

**Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes**  
 Thursday, February 7, 2008  
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center  
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

Tom O’Steen called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.

**Committee Members present:**

Tom O’Steen	Kathy Archibald
Jess Van Dyke	Kevin McGorty
Nancy Miller	Dianna Norwood
Lamar Taylor	Gregg Patterson
Hugh Brown	Scott Balog

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

Dave Bright	Angela Richardson
Jim Davis	Gary Phillips
Margie Quillman	Latesa Turner
Jim Shepherd	Beth Brenneis
Debra Schiro	Rick Feldman
Steve Nichols	Ward Miller
Vontrell Randall	Rita Stevens
Candy Dolcy	Lindsey Cole
Tracey Carter	Phil Maher
Paco de la Fuente	Steve Bailey

**Agenda Modifications**

There were several agenda modifications, primarily to readjust the order of the items to allow several guests to leave early. The one additional agenda modification item was the General Engineering Consultant Contract.

**Information Items**

**Item #10: Acceptance of FY 2007 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2007 Operating Fund Balance**

Phil Maher introduced Rick Feldman and Rita Stevens from the City Accounting division and Beth Brenneis from Carr Riggs and Ingram.

Mr. Maher gave a review of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and stated that in the past Blueprint has received an unqualified opinion, which meant that there was no exception to the financial statements and there were no material weaknesses identified. There was a recent change in accounting standards, which took place in December 2007. It was an introduction of a new item that “was a cause of significant deficiencies identified not considered

being material weaknesses". Regarding the significant deficiencies, the CAFR noted donations of land for permanent easements were not recorded in the general ledger. Blueprint's response to the comments was that to ensure all accounting issues were considered, weekly meetings between Blueprint and Accounting Services division staff would include discussion and evaluation of Blueprint minutes, contracts and other agreements. On the topic of debt service payments for the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) loans, the CAFR indicated the general ledger did not correctly allocate load principal and interest expense. The recommendation given was to confirm loan balances annually with FDOT prior to closing the books to ensure accurate accounting and reporting. Concerning the Grant Reporting, given the small size of Blueprint's staff, Blueprint's Financial Manager prepares all grant reporting and reimbursement requests for Blueprint. There currently was no independent review of those documents and reimbursement request. The suggestion was that all documents prepared for reporting to grantors should be carefully reviewed by someone other than the preparer and all reimbursements requests should be reviewed by the City's accounting services division for accuracy and compliance.

Gregg Patterson asked for recognition for a breakout of SIB loan interest and principle. Beth Brenneis from Carr Riggs and Ingram, stated that over the life of the loan, by the time Blueprint got to the end of the paying off the loan, the actual cost was \$950,992.00 less than what was originally anticipated. The \$950,992.00 savings would not have been recorded until the last year of the debt service. Mr. Rick Feldman stated that Blueprint understated the debt services and that it would be corrected and they would continue to keep it updated. Mr. Maher mentioned that he would be open to any comments and reiterated that the CAFR was a draft.

Mr. Patterson confirmed that in the financial world it was something that needed to be corrected but it was not something that needed to raise concern. Kathy Archibald moved acceptance of the Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and the Appropriation of FY 2007 Operating Fund Balance as presented. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion; it passed unanimously

**Item #4: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond Landscaping/Park**

Steve Nichols stated that Blueprint had received the Invitation For Bid and staff was reviewing it. Upon completion it would be turned over to the short-listed contractors, M. Inc., Sandco, and C.W. Roberts for their bids. Mr. Nichols noted that the project was currently in the permitting process. Mr. Nichols confirmed that bids would be received by mid-March 2008.

Dianna Norwood inquired about the pond that was located right off Tennessee Street for which parking issues were being reviewed. Jim Davis stated that the acquisition had not happened due to the requested land price being absolutely astronomical. Mr. Davis stated that there would be 13 parking places, near the right-of-way, as well as having a circular drive with handicap access. County Parks & Recreation stated would be sufficient.

**Item #5: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update**

Marcus Kelly provided the committee with a brief summary of the 15.3 acre regional Stormwater pond, part of the Capital Circle NW project. Blueprint and FDOT had arranged a work order for hand removal of the channel apple snails. Unfortunately the snails had returned and Blueprint was currently working with local agencies to find some experimental methods to fix the problem. The proposed methods would include hand picking as well as chemical treatments, fish, stakes, and cooking oil. Marcus Kelly noted meetings would continue with the County and other agencies to determine the best method.

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Mr. Maher stated Blueprint was preparing a Federal Transportation Funding Request, since with the downturn of the economy there might be a Federal infrastructure stimulus package. This request would also be used to seek funding in the Highway Reauthorization Bill for 2009. This was the same process that Blueprint went through for the prior SAFETEA-LU allocation for Capital Circle NW and SW. Mr. Davis mentioned that Blueprint was anticipating, during recession, that a stimulus package may be developed and Blueprint wanted to position to be able to pursue some funding.

Mr. Davis gave a brief update on the financial side of things, stating that FDOT was \$1.4 billion short in their planned 5-year work program. Fortunately, Blueprint had most of the projects currently under contract and costs were fixed. The economy was in a bit of an anomaly, the housing market was down, but the Right-of-Way was not coming down. Right-of-Way had continued to be outrageously high, and it would take awhile for the commercial property to come down.

Tom O'Steen asked who lobbies on Blueprint's behalf, when applications were forwarded to a Senator's office. Mr. Davis confirmed that it was a combination between the City and County and stated that it was coordinated primarily by Rick Speas, the City's lobbyist. Mr. Davis also stated that Blueprint would work through Allen Boyd's office to put something together that was justifiable and would identify that Capital Circle NW/SW costs had increased. (Right-of-Way costs had increased, along with the design budget.) Capital Circle was a SIS (Strategic Intermodal System) Roadway; the highest level of the roads in the state of Florida, by definition.

Mr. Maher stated that Northwest Florida Water Management District Florida Forever Grant was not approved. This was the first unsuccessful grant application for Blueprint. Regarding future grants, Blueprint was working on a grant that would provide funding for the Meridian Plaza in Cascade Park from the Department of State/Cultural Facilities Program, as well a grant for water quality improvements in Cascade Park.

Dave Bright stated that staff would be requesting the IA endorse the Cultural Facilities Grant. Blueprint might also request a letter of support from the CAC. Mr. O'Steen inquired about the Florida Forever Grant, was there another cycle to resubmit the application and the likelihood of being declined for one grant, and gives an advantage for another grant. Mr. Bright stated that it was a yearly cycle and he had spoken briefly with Paul Thorpe, from the Water Management District. Mr. Thorpe indicated that this grant was given to counties that were economically deficient and were contingent on that grant funding to complete their projects. Blueprint probably lost about 15 points because they were going to build the project even without grant

funding.

Mr. Davis mentioned that throughout the process, the board members felt that they were giving too much money to Leon County. He also stated that the more successful one was, the harder it became to succeed the next time. He stated that it was inevitable that Blueprint was denied one. Mr. Davis stated that, yes, Blueprint could resubmit the application, and intended too.

**Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail Segments 3 & 4 Design Consultant**

Mr. Bright notified the CAC that Kimley-Horn & Associates was selected by a committee of seven that evaluated the proposals. Blueprint planned to have a contract executed in approximately six weeks. Ward Miller of Kimley Horn was in attendance; it was noted that he had significant experience in the comprehensive Stormwater Management area, 27 years total. Mr. Miller stated that he was looking forward to working on the project, and that he had a passion for functional Stormwater greenways, while the citizens see only a beautiful park. He had worked on projects similar to that one in the past, and looking forward to identify the win-win design solutions with all of the various interests.

Kevin McGorty asked for the record what the other firms were. Mr. Bright stated that there were actually ten firms who submitted for the Request For Qualifications, but did not have them in front of him. He said that he would e-mail them to Mr. McGorty.

**Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 – Design Update**

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint was making progress on five of the six amenity designs. Mr. Phillips noted that there was a mistake in the Item regarding the Meridian Plaza Stage, it was 150 feet in diameter, not 75 feet as shown in the item. Blueprint staff met with Assistant City Manager Michael Wright concerning the concept for the dancing fountain amenity. The Signature Bridges would be A-Frame, 33 foot high and 65 foot span bridges. He also noted that Blueprint was having difficulties with one of the owners signing off on the Lake Hall School House for donation. Unfortunately no significant progress had been made. The History Timeline Fence was projected to have 14 interpretive panels that would document the history of Tallahassee. Peter Martin was working with the Local Historic Society for the wording of the panels.

In regards to permitting, Blueprint had submitted a "Type A" Site Plan Application to COT Growth Management which included the Environmental Impact Assessment. There were three steps, the Natural Features Inventory, Environmental Impact Assessment, and the ERP which was currently under review.

Furthermore, Blueprint staff was evaluating possible green initiatives for the project's design and construction. A few examples were solar applications for the restroom facility, recycled materials for the pavement areas, and pervious pavers system for the parking areas; along with landscaping.

On January 30, 2008 a constructability meeting was held with several possible contractors including Culpepper, Ajax, Sandco, and M. Inc, to discuss Segment 2 Design and best methodology for construction. The three methods that were discussed were Construction Management at Risk, Design-Build, and Design-Bid-Build with multiple contracts. Mr. Phillips stated that even though the economic conditions were bad, from a revenue side there were some

benefits; mainly that the contractors were looking for work. There was no decision made on methodology.

Mr. Davis stated that the impact to it would be in drafting the Scope of Services. Blueprint would have a decision within the next 30 days. Mr. Davis stated that staff had already considered Construction Management at Risk. After reviewing it in detail, however there was approximately 6% management/risk cost associated with that. 6% of the \$26-35 million project cost (with all of the amenities), was a significant amount of money. Blueprint would require prequalification, standard low bid and hard bids that would capitalize on the competitive market.

Nancy Miller addressed a few questions concerning the green initiatives. Ms. Miller was concerned about the issues of porous concrete, pavers, asphalt, and recycled plastic and the wear ability. Mr. Phillips stated maintenance and durability were the biggest issues with the green park elements. Mr. Davis added that Blueprint was trying to incorporate as much of the green initiatives as possible, but the question was whether or not it would be done on a demonstration basis. For example, instead of the entire sidewalk being in pervious concrete, the thought was to do a quarter of a mile in pervious concrete. Blueprint was concerned that some of the technologies were relatively new and potentially high maintenance and that future maintenance could become a burden to the Parks Department. Blueprint was not prepared to make a major wholesale commitment for the entire project, but to use it as a demonstration for a portion. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint wanted the park to be a showcase for green initiatives even if it was not a wholesale demonstration application. The biggest issue that Blueprint was researching was to find a manufacture that was willing to donate the product, in return for having it as a demonstration.

Mr. McGorty agreed with Ms. Miller to find a way, even with a very tight budget, to receive an award in terms of adding education to the community in regards to green initiatives. Mr. McGorty applauded any efforts made by Blueprint to showcase that within the given parameters. It would be an added bonus to the green initiatives project. Hugh Brown asked if the idea was to what Blueprint could do initially with hopes of turning everything green down the road. Because it was stated earlier, that Blueprint did not want to make the full commitment because the materials were still new. Mr. Davis stated that he did not see Blueprint tearing up sidewalks to replace them with pervious concrete after the 5 years of the demonstration, but it would be possible during Segment 3 or 4 that it would be more feasible to add more green items. They planned to use the composite decking where they could. Kathy Archibald agreed with the "reverse metering" for solar generation. Kevin McGorty noted the green components could eventually lead to an award.

Mr. Davis mentioned that the Segment 2 Marketing Team, Loranne Ausley, Janet Hinkle, and Gil Ziffer, had been actively pursuing fundraising efforts. He confirmed that Blueprint had received a commitment for half of the cost of the dog park. Also, Capital Health Plan had committed to funding the trail network and the City of Tallahassee and the CRA has committed to funding the dancing fountain. Blueprint also had received a commitment for the design and construction of the Signature Bridges; the name of the firm would be released at a later date. Lamar Taylor inquired about the amount of contributions. Mr. Davis stated that the commitment for the dog park was a verbal commitment for half (\$300,000 total), the interactive water park was approximately \$2,000,000, and the bridges were \$500,000 total.

Mr. Davis presented a PowerPoint presentation to the CAC on the Dog Park; a copy of which is included in the file.

Following the presentation, Nancy Miller stated that the dog waste issues was an educational opportunity that could encourage people to be more conscious of pet waste all over Tallahassee. As well as creating an educational tool for that particular park; the City would be able to implement elsewhere. Mr. Davis stated that the whole concern for the Dog Park was that John Buss (City Stormwater) did not like it because of the location immediately on top of the St. Augustine Branch.

Mr. McGorty stated that the whole issue with public health, in beaches and parks, the bacterial level that people were experiencing; was the rest of the park going to be off limits to dogs? Were dogs only going to be permitted in the dog park? Mr. McGorty mentioned that Central Park in New York has two areas, one for humans and another for dogs. He would hope that new Parks and Recreation Director was saying for an operation standpoint that this was a controlling factor, the best we can control the population of dogs. He was concerned that if the City did not police it in some way, the rampant use of pets may create a public health issue and might discourage the public from actually utilizing the park. Mr. Davis stated that he had not quite thought through that, but it would most likely be up to City Ordinances. Blueprint had spoken with the interim Parks and Rec. Director about the issues and they are on board. Mr. Davis took a few minutes to discuss the issues that City Stormwater had with the park. One being that it was in the wrong place because of the water course, but doesn't mind the park. Because of the issue of not obtaining the Lake Hall School House, there might be a possible opportunity to move the dog park there. Tom O'Steen confirmed what Mr. McGorty stated in that it was a solution for Parks & Recreation and City Stormwater to deal with.

### **Item #3: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update**

Latesa Turner gave a brief update on the status on the PD & E study, it was progressing very well. Blueprint was currently entering into the 17-month of the study development. The PD&E design consultant was currently conducting the environmental engineering analysis collecting data, and continuing to refine the corridor alignments that were identified in May 2007. They were also continuing to develop the corridor alignments alternatives, which would be presented in late April 2008 or early May 2008. Prior to that meeting an update would be given to the CAC.

### **Item #6: Capital Circle SE Completion and ribbon Cutting Ceremony**

Margie Quillman informed the Committee that the Capital Circle SE project was expected to be completed in May 2008. A ribbon cutting ceremony would be scheduled for April or May. Staff was targeting April 15, 2008 as the primary date; the Commissioners will be polled as to their availability and additional information would be forthcoming.

### **Item #8 FDOT's Future Right-of-Way Trends**

Debra Schiro provided the committee with a brief summary of a meeting she attended regarding imminent domain, right-of-way costs and funding. A few points that were given were that the FDOT work program was reduced by \$1.4 Billion for the next five years. Another interesting point was that Right-of-Way cost continued to increase and the number of parcels acquired had

consequently decreased. She further stated that it might be time to look outside for a private public partnership, legislation for which just passed during last session, HB 985, with an emphasis on some projects in District 4 starting to use existing traffic lanes rather than expanding.

Mr. Davis stated that the public private partnership was a combination of private construction funding with a portion of state funding. It was complicated; the businesses would either get a portion of the tolls or get the tolls for a certain amount of years, and then it would revert to public ownership.

#### Consent Items

##### **Item #9: CAC Minutes: December 6, 2007**

Nancy Miller stated that there was a typing mistake regarding to the sales tax, it was listed as 0.4% decrease and was supposed to be 4% (page2 of 7, item #1). Mrs. Miller moved that the committee pass the minutes and Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### Presentations/Discussion

##### **Item #11 Capital Circle NW/SW: Us 90 to Orange Avenue – Right-of-Way Acquisitions (Additional parcels) and Resolution**

Ms. Schiro stated that Blueprint intended to present a resolution to the IA, February 25, 2008, for an approval to acquire six (6) additional parcels on CCNW/SW that had been deemed necessary for the project. Blueprint was asking the IA for approval of a resolution to acquire them, either by a donation, voluntary purchase or condemnation. Of the six parcels, four of them were located on Swamp Fox Road, used for mitigation, one located on Pensacola Avenue, used for drainage.

Mr. Patterson asked if the economic downturn had impacted the Blueprint projects. Mr. Davis confirmed that Blueprint was okay for now. As far as Right-of-Way acquisition, it appeared that Blueprint would not have enough money as originally planned for Capital Circle NW/SW. The original estimate did not include the mitigation properties, but there was additional funding in the construction budget that could be moved if necessary.

Mr. Davis explained that when the original construction budget was compiled, the plan was to have a long grade level bridge across Gum Swamp; in the final design, there was a 100 foot long bridge, but in return, Blueprint agreed to purchase some mitigation property to offset the fill. Because of that, there was a net reduction in cost, so part of the "construction" money was available for purchase of the mitigation property.

##### **Item #12 Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental**

Mr. Davis stated that CSX had stated that they were planning to install an additional track in the future. The impact of that would be that the bridge over the current track and over the CSX ROW would need to be longer, because the abutments would still be within CSX's Right-of-Way. This was the primary issue with this project. There were several other unresolved issues, however, Blueprint was in the process of negotiating the supplemental agreement with Lochner

and was still negotiating a final cost of the supplemental. No money would be diverted from another project; it was the same project, just moving funds from construction to design.

Jim Shepherd addressed the funding for the pond cross section and stated that once the ponds were built the surveyors verify the constructed volume against the design plans. That had not been negotiated in the original contract. Blueprint will have inspectors on site that work for us and make sure that the ponds are functioning before it takes. Blueprint is asking permission to find a firm that that is their specialty, and insure that the project is built according to the approved drawing specifications properly.

Kevin McGorty moved to approve staff recommendation that the cost not exceed \$350,000. Kathy Archibald seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #13 Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Construction Engineering and Inspection Services**

Latesa Turner stated that Blueprint was requesting authorization to initiate the procurement process to secure Construction Engineering Inspection services. This project was anticipated to start construction by the end of 2008 or beginning of 2009, and the plan is to secure the CEI services prior to this. Also, the Agenda Item is requesting that the IMC be authorized to negotiate and award a contract once the CEI has been selected.

This particular CEI contract would be different from previous Blueprint CEI contracts. Blueprint would be requiring on-site environmental inspectors, and more stringent environmental oversight to avoid disrupting anymore land than was necessary during the construction process and to be proactive in maintaining environmental safeguards. It will be a fairly expensive CEI contract due to the additional environmental requirements; otherwise it was a standard solicitation procedure that Blueprint has used in the past.

Kathy Archibald moved for approval and Nancy Miller seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

**Item #14 Sales Tax Receipts Update**

Mr. Maher gave a brief overview of the Sales Tax receipts and impacts to the Master Plan. The Master Plan had originally used a 4.5% annual growth projection based on a recommendation of the Finance Committee, which at that time was considered conservative. Over the previous years, the cumulative average growth rate of the optional sales tax from 1992 thru 2006 had been 6.4%. For 2007, even though there was a 0.5% increase in collections, there was still a \$1.2 million deficiency based on projections. When projected out for the term of the tax, this number becomes astronomical. For the short term, no more than two years, Blueprint doesn't see anything that would jeopardize any priorities and everything that is under contract would be fine. Blueprint and the Finance Committee met and asked to run the financing model with two different scenarios, one where the growth factor should be 0.5% for two years and then bring growth back up to 4.5% annually; and the second scenario was with a growth of 2% for two years and then backup to 4.5%. Total reduction in Blueprint project funding over the 15 years was in the range of \$59 million to \$73 million. Mr. Taylor stated that if Blueprint was conservative, then maybe Blueprint would take action in the near term by scaling back planned projects now, that might result in cost savings down the road. Mr. Taylor also pointed out,

however, that there was a downside to being too conservative in that the organization could cut projects too much and miss out on cost savings that could be obtained from economies of scale. These are simply the tensions inherent in long-term planning. Mr. Taylor asked what current long-term contracts were in place that the organization was financially and legally committed to (that the organization cannot cancel without threat of legal action). He indicated that these are the "base line" items that must be funded, leaving everything else as the universe of projects that could be scaled back.

Mr. Maher stated that currently there were none; all the contracted projects were in the short term. Mr. Taylor offered the idea creating a list of projects that could potentially be eliminated as a result of funding short falls, to be presented to the IA. Mr. Maher reminded the committee that when Blueprint began, there were only three segments of Capital Cascade Trail funded and not all of Capital Circle was funded. It was through grant funding that they were able to finance additional segments of the Capital Circle (Tram to Woodville), Segment 4 of the Capital Cascade Trail was added, as were the Park amenities.

Mr. Davis stated that the Master Plan was a dynamic document by design, it would be updated every year, and Blueprint would develop options and then present them to the CAC at the next meeting and again before staff presents it to the IA along with the 2009 Budget. The importance of this item was to convey Blueprint is being affected just like the rest of the economy in a range somewhere between \$59 million to \$73 million. Blueprint would offer some reasonable recommendation as to how to deal with the change.

Mr. McGorty asked the Chairman if the item could be placed early in the Agenda for the following meeting, so that they could continue a thorough discussion, and stated that the analysis needed to be done. Mr. McGorty mentioned when it was presented to the IA, it could also be an opportunity to eliminate something that may not want to be eliminated. While also mentioning moving the important items closer to the top of the agenda

Mr. Davis mentioned that the GEC contract with the LPA Group was awarded in 2004 for five years, with one five year option to extend, and with one year extensions after that thru the end of the tax in 2019. The contract is coming up for renewal in about a year and Blueprint wanted to get started early on procurement in case the recommendation is to go out for a new solicitation. It would take about a year to get someone new on board. Blueprint staff has made the recommendation to exercise the option for the next five years with the LPA Group.

Kathy Archibald moved for approval and Dianna Norwood seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### Citizens To Be Heard

Steve Bailey, an attorney representing Tanglewood Estates, a possible mitigation site for the Capital Circle NW/SW project requested to speak. Mr. Bailey stated he had recently heard that the Tanglewood mitigation site was going away in lieu of acquiring four new parcels for mitigation along Swamp Fox Road, because of cost. Tanglewood is a low income, mobile home park, 20-30 years old, and on small lots. Mr. Bailey briefed the committee on the background of

Tanglewood, the County drained the swamp, which created drier property and Tanglewood was developed. He acknowledged that Blueprint looked at a lot of mitigation sites, which included Swamp Fox Road, and Tanglewood, and determined that Tanglewood would be a location for flood plain mitigation. Just over a year ago, the IA approved condemnation on just the areas of Tanglewood which flood. These properties had also been placed on Leon County's flood buy back program. Relocation agents and appraisers had been out, talked to the tenants, and discussed what would occur if the property were purchased and they were required to move. The tenants had made no plans but all of those people were expecting it to happen, including his father.

Mr. Bailey stated that now all of the County's money has been spent, and now finding out that the other sites are way better. He is asking the committee to look into these issues, he does not see how these other sites can be less expensive, than an older mobile home park, it seems like a lot of money and time has been spent on this mitigation, to now say there is another site that is better. He stated that from an equity stand point, not just a financial stand point, and what is right for this park which floods there should be a huge benefit to change the path of this at this point.

Mr. Davis stated that Tanglewood was initially identified by the County as a mitigation site if Blueprint could not acquire certain parcels and if they were moving in that direction. An opportunity presented itself to acquire a different piece of property that would meet the mitigation standards and was far cheaper. Blueprint had made no decision on it as of yet, however, they were in discussions with Leon County and are looking into what the costs for each option would be. If the costs were close, Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint could be inclined to go with acquiring Tanglewood, to reduce the flooded properties. However the initial numbers were significantly different, in the millions, not including relocation costs. Blueprint was considering both options and would hopefully have a better idea within 30 days. Mr. Bailey requested that Blueprint keep him informed of the status and what might transpire. Mr. Davis stated that was Blueprint's intentions; along with keeping the Board informed as well.

Mr. Bailey stated that his father and brother owned the majority of Tanglewood, and would be willing to negotiate. He offered to be the point of contact.

Mr. O'Steen stated that the opinion of the committee was to negotiate the best deal.

#### Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

#### Adjourn

**The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 p.m.**