

## Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 22, 2013

Blueprint 2000 Office

2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

Autumn Calder called the meeting to order with the tour bus departing the Blueprint offices at 2:10 pm.

### Committee Members present:

Richard Drew	David Jones
Christic Henry	Dale Landry
Chris Klena	Terence Hinson
Ron Pease	

### Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Wayne Tedder	Margie Quillman
Charles Hargraves	Angela Ivy
Autumn Calder	

### Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications.

### Information Items

There were no Information Items.

### Consent Items

There were no Consent Items.

### Presentations/Discussion

#### **Item #1: Blueprint 2000 Background, Sales Tax Extension, and the Future of Blueprint 2000**

Autumn Calder gave a history of the Blueprint program and projects completed to date.

Terence Hinson questioned of Blueprint constructed federal roads. Wayne Tedder stated that he was not sure; Capital Circle was a stated road however Blueprint received federal funding for the widening of some segments of it. Charles Hargraves stated that interstate highways were deemed one classification, from that there would be US highways which was another federal roadway. However the state administered both but improvements had to be approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Their rules and guidelines were quite stringent and often added considerable time to the approval process.

Ron Pease stated that to his knowledge there had been no instances of federal funding going

directly to Blueprint. Instead, federal funding had come via the state. Richard Drew questioned if there were other projects, besides Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest, that were federally funded. Mr. Tedder noted that Capital Circle Southeast (E3) and Franklin Boulevard projects both received federal funds. He further stated, to remind the committee, that by accepting even one dollar of federal funds, the entire project was subject to the rules and procedures for every aspect of the project; included MBE/DBE requirements or local preference. The Federal requirement for MBE participation was a **goal** of ten percent.

Christic Henry questioned if the Real Estate Policy outlined the process for the disposal of property. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it did. He further stated that the church that was acquired by Blueprint several years ago on the Capital Circle Southeast (E2) project, was recently leased and would be generating approximately \$30k annually from rent that will be applied to the Operating Budget. Ms. Henry suggested that community gardening could be incorporated on other parcels owned by Blueprint as a way to use the land until it could be otherwise disposed of. Mr. Tedder stated that there were certainly opportunities in various areas; he suggested that staff provide a map to the CAC of all land owned by Blueprint.

Wayne Tedder addressed the present and future of Blueprint, the Sales Tax Committee, and how the CAC could respond to changes that might happen.

Richard Drew suggested that Blueprint rename the TCC to specify that it was staffed entirely by City and County staff.

Regarding the reorganization of Blueprint into the Department of PLACE, Ron Pease stated that the major issue was that it came as a surprise to the CAC. Mr. Tedder stated that he had not seen the Management Review Report until the evening before the June 21, 2010 IA meeting and suggested they get into the details of it later.

Mr. Hinson questioned if in 2019 when the CAC's current role expired, would the role change with 2020 and beyond. Mr. Tedder stated that he did not see it changing. He felt that if the sales tax extension referendum was passed, the new round of projects would be bonded out and Blueprint would begin them prior to the collection of sales tax in 2020. Given that, he would not recommend any changes because the current process worked very well. If sales tax dollars were to go toward economic development there would be a different process however. The final decision on all of it would be made by the IA along with a review of the by-laws. He further stated that he thought the IA and the IMC would welcome the CAC's review of the it as well to provide input to what had and had not worked over the years.

Regarding FDOT withdrawing the design of CCSW (W1), Ms. Henry questioned if that was something Blueprint could expect to have happen again in the future or was it a special situation. Mr. Tedder stated that the situation at the time was that FDOT was having issues with several districts and the directive from the Governor's office was to regain control over their projects. Therefore, with some projects in some districts, FDOT was doing just that. Mr. Pease questioned the use of "at that time" and if those conditions were ongoing. Mr. Tedder stated that it was no longer as difficult however, there were also no other projects with FDOT either.

Ms. Henry requested clarification that FDOT would continue with the Blueprint philosophy in the design. Mr. Tedder stated that the only difference he noted was that in the request for bids, FDOT had not included the 230-foot ROW that Blueprint typically acquired. Therefore, Blueprint or the City/County would be required to purchase the remainder to maintain the full footprint of the community standard. Mr. Tedder felt that was fair.

Regarding the Finance Committee, Mr. Hinson questioned if a member of the CAC was included. Mr. Tedder stated that there was not, however, it would be prudent to make that change. It was discussed that the financial expert representative nominated by the EECC (currently Lamar Taylor) would be a likely choice.

Mr. Hinson questioned what role the CAC played when a segment of the community did not want to see a project move from Tier 2 to Tier 1. Ms. Calder stated that they could bring it to the CAC and it would be related up to the IA during the Chairman's report to the IA. Mr. Tedder reiterated that even if it was requested by one of the Commissions, before it could go before the IA, Blueprint's Board; it would have to be brought to the CAC. Regarding issues that were of grave importance to the community, Mr. Hinson questioned what the actual process was that needed to be followed. Mr. Tedder stated that while the member could not discuss it between each other (because of Sunshine laws) there was nothing that precluded them from contacting their Commissioners directly.

Mr. Hinson questioned if Blueprint leveraged funds internationally. Mr. Tedder stated Blueprint had not. Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint had investigated private grants and even endowment options.

Dale Landry stated that FAMU was interested in doing the viticulture for Smokey Hollow area at Cascades Park. He stated that he would like to meeting with Mr. Tedder and FAMU's President separately from the FAMU Leadership Team. Mr. Tedder agreed. Mr. Hinson questioned what would happen at the FAMU Way and Monroe Street intersection; if it would be made into a round-about. Ms. Calder stated that it would remain a signalized intersection however it would become a gateway entrance to the university.

Regarding federal funding and MBE/DBE goals versus the requirements set by Blueprint, Mr. Tedder reiterated his earlier comments for the benefit of Mr. Landry. Ms. Henry questioned if it was driven by the lowest bidder. Mr. Tedder confirmed that was the case and noted that in the past FDOT and FHWA each had to approve Blueprint's final selections to verify that it met the qualifications set by federal guidelines. The bottom line was that if Blueprint wanted federal funds, they had to comply with their rules; even when it meant the "goals" were less than the typical "requirements." Mr. Drew stated that it was all in how it was presented. If it was highlighted as the reason the consultant was chosen for that reason that was one issue. However, if the reason was that the consultant was the lowest bidder and had a higher local presence then... Several persons interjected and stated that it was the lowest bid period.

There was discussion on probabilities however Mr. Landry summed it up by stating that it came down to an issue of morality and taking the high road. The option left to Blueprint was to refuse the money or comply with issues that effected diversity. Mr. Tedder agreed. He further stated

that the next lowest bidder, a local firm, was \$150,000 higher on a \$56M bid, justified his marginally higher rate by confirming that their firm specifically sought out local and MBE/DBE subs. The CAC was sorely disappointed and Mr. Tedder noted that the City's MBE/DBE office listed it as a disincentive. Mr. Drew stated that it was a risk however there was still the incentive to use the local MBE/DBE firms because of their intuitional knowledge.

Mr. Drew asked about the completion and stabilization of the ponds on Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3. Mr. Tedder stated that Coal Chute Pond was mostly complete. Charles Hargraves stated that, regarding stabilization, it was in progress. The City was using the same contractor for work that was adjacent to the subject ponds and had to extend their contract and Blueprint was therefore extending time as well. The pond was constructed but not yet stabilized.

Mr. Drew stated that it would be nice if there were a safe crossing of the Capital Circle Northeast and I-10 area rather than navigating the major highways.

Mr. Tedder stated that just prior to that meeting he was advised that because there was more than one member of the Sales Tax Committee member they would have to refrain from discussion without it having been publicly noticed. In the future Blueprint would ensure that it was stated clearly in future public notices. He thought he could give the presentation in a way that would allow the conveyance of information and generate feedback in a way that would not jeopardize the work of the committee.

Mr. Tedder stated that a list of the remaining unfunded Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects as well as new projects would be provided to the CAC prior to their next meeting. Their review would allow the CAC members to identify the projects that were important to them and that information would certainly be helpful to the Sales Tax Committee.

Mr. Pease stated that in his experience that there was a breakdown in communication with the "wise" citizens of Tallahassee. It was not until Cascades Park that information began to flow to larger segments of the community with a more widespread knowledge about Blueprint. He stated that his comments were a footnote to years of a similar message, all member were responsible for attending all meetings as well as making a greater effort to communicate to the constituents they represented. It would be critical when it became time to vote for the sales tax extension.

Mr. Hinson stated that at one time there was an annual report from the CAC that was published in the Democrat or displayed at local government offices, banks, etc that explained what was accomplished over the year. It also gave a better idea of upcoming projects. Mr. Landry stated that many people were online more than not. He suggested coordinating with the Democrat to publish monthly or quarterly updates with links to the Blueprint or projects specific websites. Another real point was the need for social media outreach. Chris Klena supported the need for Facebook or Twitter accounts and shared her experience with City Utilities social media updates. Mr. Tedder stated that he heard and understood their comments and would commit to stronger efforts.

Regarding the annual performance audit, Mr. Drew questioned if Mr. Tedder wanted to pursue it

immediately, given the fluctuations in the structure of Blueprint over the last year. Mr. Tedder agreed but stated that he was comfortable with holding the audit. There were many recommendations in the Management Review Report (June 2011) that had yet to be addressed because of staffing vacancies. Some of the findings were addressed in the reorganization. However that list could be a starting point for the upcoming audit process.

Mr. Landry questioned the possibility of using "Go-To-Meeting" as an alternative to face to face CAC meetings. Ms. Calder stated that was possible however members would not be able to vote on items presented without the bylaws being reviewed and amended. Mr. Landry stated that his work required him to travel extensively and missing a business trip for a CAC meeting often meant lost revenue. The consideration and flexibility would be appreciated. Mr. Drew stated that having options would increase participation. Mr. Tedder stated that he would have Blueprint Legal review the bylaws.

Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint would continue to host and hold physical space for the meetings so that citizens could attend. Ms. Henry stated that she appreciated options yet from personal experience, it was difficult to engage via the teleconference. She acknowledged that she preferred face to face meetings and reminded members that they represented local constituents and were responsible to them to attend. However, having the option available for members who were traveling, for example, was important. Several members agreed that they did not want it to become the normal or standard form of meeting.

Mr. Pease stated that he foresaw the day that he would be alone with staff. There was no substitute for face to face opportunities to discuss, ask questions, disagree, and plan. Many members voiced their agreement with Mr. Pease. He believed that if one accepted the responsibility of membership (recognizing that he was not losing income by attending) that moving in the direction of web-based meetings would reduce discussion and thorough review of the issues. Ms. Klena suggested having a limit on the number of allowed remote meetings per member. Mr. Drew agreed with the importance of the dynamics of face to face meetings; however he would like the option to still attend if he were out of town at a conference.

Mr. Landry questioned if the meetings were scheduled in advance. Multiple people chimed in that they were. Angela Ivy stated that the schedule was published in the last agenda of the calendar year for upcoming year, meeting requests were emailed to all members prior to the beginning of the calendar year, and for that meeting, a hard copy was available on the back table. Mr. Hinson stated that there would be reasons that caused people to be out of pocket however there was room for compromise. He stated that while there might not be as many people in the room it could increase participation in the meetings. He urged Blueprint to review the options available and the bylaws as well.

Ms. Henry stated that previously there had been discussion about televising the CAC meetings or recording them to be viewed on YouTube later. It was another way of including the public and created another level of accountability for the members. She felt it would lend support to the extension of the sales tax by increasing accountability through transparency.

Mr. Pease stated that an example of transparency was the non-update on the Sales Tax

Committee. Mr. Tedder confirmed that in the future the CAC meeting would be more clearly noticed so that those updates could be communicated. Ms. Henry questioned if it would be helpful for herself or another Sales Tax Committee member to give updates at the CAC meetings. Mr. Pease and others stated yes, it would. Mr. Tedder stated that the minutes were published and the link to them could be provided. Ms. Calder stated that it could be added as a constant until activities with that committee were complete.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

**The meeting adjourned by consensus at 4:16 pm.**