

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 2, 2011

Blueprint 2000 Office

2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

Lamar Taylor, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:36 pm.

Committee Members present:

Lamar Taylor	Kevin McGorty
Burt Davy	Kent Wimmer
Richard Drew	Christic Henry
Tom O'Steen	David Jones
Ron Pease	Windell Paige

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Wayne Tedder	Gary Phillips
Dave Bright	Debra Schiro
Angela Richardson	Linda Figg
Dave Snyder	Dick Lane
Margie Quillman	Jeff Walters
Latesa Turner	Alisha Wetherell
Shelonda Meeks	Bruce Ritchie
Jim Shepherd	Paco de la Fuente
Ray Youmans	Marek Romanowski

Agenda Modifications

Dave Bright noted that there was an additional Agenda Item handout for the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Construction Options that would be discussed with the Capital Budget agenda item.

Dave Bright also noted that Agenda Item #10 relating to the Cascade Connector Bridge would be presented first by the design consultant; and that Agenda Item #9, Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment, was pulled from the Agenda. He noted that the Education Community Representative CAC position rotated between TCC, FSU, FAMU, and the Leon County School Board. For this appointment, it was up to FAMU to submit a nomination. Despite staff's due diligence since January no nomination had been received. Dave Bright noted that there would be four CAC positions requiring appointment in the fall. Item #12 would be discussed after Consent Items.

Presentations/Discussion**Item #10: Cascade Connector Bridge Design and Design Contingency Budget**

Linda Figg presented the design options for the connector bridge from the May 14, 2011, Community Design Charrette. The summary of the presentation was included in the agenda packet. The community-preferred concept included sail-like canopies for a shaded environment with adjustable, soft-color aesthetic lighting and native limestone abutments.

Richard Drew suggested signs be included to have bike-riders dismount and walk across the bridge rather than riding for the safety of both pedestrians and riders, too. Additionally, regarding the abutments, he questioned if the community hands-concept could be combined with the native stone. Ms. Figg stated they were exploring using that feature else-where on the bridge; in an area where it would be more easily seen, near the rail, a texture on the hardscape pathway, etc.

Kevin McGorty complimented the firm on the connectivity with other amenities, the sail canopies at the bridge with the sail canopy, although unfunded, over the Meridian Plaza area; as well as the limestone which replicates the Centennial Field wall.

Tom O'Steen questioned if there had been a budget analysis of the four concepts. Ms. Figg stated that all concepts were based on the knowledge that the budget was \$1.5M.

Christic Henry asked for more detail on the solar panels. Ms. Figg stated that they were integrated into a woven fabric that was often used in remote military operations, such as in the Middle East.

Kent Wimmer stated that he was concerned that 12-foot would be awfully narrow for cyclists, pedestrians, and people gathered simply to enjoy the bridge. Ms. Figg stated the bridge could be any width however 12-foot was the prescribed width. Also, it would be a short bridge, 160-feet. Mr. Wimmer suggested a "bump out" for gathering. Ms. Figg noted that it was all a function of cost.

Burt Davy questioned what material they were considering for the walkway. Ms. Figg stated that details had not been completely fleshed out but generally it would be textured or scored concrete. Mr. Davy suggested including pavers as well. She agreed that the design would include continuity with the Park trails on either side. There was also the potential of using self-cleaning concrete.

Kevin McGorty moved Option 1: Concur with the bridge concept recommended by the public at the May 14, 2011, design charrette. Kent Wimmer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Burt Davy moved Option 2: Authorize a design contingency budget of \$50,000. Funds would come from the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4 Master Plan line item. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Consent Items

Item #7: CAC Minutes: February 10, 2011

Item #8: Transfer of \$450,000 in Remaining Funds From Capital Circle Southeast (Tram Road to Woodville Highway) to Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2

Option 1: Approve the transfer of \$450,000 in remaining funds from CCSE to Capital Cascade

Trail Segment 2.

Burt Davy moved approval of the consent agenda. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #12: Name that Park: Cascade Park or Cascades Park?

Following a brief history of the issue by Dave Bright, Kevin McGorty stated that it could go either way because he did not see a right or wrong. Kevin noted that Jonathan Lammers, a former state historic preservation planner, authored the most extensive study of the site, a 38-page paper on the subject, and even he had no particular side. Mr. Lammers felt however that the plural use was a 20th century invention based on a 1912 postcard entitled "The Cascades."

Mr. McGorty stated that the original owner of his house also owned the Cascade sinkhole. In a 1890 survey of that land it uses the term "Cascade" singular. However, in local references it has been used in both singular and plural form. The 1971 National Register Nomination lists it as Cascades, plural, recognizing that there were multiple streams that fed into the cascade. That the cascading water was described as "cascades." While there may have been one uniform waterfall the historians who made that nomination felt secure in the nomination of the 30-ish acres as "Cascades" Park.

Mr. McGorty felt that the vernacular was important. However, what was on deeds or maps would not hold weight to the common vernacular. "Cascades," he agreed, did roll off the tongue well and added eloquence to a linear park system. Still, he admitted, he could go either way.

Burt Davy stated he supported the plural form because of the common usage and ease with which it rolled off the tongue. He likened it to the Junior Museum always being the "Junior Museum" and the hospital remained "Tallahassee Memorial" despite numerous name changes. Colloquial usages, correct or not, rolled and fit better.

Lamar Taylor noted that he agreed with Mr. Davy, but noted that Blueprint material used the singular form. Dave Bright noted that Blueprint's usage was a decision made early by Jim Davis. He pointed out however that the EECC report used both singular and plural forms and questioned if that was intentional. Tom O'Steen stated that they were not so purposeful.

With no strong opinions for the singular form **Burt Davy moved Option 2: The Park should be named Cascades Park. The entire greenway should be named the Capital Cascades Trail. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Kevin McGorty commended the efforts of the History Fence Working Group. He would also like to share information with them regarding the location of the fall itself. He felt it would be paramount to the final product. Dave Bright stated Blueprint had tentatively approached EGS about potentially doing electro-resistivity testing of the site. With Mr. McGorty's information they might gear that up again.

Public Hearing

Item #15: Proposed FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget

There were no speakers for the advertised Public Hearing.

Wayne Tedder, Interim Executive Director, stated that there had been no significant changes to the Operating Budget from the current year into FY 2012. There was a substantial jump in the Telephone line item however. He stated that Blueprint had to change service providers with the move to the SunTrust Building which escalated the cost. He noted that while Blueprint could piggy-back onto a state contract they were locked into a contract with CenturyLink. Blueprint's legal counsel was reviewing it to see if the contract could be broken to save Blueprint money.

There were no comments from members of the CAC.

Item #16: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2012-2016 Blueprint Capital Budget

There were no speakers for the advertised Public Hearing.

Wayne Tedder stated that Attachment 1 showed what funding was available and projected available dollars in the future years, once all expenses were deducted from sales tax received. He worked with both the City and County Budget Departments and met with the Blueprint Finance Committee, and they recommended Blueprint use the same projection rates, with regard to expected revenue streams and percentage of increase, as both local governments.

He noted the significant drop in available revenue in the out years. The benefit of that was that it was pretty conservative as it did not include any interest earnings. Blueprint earned approximately \$1M in interest over the past year due to Jim Davis and Phil Maher keeping bond money in house and leveraging projects with grants, etc. Mr. Tedder stated he would maintain that approach to apply the interest earnings to real projects.

Kent Wimmer questioned the why the projections indicated a drop in revenue. He did not think the Governor would fire that many state employees. Lamar Taylor assumed it was the projected sales tax projections over the next so many years. The EDR (Office of Economic and Demographic Research), an arm of the state Legislature who produced sales tax collection numbers and forecasts, have shown since 2007 a flat-line of revenue. In part it was the reduced expectation in spending but also the leveling off of population growth in the county. There had been a steady 4% growth rate for several years before that; 2007 was a significant paradigm shift. With debt-services that had to be paid from sales tax revenues, and that being the source of revenue there was much more of a propensity to be conservative rather than glom onto assumed 4% increases. It seemed reasonable to assume a flat-line or 1% increase projection.

Richard Drew questioned if any analysis had been completed regarding sales tax impacts of internet purchases or the potential of a trickle down to the counties from reimbursements

harnessed by the state from internet purchases. Mr. Taylor stated that there had been studies to that effect. The EDR had detailed information on that. He clarified that Blueprint's tax revenue was from a 1-cent surcharge. For example, it only applied to the first \$5K on a car purchase, not the whole purchase amount.

Mr. Tedder stated that projects highlighted in green on Attachment 2 were expected to be closed out this year, and may have funds remaining. The CAC had opportunity to provide direction as to where they wanted to see the remaining money transferred. However, as the final budget would be brought back in September, many of the answers would not be available until then.

The red line, CCNW/SW (N-2), indicated that Blueprint did not have sufficient funds to cover the entire project. Would the CAC consider moving "green" funds to that "red" line item or to another project?

Mr. Tedder noted that for N-2, Blueprint had estimated the construction cost for the segment between US 90 and Highway 20 at \$43M (as indicated in the Master Plan). The dollars programmed in the Master Plan only encompassed the Segment from US 90 to SR 20, while the full project went to Orange Avenue. In FY 2012, there would be \$9.2M additional available from the state to get thru the SR 20 intersection; there would be more information confirming that following the scheduled meeting with FDOT District 3 on June 6, 2011. It was included in the 5-year Work Program. Even with that, it was thought that left them \$5-6M short to construct all the way to Orange Avenue.

The unknown variable was current competition for construction bids. With the economy and companies hungry for work, however, the bids could come in lower than the estimated costs. The thought process was to send the project out to bid this summer and have the real number by the September IA meeting. It was possible that bids could come in at a price that matched the amount of funds available. That would give a clearer picture: surplus of funds, need additional funds, or reduce the scale of the project to work within the funds available within the Master Plan for the project.

Kevin McGorty stated that a precedent had been set during other lean budget years, with environmental projects programmed in the out years, that if funding became available it would be a high priority not to rob those projects to do gray infrastructure. Mr. Tedder stated that Mr. Bright had been working to catch him up on that. Mr. Bright stated that he had pulled four sets of minutes and found evidence to support Kevin's statement, almost verbatim in one motion. Mr. Taylor also stated that that view had also been presented to the IA.

Mr. Tedder explained that on Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4, a total cost of the project had not been determined at that point; hence the "TBD" listing. With the design of Segment 3 and FAMU Way underway (at the 60% stage in October 2011), it would give us a better idea of the costs of Segment 3 later this year. The line item would be updated to include that information and how funds would be allocated for it. Any remaining funds or additional revenues would go to Segment 4.

Moving to Attachment 3, Mr. Tedder stated that items highlighted in yellow were the estimated

net sales tax funds that would be available. They were programmed throughout the remaining years of Blueprint. Furthermore, he was working with the City Accounting Department to achieve more transparency and clarity in the budgeting process. They had made some adjustment suggestions, as did the TCC, such as breaking out segments of projects. For example, Franklin Boulevard / Segment 1 Flood Relief would be separate from Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1.

Mr. Drew questioned if the web-site was up to date regarding project details. Mr. Bright stated that it has project content and descriptions but not financial details by project. Mr. McGorty interjected that Agenda Item #4 regarding the Sales Tax Extension contained the best information regarding the original intent of Blueprint, what had been accomplished to date, and what remained.

Mr. O'Steen stated that August would be an appropriate time frame for a presentation to update the CAC on each projects' status, and it could even be beneficial for Mr. Tedder to learn more about it. Even for those who had been around, it would not hurt to review the original Blueprint Report information. For example, if the N-2 PD&E was 50% complete; it could be that with such analysis they might decide to halt a study and put funds toward another project. Maybe not, but it was worth a project by project "dust off."

Mr. Tedder stated that the Monthly Project Reports were an excellent source of information. However, the combination of the two sides would help Blueprint manage the projects better it would also be quite valuable in general. There were extensive details attached to each project, Mr. O'Steen noted. It would be beneficial to have it in one presentation rather than searching through meeting minutes. He again suggested doing it at the August meeting as it was worthy of an out-loud presentation and conversation. Projects might even be re-prioritized; they might not; but it would be an excellent exercise that everyone could learn from. Mr. McGorty agreed and requested that information regarding the Sales Tax Extension (Item #4) be included as well.

Mr. Wimmer agreed and included that a tour would be helpful for new members. Mr. Bright stated that a tour for new members was typical, the tour delay had been because of not having a new Executive Director as of yet. Once that was sorted it would be scheduled.

Mr. Taylor stated that the CAC's position would be to take it under advisement; see what developed over the next two months with a follow up presentation in August with more detail as to the projects, bids, costs, etc.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #11: Cascade Park Update

Gary Phillips briefed the committee on the status of construction at Cascade Park. Recent project photos were included in the briefing. Construction had moved into the upper park and within another month, the pond in the lower park would be graded, irrigation systems installed, and the sod and trail would be in. Seventy-eight additional days had been granted to the

contractor due to change orders and weather delays. That pushed the anticipated opening to October 2012.

Richard Drew questioned where parking would be for major events at the Park. Mr. Phillips stated that FDOT had offered the use of their parking lot; however, there was not an official agreement in place. Staff was in discussions with FDMS about using the parking garages as well. All were amenable to joint-use as long as it was outside of regular work hours. Mr. Bright noted that Blueprint would not be programming the park's activities, that would be through City Parks and Recreation, but Mr. Drew was correct, someone would need to arrange the Park events.

Item #13: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Update

Gary Phillips briefed the committee on Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4. Updated project photos were included in the briefing.

Richard Drew questioned with the redevelopment of the Gaines Street warehouse area, would there be any funding associated with the redevelopment to support the regional ponds. Mr. Phillips stated that funding for the Coal Chute Pond ROW acquisition came from the CRA in anticipation of that. The CRA and Blueprint will have a formal agreement of some sort that would reimburse the CRA when credits were sold to developers. Also, because the City needed the pond for Gaines Street and FAMU Way, they were paying \$1M of the \$2.6M it will cost to construct.

Dave Snyder stated that the design of FAMU Way and Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 would be at 60% complete in October 2011. Blueprint would begin purchasing ROW in earnest at that point. The final design would be completed 15-months from then; construction could be advertised in January 2013 with a two year construction schedule.

Christic Henry questioned if the Real Estate Policy would be available for review prior to the June 20, 2011 IA meeting. Dave Bright stated that typically the CAC did not get into that level of policy review; however, he would send it to the committee when it was complete. Debra Schiro stated that Blueprint's Real Estate Policy was available on the website. The agenda item was to amend the section on relocations. Blueprint complied with the Federal relocation guidelines when purchasing ROW on federally funded projects, but there was not a policy for locally funded projects. The agenda item would address that.

Wayne Tedder stated that during the outreach for the FAMU Way project, the City Commission indicated that they would like to look into a relocation policy. Blueprint was developing one for their review at the IA. He stated that once it was finalized, staff would forward it to the CAC for review.

Ron Pease questioned if the design had progressed to level to show rest areas with benches, etc. along the length of the trail. He wanted to make sure the benches were spaced appropriately for the elderly. Alisha Wetherell stated that Kimley-Horn had not gotten that far in the design. Mr. Phillips stated that there were 32 benches in Cascade Park; that was the only part of the trail that

had progressed to that level of detail. Mrs. Wetherell stated that there was not a requirement by ADA but there would definitely be benches included.

Kent Wimmer inquired as to shade; Mr. Phillips confirmed there would be shade and water fountains as well. Emergency call boxes, a lightning detector system for the interactive fountain area, cameras, etc were also included in the park.

Item #14: Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project

Marek Romanowski briefed the committee on the progress made on the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief project. The design would be complete by October 2011, with the project going to construction at the beginning of 2012. Due to restrictions on funding construction on the project needed to be complete in mid-2012.

Kevin McGorty questioned if there had been discussion about the City moving utility lines underground. Mr. Romanowski confirmed that it had been discussed, however, it came down to cost and for such a small project it was a challenge.

Kent Wimmer questioned the inclusion of sidewalks, etc. Mr. Bright explained that this it was a flood relief project, and was only phase 1 of the ultimate build out. Wayne Tedder stated that the money was on a time constraint and Blueprint would lose it if it was not spent by a certain date. However, discussions were underway to see if something could be done in regard to sidewalks.

Information Items

Item #1: Cascade Park History Fence Working Group Recognition and Draft History Panel Narratives

This item was informational only.

Item #2: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road – Design/Build Project

This item was informational only.

Item #3: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update

This item was informational only.

Item #4: Sales Tax Extension

This item was informational only.

Item #5: Cascade Park and Amenities Fundraising Update

This item was informational only.

Item #6: FAMU Way House Acquisition and Surplus

This item was informational only.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:45 pm.