

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, May 18, 2006
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 4:30 pm

Chairman, Michael Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.

Committee Members present:

Jerry Conger	Michael Sheridan
Jess Van Dyke	Charles Pattison
Bob Henderson	Kevin McGorty
Anita Davis	Gregg Patterson
Dianna Norwood	Kathy Archibald

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Randy Matheny
Dave Bright	Angela Richardson
Phil Maher	Joan Brown
Jerry Oshesky	Reggie Smith, MGT of America
Bill Little	Stephen Humphrey, MGT of America

Agenda Modifications

Dave Bright distributed a copy of the Citizens Advisory Committee Status Report and a revised Attachment #1 to Agenda Item #11, Proposed Operating Budget.

Michael Sheridan moved Agenda Item #7, Leveraging Update, to the first item of discussion.

Due to time constraints and quorum factors, other agenda items were addressed out of order as needed.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #7: Leveraging Update

Phil Maher presented Agenda Item #7. He stated that approval had been received of the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) grant submitted for the Booth property. The grant would fund the acquisition of 160 acres which adjoins the Copeland Sink acquisition and Booth I. FCT will fund 60% (\$840,000) of the \$1.4 million purchase price.

Mr. Maher commended the Blueprint interns on a job well done with the FCT grant submitted

for the Myers Commercial Park property which is in Segment 3 of Capital Cascade. He also noted that the entire project costs \$3.3 million of which Blueprint's share would be \$1.8 million. Bob Henderson inquired as to Blueprint's status on the list with this grant. Dave Bright stated that the grant was submitted within the past week. He also stated that FCT had received a record number of applications for this grant cycle and the competition would be strong. It is not certain where Blueprint stands at this point but the good news is the grant submitted last year for Capital Cascade Segment 4 was the highest ranked grant application in the state. This is another segment of Capital Cascade Trail, and it is hoped that a similar number of points will be attained.

Phil Maher continued with Mahan Drive as the next issue. He stated that at the last Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting, the Board recommended using up to \$10 million as potential match for construction of Mahan Drive. Charles Pattison asked for clarification on the IA's stand on the availability of Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) funding. Jim Davis stated that the Secretary of FDOT, without committing himself, clearly sent the message that he was looking for a partnership with the community and he was prepared to bring some funding to the table for Mahan Drive, how much is still to be determined. Mr. Davis continued stating that for Blueprint to do Mahan Drive it has to go through the supermajority vote process to make it a Tier 1 project. The IA has specifically said to not start the supermajority process until it is known how much funding FDOT is going to provide. He noted on the Blueprint Master Plan, the line for Mahan Drive simply states "reserved". Mr. Davis added that Jerry Oshesky would expand on this topic in Agenda Item #1.

Concluding with the last of the leveraging updates, Capital Circle Southeast-Tram to Woodville, Phil Maher stated that Southwood has relayed that the Development Agreement with the local governments have been signed and a check of \$7 million will be written to the City; \$2 million to the County; and \$1 million to FDOT. It is hopeful a majority of these monies will come to Blueprint to put towards this segment of Capital Circle. Kathy Archibald inquired as to why only "hopeful". Jim Davis stated that there is a verbal commitment from FDOT that their proportionate share will come to Blueprint and the City has committed \$1 million of their \$7 for mass transit, it is not yet known to how the remaining funds will be committed. Mr. Davis stated he has discussed this with the City and he is hopeful that they will commit at least \$4 million. Mr. Davis stated that staff would like to solicit the CAC's support in talking with the elected officials so when the issue comes up regarding the monies that were extracted from Southwood and the proportionate share, the money should go to that roadway and corridor improvement directly adjacent to the development. Kathy Archibald stated that there should be documentation as to how the money is designated. Jim Davis stated that he did not think there was formal documentation; however, there are criteria in the Southwood document designating the monies.

Bob Henderson brought to the committee's attention to a newspaper article he had read stating that the State was going to buy property along the St. Marks River and inquired as to how it related to the Blueprint parcels being discussed or to prioritization. Jim Davis stated that this is funding from the CARL Program and the properties are south of Highway 27. He also stated that in a related matter, Southwood owned approximately 2,000 acres between Capitola Road and Highway 27 which they are now going to develop as White Fence Farms. There are still some properties that DEP had tentatively agreed to be added to the property acquisition south of Highway 27. That would have been a great opportunity to get the State to purchase it. The full 2,000 acres are not available but portions of it may still be available.

Information Items

Item #1: Mahan Drive Status Update

Jerry Oshesky presented Item #1. He summarized the current status of the Mahan Drive project and the additional funding with the following:

- 1) The construction plans are currently in the design phase and FDOT's consultant is on schedule to complete the plans in mid-2007.
- 2) Blueprint and the Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency (CRTPA) staff attended a meeting that was arranged by FDOT on May 5, 2006, and at that meeting it was discussed as to what type of design criteria may apply to the Mahan corridor. There were questions as to whether or not the SIS designation would affect the currently proposed roadway typical section or median, which would be an issue for this corridor as it relates to impacts to significant trees along the corridor. FDOT thinks the SIS criterion would apply to new construction. A new design started from scratch would have to be consistent, but in this case with the project already designed, the standards will not apply. A variance to the design standards would be applied for as to not change the typical from what is proposed today, which is minimally invasive to the trees.
- 3) Although the Mahan Drive corridor is not currently listed as a SIS connector, its re-designation is in process and we have been told verbally by FDOT it is going to happen. Dianna Norwood inquired as to why Mahan Drive will be a SIS connector. Mr. Oshesky replied that it will be a SIS connector because it connects the bus station to I-10.
- 4) In a meeting with FDOT's Secretary Stutler on April 18, 2006, Secretary Stutler stated that he was looking for the community to have a bold vision for Mahan Drive, including access management for the roadway and ultimate land use plans for the corridor, which have already been completed. Secretary Stutler stressed that he wanted more than just a plan that addresses the immediate need of the project and is looking for a holistic approach. The CRTPA and the Planning Department are looking at the corridor plan for Mahan and Blueprint is working with them on this effort. Charles Pattison asked whether FDOT committed to be bound by the corridor plan. Mr. Oshesky stated that they did not but previously stated they will consider all of the elements in the corridor plan and implement those that they feel they can. Jim Davis added that he sat in on this particular meeting and he felt that Secretary Stutler has a great appreciation for Mahan Drive and realizes that this is a major corridor entering the Capital City. He will provide as much flexibility as possible to make Mahan an attractive corridor and is consistent with the Blueprint program. Mr. Davis stated that he came away from the meeting with the feeling that Secretary Stutler really is a member of the community, who really wants to make the design work, and is willing to do whatever is necessary and willing to bring some funding to the table but doesn't want to do it unilaterally. Mr. Davis stated to keep in mind that the CRTPA is in charge of this issue, not Blueprint.

In referencing a portion of the original Blueprint document, Jess Van Dyke noted the abundance of desired greenway near the project and the affect of the project on water quality in Lake

Lafayette. Kathy Archibald stated that one of the number one things, aside from the greenway connections, was the fact of the adjacency to Lake Lafayette. It should be certain that the stormwater enhancements for Mahan Drive are to Outstanding Florida Water standards to protect the water quality coming off of the road. Mr. Oshesky concurred and stated that two of the three stormwater ponds are designed and have been constructed; however, staff will go back and review this issue keeping her points in mind.

4) At the May 2, 2006, IA meeting it was emphasized by the Board that in order for FDOT staff to consider Mahan Drive for SIS funding, the Mahan project would have to be the number one ranked SIS project in the CRTPA's project priority list. This issue was presented at the last CRTPA meeting and was approved making Mahan Drive the number one SIS project on the list.

5) Lastly, Blueprint and CRTPA staff was directed to continue regular interaction with FDOT to make sure the pursuit of additional funding was kept high on FDOT's priority list.

Charles Pattison inquired as to whether or not FDOT has indicated the Level of Service (LOS) for Mahan Drive. Mr. Oshesky stated that it is not readily apparent but the SIS connector criteria require a LOS "B".

Kevin McGorty stated that he had some concerns related to an article in the Tallahassee Democrat and the leveraging discussed previously in Agenda Item #7. He stated that in regards to the \$10 million the IA recommended to reserve for the Mahan Drive project, it is his hope that Blueprint would look to the State to recoup the \$10 million, not just leverage \$18 million more, but actually get back in its coffer the \$10 million. He said it was discussed at one time that the funding be somewhat of an "advance" funding as long as it was assured the funding would be recouped. Additionally, Mr. McGorty stated that he did not recall any discussion at the special IA meeting by the County representatives regarding shifting this money around and how this would benefit the County in the realignment of its two-road projects: Tharpe Street and Buck Lake Road. There was no discussion that he is aware of at the special CAC meeting that this was one of the justifications for pursuing the Blueprint funding for Mahan. Had that fact been known, it could have been very much part of the discussion. Mr. McGorty also stated that he was extremely concerned about raiding the public confidence of the Tier I projects in order to shift priorities by the City and County Commissions. He recognizes that the CAC is only in an advisory capacity and the decision ultimately rests with the Commissions; however, the CAC needs to know all the facts as to the motivation when it is recommended to pursue a shifting of priorities and this concerned him that this would come out in the Democrat's article as one of the justifications for seeking the shift in funding, but not part of the discussion at the IA meeting. Mr. McGorty stated that he was very proud of the committee for the decision it made and its recommendation as it relates to this project. He thanked Jerry Conger and Jim Davis for their help in crafting the committee's recommended action.

Kathy Archibald asked for clarification as to how Blueprint would be repaid the \$10 million. In light of what Jerry Oshesky relayed about the Mahan project costing \$28.1 million and Blueprint funding \$10 million and FDOT funding \$18 million; it totals to the project's cost. It doesn't deposit anything back to Blueprint so she was confused as to how the money would be recouped. Also, Ms. Archibald requested clarification on where the \$10 million would be withdrawn from in looking at the revised Master Plan. To her, it looked like it would come out of the Sensitive

Land funding.

At this point Michael Sheridan shared comments with the committee regarding CAC's recommendation to the IA as it relates to the Mahan Drive project.

Gregg Patterson stated that he feels the members of the CAC are committed to the integrity of delivering to the voters what they were promised in the original vote. He strongly urged the CAC to play to the court of public opinion and make it clear to the press that the CAC is concerned with the process and get it across to the citizens that when the CAC believes the elected officials are off course in spending citizens' money.

Kathy Archibald stated that it should be remembered that Mahan Drive was originally a Blueprint project and moving it from Tier II to Tier I can be a win-win situation if Blueprint gets repaid the \$10 million. If it means sacrificing something out of Tier I to move the Mahan project up from Tier II, it then becomes a different consideration and a community discussion should be undertaken.

Jim Davis stated that a reimbursement of the \$10 million is not likely. If \$18 million or \$20 million could be awarded from FDOT as a match for Mahan Drive, he wouldn't feel very strong arguing that the \$10 million should be repaid, especially when the Secretary of FDOT has clearly stated he is looking for a partnership. Furthermore, the \$10 million was originally FDOT's money because it was part of SIS funding that was given for the Capital Circle NW/SW project and freed up Blueprint's money to be able to do the Mahan Drive project. No decisions have been made except to continue to negotiate with FDOT and make the best deal possible.

Kevin McGorty stated that he concurred with Gregg Patterson in that the CAC needs to look at the broader process and broader mission. He stated that the CAC members are advocates in an advisory capacity and have a direct link to the citizens of the community. The CAC should shoulder a greater responsibility to lobby and make sure the public is informed on the committee's decisions and recommendations.

Jerry Conger concurred with Mr. McGorty and added that the CAC should also be rational and understand that things do change.

Anita Davis stated that the CAC should evaluate where the committee is as far as getting information out to the citizens, be it publicly or politically.

Kathy Archibald reminded the committee that the system is working because there will be two public hearings prior to the supermajority vote as a result of what the CAC has requested. Ms. Archibald commended Ms. Davis for reminding the committee that as CAC members they represent the citizens and have the obligation of reporting back to the citizens periodically. Michael Sheridan suggested starting a process, led by Kevin McGorty and other committee members as needed, of revisiting the role of the CAC and its responsibility to the public. What can the CAC do to become more pro-active, get the information out to the public, and keep the IA on the Blueprint course?

Public Hearing

At 5:30 p.m. the Chair called to order the advertised Public Hearing for the Blueprint Capital and Operating budgets. There were no speakers present.

Item #11: Proposed FY 2007 Blueprint Operating Budget

Anita Davis moved to approve the proposed Operating Budget; Jerry Conger seconded the motion. Michael Sheridan called for discussion. Phil Maher presented the item and stated that the Operating Budget contained a 1% increase. Mr. Maher stated that in the professional fees category a couple of issues will surface next year - a number of contracts are up for renewal; a bond sale is expected at some point in 2007 which will add some additional charges; disclosure agents; and hiring a financial advisor. He also stated that some dollars were shifted this year internally in Blueprint moving the IT support from the City of Tallahassee to its own network server.

Charles Pattison inquired as to where would you find a line item for public outreach type activities. Mr. Maher stated that outreach monies would be noted in two places, in the operating budget under advertising and reproduction and also in the GEC overhead tasks. Michael Sheridan inquired as to the total public relations expenses. Jim Davis stated that this information could be found in the monthly production report under GEC.

Kathy Archibald inquired about the debt service transfer and if that is what is being paid in interest. Phil Maher stated that represented interest and principal. Bob Henderson inquired if the employment model was based on the City of Tallahassee's (City) employment structure. Jim Davis confirmed that this is correct, from the payroll and benefit standpoint only. Mr. Henderson further inquired as to the pay raise structure of Blueprint and if it correlated with the City or Leon County (County) government. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint does follow the City's pay raise scale as well; however, last year the City put a cap of 3.5% on pay raises, which he was in disagreement with, and is in negotiations with the City on this issue. The County approved a 5% raise for their employees. Blueprint has applied for a 5% pay raise. Mr. Davis feels that the Intergovernmental Agency should establish the pay raise amount for its employees, and the three entities, City of Tallahassee, Leon County, Blueprint 2000, need not be related to each other.

Jerry Conger asked for an explanation of the decrease in the 2007 overall budget from \$47,000,000 to \$32,000,000. Phil Maher explained that it is tied to transfers from the Operating account to the Capital account. In the way the accounting system works you have to have an appropriation for the transfer of revenues and that is what the decrease reflects in the Operating budget.

Charles Pattison commented that the funding designated for membership dues for professional advancement/education seemed low and whether there is a policy for covering or not covering these types of expenses. Jim Davis stated that the GEC covers their own professional dues, etc. as part of their overhead. The funding Mr. Pattison is referring to is primarily for the Blueprint staff, not the consultants.

The motion to approve the proposed Operating Budget passed unanimously.

Item #12: Revised Master Plan and Proposed Capital Budget for FY 2007 – FY 2011

Gregg Patterson moved to approve the revised Master Plan and proposed Capital Budget; Anita Davis seconded the motion. Michael Sheridan called for discussion. Phil Maher presented this item and stated that this item consists of the Blueprint Master Plan and the 5-Year Capital Budget. He pointed out Attachment #2 of the item and stated that in February, the IA approved, as did the CAC, the allocation and revision to the Master Plan of approximately \$46 million in additional funding to be added to new projects. The priority of projects and dollar amounts are reflected in Attachment #2. Continuing, Mr. Maher referenced Attachment #3 which reflects subsequent revisions to the Master Plan incorporating the \$10 million the IA approved to put in reserve for Mahan Drive. In summary, two areas were revised. One being the approval in February of \$6 million allocated for the Atkinson Parcel. Subsequently it was discovered that the property is under contract with K2 Urban Corp. Mr. Maher stated that staff is recommending \$2 M of the \$6 million be reserved and allocated for obtaining a greenway trail and stormwater improvements on the parcel.

Kevin McGorty stated that from a philosophical standpoint he felt that \$4 million was taken from a greenway project to go towards a gray hard-surface project. Phil Maher stated that yes; \$6 million was brought up from the outer years and put it in the earlier years. When the \$4 million was moved from Atkinson, it was restored in the outer years. There is not a net loss from greenways. Mr. McGorty reminded staff that the Mahan project should exceed the State's Best Management Practices and asked staff to continue looking at opportunities for greenway enhancement along the Mahan corridor. Phil Maher stated that greenway enhancement is allotted in the Master Plan under "Sensitive Lands-Lake Lafayette" and continues to be a priority. Charles Pattison inquired as to when the committee would see the design concept for the Mahan project. Dave Bright this PD&E study was completed in early 1990's so the public meetings have already been held and what is undergoing now is a redesign from metric units to English units. Mr. Bright stated that there may be a public meeting held to announce that the project is ready to go to construction but basically all the designs have gone through the public process. Jim Davis stated that the design is done but Blueprint will be able to do some enhancements.

The motion to approve the revised Master Plan and proposed Capital Budget passed unanimously.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were no public speakers present.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #8: 2005 Performance Audit

Phil Maher introduced Reggie Smith and Stephen Humphrey with MGT of America and stated

that this is MGT's third year in working with Blueprint in preparing the Performance Audit, and they would be briefing the committee on its findings and recommendations. Mr. Smith began by stating that MGT utilizes a systematic approach and methodology in which members of the various applicable committees/staff are randomly selected and interviewed. The interview process assists in insuring a more complete and accurate review and analysis. Mr. Smith stated that for the most part, Blueprint is doing a very good job in implementing previous recommendations notably in the areas of the IA, and environmental and leveraging successes. Mr. Smith stated that greater consideration will need to be given to maintenance costs once the roads, greenways and stormwater ponds are completed. Other recommendations included designating someone from Blueprint staff to coordinate permit applications; filling vacancies on the CAC in a timely manner; and continue following the proper process and procedure in revising the Master Plan. Mr. Smith stated that overall Blueprint is on track based on the audit findings and it is recommended that they continue to review the past recommendations and implement recommendations related to this year's audit to insure Blueprint 2000 continues to function in a productive and positive manner.

Dianna Norwood inquired as to how it was decided who was interviewed. Mr. Smith stated that the chair of both the City and County Commissions as well as the chair of the applicable committees are interviewed but other than that, it is basically a random process when choosing from staff or committee members. Kathy Archibald, Michael Sheridan, and Jess Van Dyke were interviewed from the CAC.

Kathy Archibald stated that she had issue with the recommendation that greater consideration should be given to maintenance costs and other maintenance issues in the design of the project. She stated that the proposed designs from the outset have always been that these projects would require more maintenance than a normal road. To say that more consideration be given to maintenance issues seems to be going cross-purpose to the objective of what Blueprint is all about. Jim Davis stated that Blueprint has previously noted to the City Manager and the County Administrator and Public Works staff three years ago and recently at the Blueprint 2000 retreat reminding them additional funding would be needed for maintenance costs associated with different design options.

Kevin McGorty stated that he fully supports the report but would like to make note that it is recognized that the Blueprint staff in the design elements, whether it be Mahan Drive or Capital Cascade, have all along talked about the maintenance issues associated with the projects and feels that this is a very appropriate and needed statement and should be forwarded to the IA along with its recommendation of the performance audit.

Kathy Archibald moved to recommend the 2005 Performance Audit with additional comments clarifying the CAC's position on the maintenance issue and the language be constructed by staff in a manner that is appropriate to the protocols of how performance audits are accepted; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion; motion passed unanimously.

Item #10: CAC Attendance

Michael Sheridan stated that the CAC bylaws will be enforced as it relates to meeting attendance. This will include attending all the meetings, attending the entire meeting based on ending meetings on time. Mr. Sheridan stated that resignations will be solicited if a member

cannot adhere to the attendance requirements in the bylaws.

Consent Items

Item #6: CAC Minutes: February 2, 2006

Kathy Archibald moved to approve the February 2, 2006 minutes; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Information Items

Item #2: IA Retreat: April 18, 2006 Minutes

No discussion.

Item #3: Capital Circle NW/SW PD&E Study Status

Item #4: Capital Circle SW PD&E Consultant Selection

Item #5: Capital Circle SE (Woodville-Tram) Right-of-Way
(These items were discussed together.)

In regards to Item #3, Bob Henderson inquired about the beginning construction date of August 2008 and how it corresponds with the progress of the Capital Circle section from Crawfordville Road/Orange Avenue project. Dave Bright stated that the PD&E study for the Crawfordville Road to Orange Avenue project is presently in the consultant selection stage with consultant presentations beginning next week. The study process, if only an environmental assessment, will be 36 months. He noted that construction of the Capital Circle NW/SW project from Tennessee Street to Orange Avenue would begin at some point prior to the finishing of the CCSW PD&E study. Mr. Bright further stated that there are at least eight parcels under consideration for potential acquisition, mitigation, and restoration in the CCNW/SW project area.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #9: CAC Report to the Citizens

Dave Bright presented this item and stated that Blueprint has been working off and on for approximately 8 months in creating somewhat of a "fact sheet" for the citizens, something along the lines of a potential flyer or an ad that can be published in the newspaper. Mr. Bright stated that he and Dianna Norwood drafted a potential newspaper ad and would like to solicit comments from the committee in regard to the draft. He further stated that the intention of the ad is to inform the citizens of the status of each project. In addition to the ad, he stated that Ms. Norwood has drafted a handout/brochure to accomplish the same.

Adjourn

Kathy Archibald moved to adjourn the meeting; Jerry Conger seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.