

BluePrint 2000 - Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, February 7, 2002

Meeting Attendees: Kathy Archibald
Jess Van Dyke
Burt Davey
Albert Trull
John Hutchinson
Katherine Baughman
Anita L. Davis
Carl McCoy
Dinah Hart (*city staff*)

Guest(s): Michael Wright (*city staff*)
David Reid (*city staff*)
Gary Herndon (*city staff*)
Debra Schiro (*city staff*)
Bruce Barrett (*city/county staff*)
Greg Burke (*city staff*)
Bill Woolery (*city staff*)
Alan Rosenzweig (*county staff*)
Vince Long (*county staff*)
Robert Inzer (*county staff*)
Tony Parks (*county staff*)
Rick Boutin (*citizen*)
Bob Henderson (*citizen*)
Jeannie McCoy (*citizen*)

Recording Secretary: Jeanette Lindsey

Meeting called to order at 4:37 P.M.

Kathy Archibald stated that the committee was one short of a quorum; however, Katherine Baughman was on the way. Therefore, she changed the outline of the agenda and began with item 4, which was a presentation on corridor preservation measures.

Greg Burke, City of Tallahassee-Planning Department

Provided a presentation on the corridor preservation measures. Discussed some of the benefits of corridor management, discussed what it is, talked about some of the techniques of how to go about doing this; and how to actually apply this within Leon County.

Explained what is a transportation corridor, and what is corridor preservation (*protect future right-of-ways as well as enhance or provide measures to improve the safety and efficiency of right-of-ways through access management*).

Corridor presentation cont...

Discussed right-of-way preservation procedures (*setback requirements, transferring densities within parcels, etc.*).

Reviewed how to implement.

Per Greg, at the next BluePrint IA meeting (*February 11*) they are proposing to actually request \$200,000 to have the Center for Urban Transportation Research come to town and do the work. (***Provided some background information on the Center for Urban Transportation Research***).

Dinah – The reason for this presentation is because during one of the first meetings held in December, we talked about the benefits of corridor preservation, and how it fit in with what we conceded to be increases in right-of-way cost. Your role (*committee*) will be to ask questions, seek more information, and to serve in an advisory capacity to the IA. If there were comments or input you would like to provide to the IA, this would be your opportunity.

Question was asked, what exactly are we are paying CUTR \$200,000 to do, and what will we do with the results?

Greg – First of all, it is not necessarily sure that we will have to actually pay CUTR the entire \$200,000. What they would do is come in and utilize our adopted cost feasible long-range transportation plans, which shows the improvements over the next twenty years to certain roadways within the community (including BluePrint 2000 projects; and from that map determine how much right-of-way we generally would need). CUTR will develop ordinance for adoption; they would do the foundation as discussed in the Comprehensive Plan; look at setting up the mechanism to do the ordinance in term of what actual goals, objectives, and policies need to be adopted within the Comprehensive Plan ...from the standpoint of being legally defensible.

Bruce Barrett – Provided more in-depth qualifications and background on CUTR. Per Bruce, CUTR will not be identifying right-of-way needs, but they will give us the tools to implement it; we are going to identify what we need and work with them to implement it. CUTR will not be determining our needs.

Kathy – Provided clarification on subject. You are going to ask IA for \$200,000 to do a study to be funded out of the 80% of the BluePrint sales tax money; the way it will benefit the BluePrint projects is it will provide us with the tools that we need to hold down right-of-way costs from what they are now to what they will be when comes the time to purchase the right-of-way. This corridor study will also be applied to the whole 20/20 Transportation Plan; it's not just for Capital Circle it's for all of the roads. The way it is applicable to BluePrint is that it will hold down (*theoretically*) right-of-way cost from what they are today to the time that government is able to purchase those within a reasonable amount. Also, this is not currently in any of the BluePrint project dollars; this is an expenditure above what is already funded in the BluePrint cost.

Question asked in regards to how this will reduce cost.

Gary - With the adoption of the ordinance, we will identify where future right-of-way needs are. We will have mechanisms for when developments come in either for redevelopment or a new development on a complete vacant piece of land, to require that buildings not be constructed within that need of right-of-way.

Motion entered by Jess Van Dyke to endorse the idea; motion seconded. Motion carried.

(Additional discussion held due to some members not having an absolute understanding of how the ordinance will help to save money).

Question asked in regards to the timing; when will the study be done, and when will the ordinance be prepared?

Greg - If we are successful in getting the BluePrint IA to agree with us to move forward with CUTR, then CUTR will come up with the next cycle for the comp plan amendment which is in July; that generally takes about a year. As we move through the comp plan amendment process we can actually be working on the final ordinance itself. So that when the comp plan amendment is adopted we will also jointly adopt the ordinance itself, so it will immediately be in place; therefore, we are looking at approximately next summer.

Question asked as to what comp plan amendments have to be generated?

Greg – Ones that establish the foundation of us doing this; with regards to potential right-of-ways and access management. All of these things have to be laid as foundation of the comp plan prior to moving forward and actually doing the ordinance.

Kathy finalized motion; motion in favor by all. Motion carried.

Kathy – Next item on the agenda is approval of CAC meeting minutes (Attachments 1 and 2). - **Motion entered to accept the minutes; motion seconded. Motion carried.**

Kathy – By-Laws (I would like propose a couple of changes or clarification):

1. Under 1.2, Item 3 – Amend to say, “shall be responsible for the review of ‘*and revisions to*’ work plans as proposed by the BluePrint 2000 Staff director; and to add the phrase, “*to implement the BluePrint 2000 projects adopted in the Interlocal Agreement of the IA.*”

Cathy read requested change in its entirety:

The CAC shall be responsible for the review of and revisions to work plans as proposed by the BluePrint 2000 Staff director, to implement the BluePrint 2000 projects adopted in the Interlocal Agreement of the IA.

The reason for this is that the Interlocal Agreement does not address the annual work plans; it addresses the work plans. This makes it consistent with the Interlocal Agreement.

Motion entered to accept the chairperson’s proposed changes; motion seconded. Motion carried.

Kathy – Clarification of #4 – The CAC shall be responsible for the review of the annual financial and performance audit. The audit will be for all of the sales tax projects, not just the BluePrint projects; this is how it is in the referendum.

Dinah Hart and Kathy provided further clarification on the subject of the audit.

David Reid – Performance audits are not a part of the process; and what we would also have to do is work with the auditors to understand the opinions specifically to sales tax dollars.

Kathy – Verbal clarification needs to be made with the IA and get their opinions. I don’t think that it is important that this group be in that loop of reviewing all of the projects, it’s just the understanding that it needs to be done... that it was part of the referendum to be done... not that the financial and performance audit only applied to BluePrint 2000 projects.

Kathy – Term Limits:

2. Page 2, Item 5 – Amend to add, “*except in the case of initial appointments, and members serving one-year terms may be eligible to serve two-additional consecutive terms for a total of seven-years.*”

Motion entered to accept the chairperson’s recommended changes, along with Mr. McCoy’s amendment (to be eligible for two full terms); motion seconded. Motion carried.

Kathy – Absences and Vacancies:

3. Page 3, 1.4A – Amend to add, “*but may be used to offset absences at regularly scheduled meetings.*”

Motion entered to accept the chairperson’s recommended changes; motion seconded. Motion carried.

Motion entered to approve the By-Laws as amended; motion seconded. Motion carried.

* Revised copies of the By-Laws will be provided to CAC members.

Bill Woolery:

Item #5 – Presentation on Capital Circle South East - Advanced Funding

(Detailed Discussion/Question and Answer session held regarding Presentation)

Motion entered to recommend advance funding of the construction of Capital Circle project; motion seconded.

Brief discussion held in regards to the clarification of the above motion.

“For clarification, the committee is recommending that the project be carried to Blair Stone; motion is to identify all the reasons why, such as for lane change and possibly potential scale change.”

Motion entered to accept the revised motion for advance funding; motion seconded. Motion carried.

Kathy – “One suggestion I would like to propose --- there are a number of pieces that have been approved through the IA, and I am not sure if there is a recap sheet of all of these proposed advance funding pieces (i.e. Jackson Bluff Road project, \$200,000 corridor study, St. Marks headwaters, etc.). It would be helpful to have a recap sheet showing the commission what map these are coming out of, what map projects these are coming out of, BluePrint projects, and then how they impact the total cost of those BluePrint projects. Some of these projects aren’t identified within a BluePrint project map such as the corridor study we talked about, but there needs to be some general language of how this will save money in the long run and reduce the cost of the map.”

Katherine Baughman – 1) Requested that the committee members have name cards to help guests identify who they are and whom we represent; 2) Requested that they hear about the progress of hiring the Executive Director for the program; 3) Wanted to ask about the possibility of bonding against future revenues to save money on the land acquisitions; and 4) At one time, I mentioned that I thought it would be a good idea for us to have some sort of press release that let the citizens of the County know that there were citizens watching over the project list.

Kathy/Dinah – Provided a response to question #2 (*hiring of an Executive Director*).

Kathy – Item #6 – Update on BluePrint 2000 Project Cost Review and Financing Plan - (Dinah is to give a presentation).

Dinah – “Over the past several meetings that we have had, I have tried to spend a little time at each meeting to bring you up-to-date on where we were as staff in the re-costing out of projects, and looking at financing issues and revenue projections. All of this having being brought about by a number of things, one was the September 11 events -- we really had no idea what that might do to revenue projections; secondly, the excessive right-of-way information that we were getting back from our engineering staff on some projects, particularly Capital Circle North West; and thirdly, we had already asked the Finance Committee to look at the draft implementation plan that we started with in September (*the very aggressive/compressed schedule*), and had perceived that the cost of financing was going to be actually pretty heavy -- moving it all up front, and so we put a staff team together and have been working for the past couple of months on looking at all these issues. What I would like to do now is go over that briefly, and just as a matter of consideration we have two issues: 1) The right-of-way issues, and 2) financing issues.

Bob Inzer was introduced as the chair of the Finance Committee.

Bob Inzer – Thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak to them, and then introduced the Finance Committee members: David Reid (*Finance Director, city*), Alan Rosenzweig (*Budget Director, county*), and Gary Herndon (*Treasurer-Clerk, city*).

(Presentation was to inform the CAC members of what the Finance Committee sees as their role and purpose; and also, some of the assumptions made by the committee, and some of their conclusions).

Issues Discussed:

- Revised Revenue Forecast
- Expenditure Schedules (*4 different sheets provided*)

(Detailed question/answer session followed presentation)

Kathy – Next Item - New Right-of-Way Costs

“It has been incorporated into ... you have revised estimates here of total cost; this includes the new right-of-way cost and an additional 14.27% basically across-the-board for everything else (*i.e. greenway, floodplains, stormwater improvements*), everything has been given a 14.27% increase in cost.”

Reason provided as to why the new numbers are so different from the original estimates:

Kathy – “The original projections for Capital Circle (*obviously that is where the biggest hit is and the change in the right-of-way cost*) the original projections that staff did were based on the DOT projections that they had already done for Capital Circle North West, which was about \$5 mil in right-of-way cost; what Jack did was took that \$5 mil and extracted it out for the rest of the right-of-way around Capital Circle. For some reason, I am not sure why, the width that was calculated was the standard DOT model, not the BluePrint 2000 width of 200 + feet.”

“The explanation for why the BluePrint total right-of-way is \$35 mil and your new total right-of-way included in your total fee, does not even include Capital Circle North West which is \$15.1 mil; this takes it up to \$92.9 mil.”

Dinah – “That is Capital Circle ‘only’ right-of-way; that does not include the right-of-way for Tram Road, or the various stormwater and greenway right-of-ways.”

Dinah – “The amount in increase of cost is around \$60 mil in right-of-way, due in part to the extended right-of-way.”

Presentation made by Debra Schiro (*city, Legal department*) and Rick Boutin (*Boutin Brown Realty Advisors, Inc.*).

Dinah – “They are the group that we contracted with to do a parcel by parcel approach all around Capital Circle. It is extremely detailed; we did not do this back when we were parceling out the projects, we simply took numbers from Capital Circle North West and

extrapolated those numbers around. This is what we believe is as accurate information that we can get, at this point and time.”

Debra – “We were asked to look on a parcel by parcel basis of the parcels that would be impacted by using the 226 foot right-of-way for BluePrint 2000. The Engineering staff of the City provided us with a map that obviously does not show everything in terms of detail, but does show quantities per parcel that would be impacted if the 226 typical sections for BluePrint 2000 were required. Rick Boutin’s group actually appraised the right-of-way, which is how much our appraised value would be for the government (*the spreadsheet provided is self-explanatory in the types of information that it provides*).”

**** Prior to meeting adjournment, it was announced that pending the direction of the IA, a meeting may be called prior to the regularly scheduled April 4th CAC meeting.***

Meeting adjourned at 6:35 P.M.