FDOT District 3 for TRIP funds. Initiate contract activity to:

- a. Select a CEI firm for the Tram to Woodville segment.
- b. Initiate the procurement process for a Design-Build Team.
- c. Authorize a stipend not to exceed \$25,000 for the Design Build Short listed firms, with payment to all three firms if the Design-Build is terminated.
- d. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award the above listed contracts.
- e. Commit the funding released from CCNW/SW due to the \$16M in Federal funding if Trip matching funds for this segment is approved.
- f. Recommend the CRTPA to take all necessary actions to enhance the probability of qualifying for TRIP funding for this project.

Commissioner Proctor moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Gillum seconded the motion. **Commissioner Proctor stated that he would like to see the Board look at a design for Woodville Highway, from Capital Circle to Tram Road at the fairground as a part of the motion.** He stated that the widening of Woodville Highway is a part of the economic development part of the southern strategy. He further stated that there were quite a few new units on Woodville Highway and the projected expansion of Southwood to Woodville Highway begs for road expansion. He stated that Woodville Highway goes to Georgia and that this small segment needs to be widened as well.

Mr. Davis stated that Woodville Highway is not a Capital Circle project and is not a part of the Blueprint 2000 program. He stated that in order to add this segment to the program it would require 2 public hearings and a super-majority vote of the Board.

Commissioner Thaelle stated that the addition of Woodville Highway to the motion was not in order because the bylaws prohibit it.

Commissioner Proctor stated that he did not understand why it could not be added. Commissioner Proctor withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Gillum moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Rackleff seconded the motion.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he agreed that Commissioner Proctor's motion was out of order. He further stated that it should be addressed as a part of the CRTPA process and that it should be made a priority for that body.

Commissioner Proctor stated that since there was additional money available, then the project should be expanded. He stated that Woodville highway runs parallel to Capital Circle and is complementary to Tram to the Airport.

Commissioner ThaelI stated that there is no additional money for Woodville Highway and it was never intended to be funded through the Blueprint program.

Mr. Davis stated this segment of Capital Circle (Tram to Woodville) is only funded for design and not construction. He stated that the additional money being discussed would be used for construction.

The motion carried 11-1. Commissioner Proctor cast the dissenting vote.

17. Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 Concept Approval and Segment 2 Design

Mr. Davis stated that this item was before the Board to request permission to advance the project to the design phase. He further stated that this was not the perfect solution for a park nor is it the perfect solution for a stormwater facility; it is a compromise for both. It is a floodable park with various flood level capacities, from a 2-year flood to a 50-year flood capacity. He mentioned that both the TCC and the CAC had reviewed the item and had both recommended approval of Staff Recommendation with the comments included in the agenda materials.

Commissioner Grippa questioned Option 1, point #2, as to why the Board would award the contract for Phase 2-Segment 2 without going out for bid.

Mr. Davis stated that the original contract with Genesis included the option to continue the contract through the design phase of segment 2.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he recalled that issue being debated by the Board. He further stated that the CAC members had recommended that a landscape architect be the lead on the contract for the design of this segment instead of a stormwater engineering firm. He asked if there would be a problem bidding out this phase to give other firms the opportunity and to have greater MBE participation. Mr. Davis stated that it could be done, however it would delay the project by 6 to 9 months. Commissioner Proctor interjected that not bidding the project out was an excuse to not adhere to the MBE policy.

Commissioner Grippa asked if the project was fully funded. Mr. Davis stated that it was. Commissioner Grippa stated that he recalled the design phase being evaluated as a part of the original RFP and that maybe the scores could be used from the original RFP to award the winner of the design phase at this point. Mr. Davis stated that he would go back to look at the issue. Commissioner Grippa stated that he had a few issues with awarding phase 2 of the project to the same firm for several reasons. (1.) he wanted to insure minority participation; (2.) he wanted to get as many local business as possible involved; (3.) there was a detailed analysis done when the original request for proposals were submitted and that there was another firm that was ranked higher for this phase of the project. He further stated that he believed that a landscape architect should take the lead on this phase of the project. Commissioner Grippa stated that he would like to review the old scoring sheet for the first request for proposals.

Commissioner Gillum requested to be provided the minutes of the meeting that reflected the approved sequencing of the phases of Capital Cascade Trail. He stated that he recalled a different sequencing. Mr. Davis stated that original recommendation by the CAC was 4, 3, 2, and then 1. He continued that the staff recommendation was to sequence the project 2, 4, 3, and then 1 to because of the clean-up efforts that were taking place in segment 2. He stated that the Board's direction was to defer segment 1 and to use the money to complete construction on segment 4. Mr. Davis stated that the stormwater department has recommended the original sequencing. Commissioner Gillum stated that he recalled that there were issues that still needed to be worked out such as Leon High School and the School Board. He stated that he was concerned about the engineering of segment 3 since it would be constructed following segments 2 and 4. Mr. Davis stated that each segment would be constructed independently and that each segment would be designed to retain water from either of the preceding segments, i.e. water from segment 1 would be retained in segment 2. He further stated that segment 4 has the most water quality ponds but each segment can be built independently.

Commissioner Lighsey stated that she recalled that segment 1 was removed because of numerous outstanding issues. She further stated that segment 2 would have the most public access. She mentioned that attachment 6 listed the proposed project design team and that the Board had been promised that there would be a nationally prominent park design team and that it would be brought back later for the Board review. She asked what validity attachment 6 has if it is not final and has to be brought back. She further stated that she wanted to insure that the nationally prominent park design firm would have significant hours in the contract so that they are taking the lead in the park design not just in a cursory review capacity. Mr. Davis stated that the recommendation was to authorize him to approve the team and that it would not come back to the Board for review. He further stated that the team has not been finalized nor has the scope of services been completed. He stated that what the Board was provided was a sample of the types of firms that had been contacted for participation. He mentioned that the amount of work each firm would do had not been determined either. Commissioner Grippa asked that the Board be provided a copy of the original contract. Mr. Davis stated that if the Board requires that staff issue a new RFP then everything would be brought back for approval. Commissioner Lightsey reiterated her desire that the national recognized park design firm be pivotal in the design of segment 2. She asked how the approval of the team would be handled and when would it be brought back before the Board for approval. Mr. Davis stated that staff was working on scheduling a special meeting in October and that this could be brought back at that meeting. Commissioner Lightsey asked if the item would include the roles of the firms and the breakdown of hours. Mr. Davis affirmed that it would include the roles, but the hours for each firm would be finalized during contract and fee negotiations.

Commissioner Rackleff moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. Commissioner Rackleff stated that he was not interested in putting this item out for a new RPF because Genesis had done excellent work on the project previously. He further stated that if the Board stopped micro-managing staff, this segment could be built in 4 years. He mentioned that staff and the consultants are very capable and that they provide frequent updates on the progress of the projects to insure that the Board is well informed.

Commissioner Proctor stated pointed out that the January meeting minutes reflected that he supported approval of the project because the science suggested that the project should begin in segment 4. He further stated that he was under the impression that this project was about water quality not water quantity. He stated that segment 2 has karst features and that the Board had not

been informed as to the status of these karst features, nor has the Board been updated on the status of the contamination issues. He stated that segment 3 was the portion that goes through FAMU. He further stated that he would suggest the name of R. N. Gooden Park for the name of the park in segment 2 and to make room for an amphitheatre.

Mr. David Bright narrated a PowerPoint, and reviewed information that was provided to the Board in the agenda item. He stated that Blueprint had submitted a grant application to the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) to purchase 4 parcels in segment 4 and that it was the #1 ranked application in the State of Florida and that it would garner approximately \$1 million for the project. He stated that permitting for the project would be very complicated, however meetings have been held with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and the City and County Departments of Growth Management. He further stated that staff might pursue jurisdictional severance to limit the involvement of federal and state agencies. The EPA and the Corps of Engineers are in favor of the design that has been presented to them because it meets the intent to improve water quality along the channel. The Capital Cascade Master Plan is nearly complete and the contract can be extended. Mr. Bright reviewed the staff's recommendations.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1:

1. Reaffirm the January 31, 2005, IA recommendation for the preferred concept for Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2.
2. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and execute a contract with Genesis Group for design services for Phase 2 Segment 2, at a cost not to exceed \$1,635,000 (including contingency); it is acknowledged that additional funding will be required and requested in order to address all scope items. The design team will include a nationally recognized park design firm. The Blueprint Director will approve the design team. The proposed design team is shown in **Attachment 6**. The Contract will be divided into the following three separate authorizations
 - A. Expanded Master Plan Activities
 - a. Increased geotechnical and historic/cultural resource investigations of Segments 3 and 4
 - b. Prepare FEMA letter of map revision
 - c. Develop permit level plans for all CCT segments
 - d. Design of SWMF at Leon High School
 - B. Segment 2 Technical Design
 - a. Design Survey
 - b. Geotechnical Investigations
 - c. Final Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis
 - d. Park Programming: Trails and recreational facilities, public areas, stream morphology
 - e. Construction Plan and documents
 - f. Permitting
 - g. Public Information Program

- C. Myers Park SWMF Conceptual Design (with option for Final Design)
 - a. Preliminary Design Survey
 - b. Preliminary Geotechnical Analysis
 - c. Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis
 - d. Conceptual Design and Feasibility
 - e. Right-of-Way Map
 - f. Public Information Program
3. The Technical Coordinating Committee will be required to comment on the Scope of Services.

There was further board discussion following the presentation.

Mayor Marks asked how much the contract would be for this phase of the project. Mr. Davis answered that it would be \$1.6M for the design and contingency cost. Mayor Marks asked who were the minority team members of the proposed firms. Mr. Mark Thomasson of Genesis Group stated that Moore Bass Consulting, Environmental & Geotechnical Specialists, Inc., Archeological Consultants, Inc. and Welch and Ward Architects. Mr. Davis stated that the MBE policy of the City would be used and that the vendor would be certified according to the City's guidelines of local preference at 15.5% minimum.

Commissioner Mustian stated that segment 2 concept was what was sold to the voters, coupled with the fact that the City is removing contamination from the site which will leave a large hole, he felt that the sequencing for the project makes sense. He stated that he felt that they should go out for a RFP, however given where we are in the project, it is a cost and time savings to continue the design contract with the same contractor.

Commissioner Grippa asked how much Genesis had been paid for the current contract. Mr. Bright stated that \$1.5M in the last 2 years. Commissioner Grippa asked if they had met the MBE participation requirement of 15.5%. Mr. Davis stated that they had achieved 14.81% of the MBE participation at last invoicing. Commissioner Grippa asked which firm would be used to achieve the MBE goal. Mr. Davis stated that this would depend in the specific tasks that the firms would perform. Commissioner Grippa asked about the jurisdictional severance approval that would be need for the permitting. Mr. Davis stated that permitting would be very complicated. Commissioner Grippa asked how long the permitting would take. Mr. Davis stated that the project would need to be conceptually designed before the permit could be applied for. Commissioner Grippa asked if Genesis had completed the first contract. Mr. Davis stated that there were still some outstanding issues, however the majority of the contract had been completed. Commissioner Grippa asked if the same sub-contractors would be used on the next phase if Genesis where awarded the contract for the design phase of the project. Mr. Davis stated that some of the team members would be the same and others would be added based upon the tasks needed. He further stated that the park design firms would be added and others such as CDM would remain the same. Commissioner Grippa stated that CDM was a contractor that was in a nonperformance status for a contract that they were awarded through the County and that contract had been revoked and the County was pursuing litigation against them. He stated that they were working on the Lafayette study and were removed. Commissioner Grippa stated that he did not recall giving a contract away without doing a RFP. Commissioner Grippa stated that he would vote against awarding this contract to Genesis without it going out for a RFP.

Commissioner Proctor asked which of the firms on the proposed design team was a black owned company. Mr. Davis stated that they did not track the firms by race; the City's MBE department handled certifying the vendors as MBE firms. He stated that any firm that the MBE office certifies as MBE is used to count towards the MBE goals for each contract. Blueprint does not make the call on which firm is and MBE and which is not. Commissioner Proctor stated that he believed that the MBE policy functions to phase out black owned companies. He stated that it is very clearly denoted when a company is owned by a white woman but there is nothing functionally that allows money to flow into black owned businesses. He stated that he would like to see Spectra Engineering and Akin and Associates who are both qualified and certified firms. Commissioner Proctor stated that black owned businesses are boxed out of contracts even when policies are on the books. He stated that it is very important to him that some of the money to go into the black community and that there be local preference. He stated that he did not want to save time on the project if it does not mean putting money into the black community.

Commissioner Proctor asked why Blueprint was seeking jurisdictional severance from the federal government. Mr. Davis stated that it was for permitting for ponds and in wetlands. He stated that severing jurisdiction gives Blueprint more options in dealing with the water in the area. Commissioner Proctor asked what the advantage would be in severing jurisdiction. Mr. Davis stated that it allowed for more options in the design and it would expedite the permitting process.

Commissioner Lightsey asked if Commissioner Mustian was comfortable that a national recognized firm would be selected by Mr. Davis and not the Board. Commissioner Mustian stated that he would like to see the firms come back before the Board for review.

Commissioner Rackleff moved to extend the time of the meeting to 8:15. Commissioner Gillum seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that he would like to express his confidence in the Director of Blueprint and his staff for the excellent job that they are doing in looking after every aspect of the program, protecting the interest of the community and getting the project built. He stated that he did not appreciate the insulting comments because we have a professional staff that should be treated as professionals.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he was concerned with voting on this agenda item until all of the questions, goals and objectives were met. He stated that if any commissioners had concerns that they would get with staff prior to the meeting to have those issues addressed. **Commissioner Gillum moved to table the vote until the special meeting.** Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion. The motion carried 9-1. Commissioner Rackleff cast the dissenting vote. Commissioner Proctor stated that he wanted to see black owned businesses become a part of the proposed design team and that MBE should not include white women.

Commissioner Thaelle asked if Mr. Davis knew the date of the special meeting. Mr. Davis stated that he would like to have it in conjunction with the upcoming CRTPA retreat on October 24; however, staff would work on getting it coordinated.

V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Commissioner Grippa asked that staff bring the rankings of the previous RFP to the meeting so that the Board could make an informed decision on the contract award.

VII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Thael adjourned the meeting at 8:20 pm.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Cliff Thael
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA

Shelonda Gay
Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA