

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 5, 2009

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

Tom O’Steen called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

Committee Members present:

Tom O’Steen	Scott Balog (telephonically)
Jess Van Dyke	Nancy Miller
Lamar Taylor	Burt Davy
Kathy Archibald	Kevin McGorty

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	George Reynolds
Dave Bright	Ward Miller
Phil Maher	Steve Godfrey
Dave Snyder	Ryan Wetherell
Jim Shepherd	Will Mitchell
Gary Phillips	Harry Reed
Margie Quillman	Paco de la Fuente
Marek Romanowski	Mark Llewellyn
Latesa Turner	Rachel Delisle
Angela Richardson	Mark Jones
Debra Schiro	Patrick Twyman

Agenda Modifications

There were no modifications to the agenda. Dave Bright noted that the CAC membership list was being distributed for any required updates. He also noted that Item #8 would be discussed first so that certain staff could be released, and that Item #9 would be advanced so the Committee had time to discuss it in full.

Consent Items

Item #8: Acceptance of FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2008 Operating Fund Balance

Phil Maher stated that the report was still in draft form, however, a copy of it had been forwarded to CAC member Lamar Taylor for review. The final report, including all financials, would be presented for approval at the February 23, 2009 IA meeting with general distribution to follow. Mr. Maher distributed the management letters for CAC review and noted highlighted areas giving Blueprint an unqualified opinion with no exceptions.

Jess Van Dyke moved staff recommendation of accepting the FY08 CAFR and approval of additional appropriation to the FY09 Operating Budget of \$48,935.00 for encumbrances

and \$41,755,171 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Item #7: CAC Minutes: December 4, 2008

Kathy Archibald moved approval of the December 4, 2008 minutes. Nancy Miller seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion (Part 1)

Item #9: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study – Recommended Corridor Segment Solutions

Steve Godfrey of Kimley-Horn, the consulting firm conducting the PD&E Study, gave a brief presentation of the recommended corridor segment solutions for CCSW. In summary Blueprint and Kimley Horn staff recommendation was:

- **Segment 1** - Existing Capital Circle, generally from Crawfordville Road to Near Springhill Road
Recommended Solution: Widen Right
- **Segment 2** - Existing Capital Circle, generally from Springhill Road to South of SR 20
Recommended Solution: Hybrid Solution
- **Segment 3/3c** - Realignment, generally from the Capital Circle/Springhill Road Intersection to the Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection
Recommended Solution: 3c – Center Alignment
- **Segment 4** - Realignment, generally from the Orange Avenue/Lake Bradford Road Intersection to south of SR 20
Recommended Solution: 4b1-North Alignment

Jess Van Dyke stated that he found the elimination of 4A due to impacts to wetlands and the Delta property unfortunate. The original idea was to pull the road away from Cascade Lake to an extent. His opinion was that the wetlands were rather new, artificial and of lesser quality. Mr. Godfrey stated that Kimley Horn's Environmental Specialist personally investigated the area and classified the wetlands to be high quality.

Nancy Miller questioned that Kimley-Horn was choosing to protect the high quality wetlands near Delta as opposed to the Cascade Lake. Also, she mentioned the reconstruction of the relatively recent intersection improvements at Orange Avenue that would be changed again. Mr. Godfrey stated that Kimley-Horn's purpose was to determine which long-term roadway solution made the most sense. The realignment of the Orange Avenue intersection, while an important project, was a short-term solution. They were aware of them but no previous improvements were driving their decision making process for the future corridor. Any of the various alignments, including the existing alignment, would require the reconfiguration of that intersection and would be only a small portion of the overall cost of the project. Speaking of the area around FSU and how their Master Plan related to the CCSW project, Mr. Godfrey stated that it was a great opportunity to create a unique vision as well as a public/private partnership there.

Lamar Taylor questioned what Kimley-Horn based cost estimates on. Mr. Godfrey stated that Florida Land Acquisition assisted in the evaluation of Right-of-Way costs for all alternatives. They did not perform appraisals at this time as they were quite costly. However, they evaluated land value, damages, and cost of acquisition using the database information available (2007/2008) for acquisitions in the area. Cost estimates also included culverts, the bridge over Bradford Brook, mitigation for wetland and various other impacts, etc. Mr. Taylor questioned the difference in ROW costs between the existing alignment and the realignment. Mr. Godfrey cautioned that it would be inappropriate to, at that time, consider relativity between existing alignment and realignment in total because the PD&E (data) was not at that phase yet. That being said however, he further stated that they compared the ROW and real costs for each of the alternative alignments within each segment and identified the ROW and construction costs for each of the various alternatives. That was what was represented in the total number in the presentation. The numbers, as presented, could not be added together nor compared yet; the study was still too macro. Mr. Godfrey assured Mr. Taylor that the costs had been reviewed quite carefully. More importantly however, everything had been evaluated on common ground. Even if costs were slightly inflated or deflated they were all relative to each other and in the correct order of magnitude.

Kevin McGorty stated that his personal concern was that as they came down to making the decision between the existing alignment and realignment that they moved into that discussion on an even playing field. He felt frustrated though because it was coming out of a unique public effort that had higher standards than if they were looking at a typical road segment outside of the parameters of the Blueprint values. He wanted to be comfortable knowing that the realignment had an 'even shot' with the existing alignment. Mr. Godfrey stated that while it was more work for Kimley-Horn, if they evaluated smaller sections of the project area and agreed within that geographic area to what was best it provided a better opportunity to ensure that everything was evaluated on a fair basis. Mr. McGorty stated that the creators of the EECC had a vision in which two key values were expressed: economic development potential in implementing the southern strategy along an innovative alignment and protection of the area's natural resources. He only wanted to ensure that the policy makers would make a decision that would have tremendous consequences to broader community and specifically the values of Blueprint.

Burt Davy questioned if active dialogue had occurred with FSU. Mr. Godfrey stated that FSU had gone on record, even though it was not the time to say so, as preferring the existing alignment. If however, something was to be done in Segment 4 they preferred the 4C alignment. They felt that any other alternative would be disruptive to their future plans. Mr. Godfrey stated that they would continue dialoguing with FSU to discuss ways they could work with the enhancements. Dave Bright mentioned that Laurie Thomas from FSU Facilities Planning was on the Community Representatives group, and that Blueprint staff had met at FSU with Facilities Planning staff.

Kathy Archibald stated that she felt comfortable in moving forward with the segments as they had been presented and recommended. She stated that she had attended several of the public meetings and that Kimley-Horn had done a great job of getting public input. Of course, she stated, she had her personal preference for an alignment, however, the people that would be directly affected had a better idea of "what it would mean to the neighborhood." For everyone

else it was a part of the community but not as personal. She did not want to micro-manage the process; the bottom line, in her opinion was that they would have to trust and allow the process to unfold.

Kevin McGorty stated that he was coming from a definite bias regarding the two potential alignments. He did not think it fair of them to pick apart the process. He also reminded the committee to look at the larger vision and that they would have the opportunity in the future to weigh the pros and cons of both.

Jess Van Dyke moved staff recommendation; Nancy Miller seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #10: EECC Presentation to IA Regarding Capital Circle SW

Kathy Archibald stated that her purpose with the presentation was to remind the IA of the original vision of the EECC. The whole concept was based on vision and a potential for economic development. That was the element that was so hard to encapsulate and convey. She felt that Kimley-Horn had done a remarkable job of quantifying that in terms the PD&E. She spoke of the original PD&E from many years earlier, of the sensitive nature of the area due to sinkholes, and the southern strategy of promoting economic development on the south side. She spoke of the difficulty in passing down with continuity that vision from administration to administration at the universities and the benefits of an Airport access road. She stated that it would take imitative on the part of the elected officials to create public and private partnerships; the potential was unbelievable.

Information Items

Item #1: Wood Sink Tract Acquisition

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Design Update

This item was informational only. In brief discussion however, Mr. Davis stated that there was a philosophical quandary. There were certain limitations but the design should maximize capacity. If Blueprint constructed the pond(s) to maximum capacity and retained enough space to incorporate amenities later he did not see a down side to doing so and constructing the improvements now; even without full blown stormwater modeling (as recommended by the TCC). All of the proposed short-term improvements were part of the final solution in every scenario.

Mr. Maher stated that there was no funding available for Segments 3 and 4 ROW or construction estimated at \$100M) until beginning in FY2012. There was approximately \$4M remaining in the design budget which could be used for ROW or construction as well.

Item #3: Cascade Park / Meridian Monument Plaza Design Modification Due to Property Constraints

This item was informational only. However, Mr. O'Steen requested an update of fund raising efforts at the next CAC meeting. Nancy Miller requested clarification on the requested \$10M for stormwater (under the Federal Stimulus Package). Mr. Davis stated that staff extracted elements

of various park infrastructure that they felt could be implemented in a timely manner. The double by-pass box culvert was purely a stormwater entity and was what funding was being requested; although, it was also part of the delay in project construction due to regulatory permitting requirements.

Item #4: Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest: US 90 to Orange Avenue

This item was informational only.

Item #5: Naming of Regional Pond/Park after Martha Wellman

This item was informational only.

Item #6: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road Design/Build Project

This item was informational only. There was however discussion of this item with Agenda Item #12.

Presentations/Discussion (Part 2)

Item #11: Billingsley Property Conservation Easement

Dave Bright stated that the NFWFMD staff had been working with the Billingsley's regarding a Conservation Easement for 192-acres. In January, the NFWFMD Governing Board did not approve the appraisal, ultimately "killing" the project. One representative was adamantly against the Conservation Easement because it did not allow public access. However Blueprint would continue to work the process via the Board and Commissioner Thaell. If circumstances changed they would report back to the CAC.

Item #12: Sales Tax Revenue Update

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint's typical growth rate in sales tax receipts was 4.5% which, at the time, was considered conservative compared to previous growth rates. Staff estimated a 3% decline in the growth rate for last year and they were not far off. At the last Finance Committee meeting it was determined that the current year's collections would be at a -3% also with the following years growth rates at 1% for the first year. Based on that, Mr. Maher expected an additional \$20M in cuts to the Blueprint budget. The budget, reflecting those cuts, would be brought to the Board in June 2009; the CAC would review the budget at their May meeting.

Regarding potential Federal Stimulus Package funding there were several criteria that had to be met to be eligible. Blueprint had been exceedingly proactive in its efforts to meet those parameters. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint staff felt confident that they were in a good position to receive stimulus package dollars that would come through FDOT, District 3 (for the Capital Circle SE (E-3) project). Staff has also reviewed and listed projects that could qualify for a Phase II of funding should it become available (for stormwater, Capital Cascade Trail, and Capital Circle NW/SW (N-2)).

Jim Davis reiterated that Blueprint was in "very good shape" for obtaining funding for E-3. There were only two Leon County projects on the District's list for stimulus money with Blueprint/Capital Circle being one; the Lafayette Street tunnel (near the FDOT central office) was the other. The funding could not go for reimbursement, however. The E-3 project was

currently unfunded for construction. Any funds received would not add money to the coffers to be distributed amongst other projects; it could only be used on Capital Circle: Woodville to Crawfordville, which is unfunded.

Blueprint was also competing for an additional \$10M for Segment 2 of Capital Cascade Trail and \$24M for Capital Circle NW/SW. The problem with those two projects was that Blueprint could not meet the 120-day letting period for construction. They were hopeful that there would be a Phase I (120-days) and a Phase II (120-360 days) in which case Blueprint would once again be in good stead. They could not meet the 120-day criteria due to permitting issues (LOMAR & CLOMAR for Capital Cascade Trail and FEMA requirements, contamination issues, City coordination, etc) and time frames of other departments that did not share the same sense of urgency as Blueprint.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint staff had met with representatives from Congressman Boyd's and Senator Nelson's offices. The City and County had coordinated along with FSU and regional governments for the local stimulus package; Blueprint was included with that package as well. They had worked diligently to position themselves for the money. Harry Reed stated that it was a dynamic process that was continually evolving. The CRTPA was working closely with Blueprint, the City, etc to find projects that they could move forward as quickly as possible. The key element was construction projects.

Lamar Taylor stated that he was concerned because E-3 was not initially funded in the Master Plan; what if Blueprint was offered only a portion of the necessary funds? Would they pursue reallocating funds from other projects to cover the difference? Or be willing to turn the funding down? Mr. Maher stated that the whole purpose was to move the money and create jobs. There would not be enough time for other scenarios; for the project to be successful Blueprint would need the full \$15M or nothing. Mr. Davis stated it was a situation that would be handled if it arose. It was an opportunity for Blueprint to chase and hopefully secure \$15M in "free" money for the community and they were not passing it by. The E-3 project met the criteria and had the opportunity to be successful; if it had not been eligible, Blueprint would not have applied.

Item #13: Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Construction Project Limits

Latesa Turner stated that the item discussed what construction limit alternatives staff was currently reviewing based on the possibility of further reductions to available funding for NWSW.

Option 1: Construct Project from South of US 90 to North of SR 20

Estimated Construction Cost: \$34.4 million

Option 1 would not include construction of improvements to the intersection of CCNW/SW and SR 20 or along SR 20, the Broadmoor pond or the Delta pond.

Option 2: Construct Project from South of US 90 to South of SR 20

Estimated Construction Cost: \$46.9 million

Option 2 would require the construction of the Broadmoor and Delta ponds.

Option 3: Construct Project from South of US 90 to South of Orange Avenue
Estimated Construction Cost: \$55.2 million

There is a total of \$46.5M available for CCNW/SW in the Master Plan. Of that, \$2.5M is allocated for CEI services and there is \$4M (10%) for contingency; that leaves a balance of \$40M for actual construction. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint would bid out Option 1 as the base line with a contract option for Option 2 to evaluate the costs. Based on the bids received, if there was a way to fund Option 2 Blueprint would construct through the SR 20 intersection.

Item #14: Blueprint Participation in Lafayette Heritage Trail/Bridge Project

Dave Bright stated that Blueprint was looking to partner with the City Parks and Recreation for a bike/ped bridge at the far eastern edge of the Lafayette Heritage Trail over the CSX railroad. Blueprint would be submitting, along with the City, a \$250,000 Recreational Trails Program grant application. In order to make sure the entire project can be built, Blueprint was looking to offer up to \$500,000 toward the construction.

Kathy Archibald moved approval of endorsing Blueprint's participation in the Bridge project and authorized up to \$500,000 to be transferred from the Lake Jackson Basin/Fred George line item to be used for the project. Nancy Miller seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

Mr. Davis requested that the CAC membership review their by-laws as part of routine maintenance. Presently there were three vacancies on the CAC. Mr. O'Steen stated that when the membership was created certain organizations held places however attendance of appointees had not been consistent. Could there be other organizations that should be involved? Mr. O'Steen would bring information back to Blueprint and the CAC.

Mr. Davis stated that there was potential for Blueprint to take on an aggressive role of project management for the City and County regarding the stimulus package. Blueprint was in favor of such an arrangement because of the capabilities to expand/contract through the GEC. Furthermore Blueprint was exclusively designed to manage large infrastructure projects. Additional projects would be at no expense to the Agency's sales tax receipts, as they would be fully funded by other sources.

Adjourn

Kathy Archibald moved to adjourn; it was seconded by several members. The meeting adjourned at 6:59 pm.