

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 3, 2010

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

Lamar Taylor, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

Committee Members present:

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Lamar Taylor | Burt Davy |
| Kevin McGorty | Ron Pease |
| Windell Page | Tom O'Steen |
| Stephen Hogge | Erin Ennis |
| | |

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Jim Davis | Angela Richardson |
| Phil Maher | Claire Forbes |
| Dave Bright | Ryan Wetherell |
| Dave Snyder | Alicia Wetherell |
| Latesa Turner | Paco de la Fuente |
| Ray Youmans | Kelly Layman |
| Gary Phillips | Frank Terrafirma |
| Ed Ringe | Eric Rosenstein |
| Margie Quillman | Luciano Ramos |

Agenda Modifications

Due to some members needing to leave early and the potential loss of a quorum, agenda items were taken in the following order: 9, 10, 3, 6, 4, 5, 7, 8, 1, and 2. Luciano Ramos was also introduced as a potential new CAC member representing the Education Community.

Public Hearings

Item #9: Proposed FY 2011 Blueprint 2000 Operating Budget

Phil Maher stated that the item was for CAC review and comment prior to the IA's review at the June 21, 2010 meeting. The Budget would not be voted on until the September 20, 2010 IA meeting. Mr. Maher explained the personnel changes at Blueprint over the past year and how that affected the Operating Budget as we know had one County employee. He noted that the City of Tallahassee determined the cost of the fringe benefits and that those could change once they adopted their FY 2011 budget.

Windell Page questioned why Blueprint had a "temporary attorney." Mr. Maher explained that it referred to the portion of the Attorney's time that could not be charged directly to a project. Jim Davis clarified that the Attorney in question was full time, a member of the bar, graduated two years earlier and that he assisted Blueprint's Legal Counsel.

Mr. Maher noted that the Rental of Office Space line item would most likely be modified as Blueprint would be moving in December 2010. Based on the market, the preliminary indications were that the new lease would come in lower than the current rate. The likely location will be the 2nd floor of the SunTrust Bank building on Apalachee Parkway as it most closely fit Blueprint's needs.

Stephen Hogge questioned who handled Blueprint's liability insurance and how the firm was selected. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint was insured by Brown and Brown (the same as the City and County). The City's Treasurer-Clerk would not allow Blueprint to piggy-back onto their policy at the recommendation of their Risk Manager.

Regarding Capital Outlay and computer equipment, Erin Ennis questioned if they had not been replaced in three years, if it might be prudent to include them in the budget. Mr. Maher explained that City policy stated that costs less than \$1,000 were not a Capital Outlay expense. There were allocations in other areas of the operating budget for the replacement of computer equipment. Additionally, there was \$18,000 allocated in the Moving Expense item to upgrade the servers, which were five-years old.

Erin Ennis stated that in previous years, there was a significant fund balance carried forward to spend, however, she did not see that for 2011. It seemed to her that if there was not money to spend Blueprint could reduce staff. Mr. Maher explained that the \$48M was the fund balance. The sales tax revenue came into Blueprint Operating funds; it was not transferred out to the projects until the funds were needed for expenditure. Whatever was not transferred was carried forward to the following year. It was not reflected as carried forward in FY 2011 because the current fiscal year had not been completed. Ms. Ennis stated she would have assumed that there would be an estimate of what would be carried forward however.

Mr. Maher stated that of the \$27M in sales tax proceeds \$1.9M would go to Operating expenses, \$6.3M would be available to be transferred to Capital Projects, \$14.9M would go to Debt Service as well as \$4.5M for the SIB loan. The \$48M indicated in the FY 2010 fund balance was available to be transferred to projects. Mr. Maher doubted much, if any would be transferred because Blueprint had \$93M available in cash from bond proceeds, sales tax collections, and debt service fund. He did not anticipate needing to transfer any of the \$48M to Capital projects and estimated the full amount would be carried forward to FY 2011. The \$48M in the fund balance had been appropriated in the Capital Budget; but the funds had not been transferred to the project fund.

Ms. Ennis also expressed confusion regarding salary enhancements. Mr. Davis explained that Blueprint was a separate governmental agency that was neither City nor County. All full-time employees had the option to select to be on the City's payroll system with their benefits or the County's with theirs; only as a carrier organization. Technically speaking no one was a City or County employee, they were only on the respective payroll system. Those Agencies were carrier organizations only because of economies of scale.

In the past Blueprint had included a 5% pay raise in the draft budget. However, Blueprint's budget cycle was significantly ahead of the City or County. Subsequently, if the Blueprint Board approved 5% raises for Blueprint employees but, by the time the City and County worked their way through their budget process, approved a 3.5% for their own employees, it put the City Manager or County Administrator in a situation where they had approved more for Blueprint than for their own employees. The way Blueprint has resolved that, in conjunction with the City Manager and County Administrator, was with the language of "the higher of the City or the County raises."

Furthermore, as the Executive Director, Mr. Davis felt it would be inconsistent and did not support the fact that one employee could get a 2% raise and another could get 5% simply because one happened to be on the City system and the other was on the County system. Blueprint, he stated, was one organization; not the City nor the County but a wholly separate entity. He felt very strongly that any kind of pay raises should be consistent among all employees because they were all doing the same work. If Blueprint was successful it was because of the work that was done by all of the employees and should be rewarded accordingly. Additionally, Mr. Maher noted, all Blueprint employees served at the pleasure of the Board which furthered the distinction.

Ms. Ennis questioned if the CAC was expected to vote on the proposed Operating Budget. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint presented a preliminary budget to the CAC and IA in June for their comment and discussion. Based upon their guidance Blueprint would make the necessary adjustment and return it for the final public hearing and approval in September. It was presented to the CAC for their review and comment prior to it going to the IA.

Mr. Maher stated that the funds in the Capital Budget also included bond proceeds dollars. Due to arbitrage, Blueprint needed to spend those before the \$48M in the fund balance from the Operating Budget. For projects that would be reimbursed from another entity, Mr. Maher transferred money from the fund balance to the Capital Budget. If bond proceeds were to be used the reimbursement would, in essence, become bond funds again continuing to be subject the arbitrage.

Burt Davy questioned if there was an outside audit. Mr. Maher confirmed that there was and that a copy was provided to the CAC annually. Blueprint had always received an audit with no qualifications. Erin Ennis questioned how many years the same firm was used. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint piggy-backed onto the City; the firms changed every three years. Currently the auditor was Carl Riggs and before that it was Law Redd. There was also an annual Performance Audit; FSU was the current auditor, and that a copy would be furnished to the CAC as well. Mr. Davis stated that those were requirements of the Interlocal Agreement.

Stephen Hogge moved approval by CAC; Windell Paige seconded the motion. It passed 7-0; Erin Ennis abstained from the vote.

Item #10: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2011 – FY 2015 Blueprint Capital Budget

Phil Maher stated that Blueprint developed a long range plan, the Master Plan, which extended to

2019; most Capital Programs only extend five years. From that he developed a five year capital budget; of which only FY 2011 would be appropriated. The remainder was estimated. The Master Plan was what the Board would vote to approve. That would, in turn, be extracted into the capital budget. The Master Plan was based on growth rates for future sales tax and estimated expenditures; all of which was approved by the Finance Committee.

The Blueprint Finance Committee recommended that Blueprint make no changes to the growth rates. Sales tax revenue had continued to decline, however there was a two month delay to sales tax reports. March 2010 collections, which were being reported in May 2010, were the first month to reflect an increase over the prior year. March 2010 showed a 5% increase over March 2009.

Mr. Maher further stated that there were increases to the Master Plan which came from sources other than sales tax revenue. The Board had previously approved the following \$11.7M increases:

- \$9 million in additional ARRA funds for Capital Circle Southeast Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road.
- \$2,121,919 in additional grants and donations for amenities in Cascade Park.
- \$425,000 in DOT funds not previously budgeted for the design and post design services of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest.
- \$150,000 in FDOT funds for the design of a pedestrian bridge over South Monroe Street connecting Cascade Park and Segment 3 of Capital Cascade Trail.
- A reduction of \$1,357,829 due to a change in the County's water quality drawdown schedule.

A minor change was in the drawdown schedule on the Water Quality funds for the City and County. Each entity was allocated and would receive \$25M as Blueprint collected sales tax revenue. They had the option to draw down funds early, however, there was an interest rate that was used as a discount factor, which reduced the amount they would be able to claim. Over the past year, they drew down less than anticipated thereby giving them more money, an additional \$21K, in the future. The County would be changing their drawdown schedule to implement Water Quality projects earlier than originally planned. That would free up dollars in the future.

Erin Ennis requested clarification on how the Capital Budget tied into the Master Plan. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint appropriated the full amount necessary for a project, beginning with the design process, for the project in year one. With a multi-year construction contract, they request appropriation of all the necessary dollars that year. With Program Management, those dollars are requested the year Blueprint plans to use them; and the same with Right-of-Way.

Ms. Ennis questioned the difference between Water Quality dollars listed in the approved versus proposed Master Plans. Mr. Maher stated that in prior years, the City appropriated \$8.6M but had not spent all of it. If all of the years, from 2005-2011, were combined you would be short \$713,255K of what was necessary for the \$1.5M reflected in the Master Plan.

Ms. Ennis stated it was not money that had been spent, but appropriated. Mr. Maher confirmed that to be accurate. Ms. Ennis stated that it should be labeled correctly then, as it was not a budget. Lamar Taylor stated that from the State's perspective, that was how one budgeted and appropriated for capital items. One could not spend what had not been appropriated and they were appropriating the budget. Mr. Taylor clarified that from a business perspective a budget was planned expenditures. However, from a government standpoint, a budget was legal authorization to spend money, and is not only planned expenditures. If it was not approved and appropriated in a budget, one did not have the legal authority to spend the money in the future. Ms. Ennis stated that it should be labeled "Prior Authorization" and "Funds Actually Spent" so that she would know what she was reviewing.

If approved, at the end of the year, Ms. Ennis questioned, what would have been spent in aggregate total versus what had been appropriated. Mr. Maher answered her by explaining that the \$435K requested for appropriation for Program Management for N2 was the amount Blueprint anticipated needing. If however, they spent only \$300K there would be a balance of \$135K in appropriation that could be carried forward. They would only need to appropriate the difference between \$135K and the estimate total for the following year because of the unexpended appropriations from that year. Government appropriation for capital projects must be certified forward but they did not expire, stated Mr. Taylor.

Ms. Ennis stated that she was not convinced and would not vote for something that she did not understand. She would be abstaining from the vote.

Jim Davis reiterated that Blueprint was not requesting the CAC vote on the budget but to provide comments. Ms. Ennis stated that her comment would be that the budgets needed to be put forward in a process that tied and was clearly understood to the advisory committee. Mr. Davis asked if she would be willing to help staff craft the format that would do that. Potentially, she responded. Mr. Davis stated that her comment would be incorporated.

Mr. Taylor remarked that the format was not intuitive, however, it was a function of governmental accounting and those processes. Either one takes it on faith that it is correct or they spend hour upon hour with someone explaining it to you. Mr. Maher stated that was probably why the committee typically spent their time focused on the Master Plan because that was where the Capital Budget was derived from. Historically, the Board and committees have "voted on" the Master Plan; agreeing annually that they wanted a particular project completed in a specified period of time for the price reflected. It was left at face value that through the City and the Auditors, the Capital Budget would implement the Master Plan as approved.

Ron Pease stated that one of the key words for this was "confusing". Had previous years been as confusing? Also, was there full understanding, comprehension, and support at the Board level? Mr. Davis stated that he could not attest to confusion but he could attest to support. It had never before presented a problem, yet some of the greatest discussions held by the CAC were in regard to the Master Plan and establishing priorities for the projects. Generally speaking, when Budgets were presented to the IA at the June meeting, staff would convey to the Board that the Operating and Capital Budgets were presented for their consideration only. Inevitably someone would

move to approve them.

Mr. Maher reiterated that in the past, there had been less focus placed on the budget details than on the general Master Plan and the timing of projects. He presumed that the Board trusted the accountants in the City to implement that part of it. Tom O'Steen stated that was an appropriate description of what prior CAC members had spent more time concentrating on. At the beginning of the Blueprint 2000 enterprise there was a projected stream of sales tax that would generate a certain amount of money. Their concentration, as EECC members, was to ensure that the program was funded appropriately in a broad term based on that revenue stream, and that specific projects were prioritized in concert with what the EECC had outlined. Over time, they had watched different City or County governments try to grab a bit here or there, or to move money around that, as the CAC and as EECC members, they did not always necessarily agree with. Not wanting to speak for others, Mr. O'Steen stated his focus concentrated on programs and money being moved around as opposed to complete fluid understanding of the document itself. They relied on their trust in Mr. Maher, the Finance Committee, and the positive annual, independent audits. If, however, there was something that was easier to understand that would be great too.

Kevin McGorty stated that Ms. Ennis' comments were on target, and there could be improvements in terms of identification. However, the members of the EECC were quite familiar with the line items. The Master Plan had been their score card. They recognized early on that projects slated for the out years were the most susceptible to budget cuts and that certainly had happened. Those were policy issues that they commented on. However, they did not micro-manage the staff with their operational budget. They felt there was tremendous oversight by the City, County, and the IA on issues of salary, benefits, etc. He noted that they had relied heavily on the audits because of their financial commitments to the citizens. In terms of labeling perspective though, he felt Ms. Ennis had valid suggestions.

Luciano Ramos stated that it seemed that it was a language issue that could be easily corrected with the addition of a column to the capital budget spreadsheet, that listed "Appropriated Funds in Prior Years, Amount Actually Spent, and Amount Needed for..." Mr. Maher stated that he could easily incorporate the suggestions.

At this time, the advertised Budget Public Hearing was begun and citizens were able to make comments on the Operating and Capital Budget Agenda Items.

Kelly Layman, private citizen residing on Cadiz Street in the Park Avenue Historic District one block over (parallel) from Franklin Boulevard, stated that she wished to clarify what was intended in the recent Tallahassee Democrat article in which she was quoted. She understood that, while she was living out of town, a very vocal minority were successful in their efforts to reprioritize the segments of Capital Cascade Trail. All she asked and intended in the article was to find a way to address flooding on Franklin Boulevard in the Blueprint program. She has since learned, thanks to phone calls and discussions with staff, that there was a way. In reading the agenda items she understood the interim solutions. Her only consideration as it moved forward was the \$1.4M that was needed to complete the Franklin Boulevard improvements and to make it

continuous from Cascade Park to East Tennessee Street. It was a public safety issue that was long overdue. She had no opinion on box culverts; she would leave that to the technical experts and engineering staff. She encouraged staff to complete the list that voters approved and she strongly believed that they would. She stated that there was support from residents of that area and felt they would be at the June 21, 2010 IA meeting.

Kevin McGorty moved approval of the Master Plan and Capital Budget; Tom O'Steen seconded the motion. It passed 7-0; Erin Ennis abstained from the vote.

Consent Items

Item #3: CAC Minutes: February 11, 2010 and April 8, 2010

Kevin McGorty clarified that in the April 8, 2010 minutes in the discussion regarding Smokey Hollow Village, he felt that the CAC reached consensus of a timetable of not keeping that critical, open space vacant. He felt there was clear direction that not a fixed but some kind of timetable would be established. It was noted and would be checked. Otherwise, they were very good. **Mr. McGorty moved approval of the February 11 and April 8 minutes; it was seconded by Erin Ennis. It passed 8-0.**

Presentations/Discussion

Item #6: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 1 – Authorization to Negotiate a Supplemental Agreement to Design Segment 1 Flood Relief Project and to Amend the Master Plan to Incorporate any Additional Funding Received

Gary Phillips stated that staff was requesting the IA to authorize Blueprint to contract with Genesis Group, the existing Park design consultant, to design the flood relief improvement project on Franklin Boulevard. The \$1.7M was money that came available through the City/County from flood relief money related to Tropical Storm Fay. For an additional \$1.4M Blueprint could extend the box culvert to East Tennessee Street and close off the ditch completely. For an additional \$350K Blueprint could improve the conveyance under East Tennessee Street to improve the flooding at Leon High School.

Mr. Davis stated that it was much cheaper than the original plan because it would be in the same location as where the ditch was currently. The impacts to traffic would be minimal most likely closing only the inside lanes during construction. The project did not include any roadway improvements and the current street crossings would all remain in place. The total cost for the project was \$3.1M (from the Park to East Tennessee Street); Blueprint had \$1.7M and needed \$1.4M more to extend the project to East Tennessee Street. Blueprint's position had been to do whatever could be done for the money available as compared to doing nothing.

Stephen Hogge questioned if the approval of the Capital Budget would preclude completing Franklin Boulevard. Mr. Maher stated that the agenda item would appropriate the grant (\$1.7M) but there was an additional \$1.4M needed to complete the project. The City was looking at potentially funding that portion. If they were successful in identifying funding, Mr. Maher stated that it would be a "done deal." If however, they were unsuccessful, there was not money in the

Master Plan to make up the difference. If the IA chose to complete Franklin, another project would have to be reduced by \$1.4M because the Master Plan was balanced. The Capital Budget would have to be amended as well.

Jim Davis stated that not only would it require amending the Capital Budget but it would require considerable work as well because of work that had been previously completed and priorities that had been established by the Board. The \$1.7M was new money; not part of the sales tax revenue. Furthermore, the agenda item requested permission to include any additional money, found money, to the Capital Budget to complete Franklin.

Kevin McGorty stated that he was pleased that Franklin Boulevard was back in the game. He was also sympathetic to Ms. Layman's points. He felt there was traction and leveraging opportunities available. They might not occur within the current budget cycle, however, there was support. He did not feel that it was appropriate at this time to begin raiding other projects to fund Franklin. Mr. Maher agreed.

Ron Pease questioned if there was any indication as to what the City was moving on. Mr. Davis stated that Jay Townsend, Assistant City Manager, was working to get it funded from City Stormwater. Mr. McGorty stated that it was a foot hold. Furthermore, he felt that with the momentum of the opening of the park, the emphasis of Franklin Boulevard as a gateway would be critical. That segment could not be degraded and not functioning. He felt there would be stimulus to move it forward.

Kevin McGorty moved approval of Option 1; it was seconded by Tom O'Steen.

- A. Authorize the Director to negotiate a Supplemental Agreement with Genesis Group for an amount not to exceed \$330,000 which includes a 10% contingency, to model the St. Augustine Branch (SAB) from CCT Segment 2 to LHS parking lot and to design the Segment 1 Flood Relief Improvement Project from the Segment 2 (Pensacola Street) Northern Terminus to north of Park Avenue.
- B. Authorize the Director, if additional funding becomes available, to negotiate a Supplemental Agreement with Genesis Group for an amount not to exceed \$350,000 which includes a 10% contingency to design the remaining section of Franklin Boulevard from north of Park Avenue to Tennessee Street, or to the LHS parking lot.
- C. In addition to the FEMA funding, provide authorization to amend the Master Plan and incorporate into the Capital Budget any additional funding which may be identified and received for the Segment 1 Flood Relief Project.

Stephen Hogge asked what the historical thinking was on the box culvert versus the open ditch. Mr. McGorty stated that there was a healthy debate on whether it was a natural water course versus one that had been severely altered and was mainly a stormwater facility. There was conflict regarding how wide the road should be, but in the end the money simply was not available. It was decided to table Segment 1 because consensus could not be reached, and move on to other segments of the project. While the \$22M was not available for the full reconstruction of the roadway, many people, he felt, were pleased that it was back on the table.

Erin Ennis questioned if there was concern if the protestors would return. Mr. Davis stated that it was concern not over if they would but when they would arrive. Many people felt that the situation was a very different system from the St. Augustine Branch that existed in the 19th century. They were trying to deal realistically with what existed presently, as well as being aware of the potential for the revitalization and pedestrian safety that was critically needed on Franklin Boulevard.

Mr. Davis stated that the original concept by the EECC, what Blueprint was based on, was for a box culvert along Franklin Boulevard. It was always the design. Mr. Hogge interjected that it was on the basis that it had been manipulated... Mr. McGorty stated that the box culvert was recommended on the basis of public safety and better utilization as a greenway and urban design.

Mr. Hogge questioned the cost consideration of restoration versus a box culvert. Mr. Bright stated that the ditch, currently, was quite wide. By installing the box culvert, Blueprint could move the travel lanes closer and put sidewalks to the outside. There was virtually no ROW available outside the current limits. Having to purchase ROW on Franklin Boulevard would have caused the cost to skyrocket; if ROW was even available without taking houses. Mr. Hogge stated he was looking for a number, a price tag comparison of the options. Mr. McGorty stated that there had been various options, each with its own cost, over the years.

Mr. Davis pointed out for Mr. Hogge that when he spoke of restoration he needed to remember that one of the sources for the St. Augustine Branch was Lake Leon which was now a baseball field. How could that be restored? To put four-lanes of traffic, a sidewalk, bike lanes, etc required a set number of feet of ROW; there was no funding for ROW on Segment 1. One way to minimize that and capitalize on the space available was to install a box culvert. It was a trade off, but one could imagine what ROW would cost in that area to expand the ROW, to include the amenities, to keep the ditch open, and make the necessary improvements to accommodate the rate of flow.

Furthermore, Mr. Davis stated, that water quality improvements were a big part of the St. Augustine Branch. It was determined that the water quality aspects of Capital Cascade Trail would occur in Segment 4, where many of the ponds would be constructed. Normally, in stormwater projects one worked upstream to accommodate the improvements made at the top. That it was initially named Segment 1 – 4, north to south; if it had been named 1-4 south to north it would not have had the same connotation. One of the significant factors in the sequencing of Segment 1 last, however, was the very vocal minority group.

Tom O'Steen asked if there were concept graphics to illustrate what Franklin Boulevard could look like with the proposed interim solution. Mr. Davis stated that it would be a grassy median along the funded portion that was placed in the box culvert. The unfunded portion would remain the way it currently was. Mr. O'Steen questioned if there was a portion that could be used as a bike or pedestrian trail within the median. Mr. Bright stated that there would be multiple conflicts at each median opening as would be in the middle of the road. There would be no sidewalks. Mr. Phillips stated that the money was specifically for flood relief. He did not know

if it would be eligible for use for sidewalks or trails. Funding for that would need to come from another source.

Frank Terrafirma, private citizen residing at 641 E College Avenue and who also owned 328 S Franklin Boulevard, stated that he was on the Board of Directors for Lafayette Condominiums. The Association was fully aware of the potential additional funding for flood relief on Franklin Boulevard. They were very enthusiastic about the possibility to fund all of Franklin and that would be ideal, but segments would certainly help. It was not the original plan, but it was forward progress. He hoped that the CAC and IA would support the box culvert for safety reasons as well as add the bike lanes, trails, and sidewalks when additional funding became available.

Eric Rosenstein of Post Buckley stated that Franklin would potentially look similar to Blair Stone Road near Capital Circle NE near Goose Pond. There was a box culvert located there.

Kelly Layman stated that she would like to help because people were asking her what they could do. Mr. Davis requested that she attend the IA meeting on June 21, 2010 and to bring those folks with her. Of equal importance was to email their sentiment and support to the elected officials of the City and County.

The motion passed unanimously.

Item #4: CAC Appointments

Dave Bright briefly discussed some of the historical issues with several vacancies for certain CAC positions. Following the last IA meeting, revisions were made to the CAC bylaws which opened up the potential of getting different agencies to appoint members to those positions. The recommendation representing the Disabled Community was David Jones from the Florida Disabled Outdoors Association. Originally, that was not an agency that had authority to appoint a nominee. Mr. Bright had been in contact with Ability 1st, the agency that was originally mentioned, and Judith Barrett indicated support for Mr. Jones for the position on the CAC.

The second position, a representative of the Education Community, was proposed to be filled by Luciano Ramos. Mr. Ramos was nominated by FAMU and was employed by the Florida Campus Compact. The third nominee was Lamar Taylor. Lamar's position does not expire until November 2010, however, since the agenda item was going before the IA, Mr. Bright had him re-approved by the EECC. Blueprint was still waiting for a replacement nominee for the Environmental Biologist position by the EECC.

Kevin McGorty moved approval and welcomed Mr. Ramos (who was in attendance); it was seconded by Ron Pease. It passed unanimously.

Item #5: Cascade Park Update

Gary Phillips stated that Blueprint held a very successful ground breaking ceremony since the April CAC meeting, with approximately 200 people in attendance. Blueprint had signed the contract with Sandco, and had all the permits necessary to begin construction. The Pre-

Construction Conference and Partnering meetings had been schedule for later in June. The Notice to Proceed would be issued June 25, 2010 with the contractor "turning dirt" on July 5, 2010.

Windell Page questioned if there was something the CAC could do to assist to re-secure the donation for Centennial Field. Mr. Davis stated that the potential donor was in the banking field, and they did not feel that with new regulations and the overall environment of the financial community that it was the appropriate time for them to move forward. They have requested Blueprint come back to them in one year.

Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Design Update: Request Approval to Initiate the Design Phase for Segment 3 from South Adams Street to Gamble Street

Gary Phillips stated that because of the decrease in sales tax receipts, funding was not available to design Segment 3 and Segment 4 together. Earlier, the IA requested that Blueprint design items with the "biggest bang for the buck" in terms of water quality and flood relief improvements. The three that were decided on were ditch improvements between Monroe and Adams Streets (which was determined to be a box culvert), Coal Chute Pond, and Pond 5 (in Segment 4 near Black Swamp). At this time, staff was requesting the IA approve the design of Segment 3, Adams to Gamble Streets. Blueprint was coordinating with the City on the design of Segment 3 as it related to the FAMU Way extension. The City was also doing a ditch restoration and stabilization project south of Coal Chute Pond. Mr. Phillips briefly discussed the coordination efforts and concept options for Segment 3.

Mr. Davis stated that the residents, speaking at FAMU Way extension public meetings, have expressed that they like the brook and trail concept minus the brook. They would rather have a greenway and potential park-like amenities. They are very concerned about maintenance of the brook itself, the cost to construct it, and litter etc., that could accumulate in it. Blueprint and the City agreed, and the City intended to recommend that they retain the 175-feet of ROW without the creation of the brook itself in that area; focusing instead on park-like amenities that the residents were keen on. Staff was prepared to recommend that to the IA since it was cheaper to construct, much cheaper to maintain, and was in keeping with what the residents wanted.

Kevin McGorty requested clarification on who represented who as it was not a dense residential area. Mr. Davis stated that there were three public meetings held by the City, with an approximate total of 450 people in attendance. Their reaction was gauged by surveys conducted by the City. FAMU's preference of the two options was unclear; however, the one clear opinion was to cover the ditch. The folks who attended the meeting were strongly in favor of the trail with park-like amenities option. Mr. McGorty stated that it was a nice idea to carry the water theme as far as possible without the ditch. Mr. Davis stated that the water features would be intermittent with the trail, ponds, and brook features.

Luciano Ramos stated that he had some concerns if FAMU had not been consulted simply because their student population made up the majority of residents in that area. He requested if the item could be tabled until he had the opportunity to meet with planners and officials from FAMU to discuss the options. Mr. Davis stated that the FAMU Way extension was a City

project and they were taking the lead on it. The City was coordinating with FAMU regarding that project.

Furthermore, Mr. Davis stated, that he understood everyone's concerns. The agenda item requested authorization to move forward with the design phase. In that phase staff would resolve all of those issues. The time for resolution was not yet at hand. It would be brought back to the CAC and IA once the design was further along and would include conceptual drawings. On June 9, 2010 City staff would present to the City Commission the preferred route for the FAMU Way extension with approval to come at the following Commission meeting. As part of that, the City would make a non-binding recommendation to the IA on what that portion of Capital Cascade Trail would look like. Blueprint would work that through normal processes to have input and recommendation from the CAC as well.

Dave Bright and Ray Youmans clarified that the City had been in discussions with FAMU regarding the roadway project; more so than Blueprint had regarding the Trail. Mr. O'Steen requested clarification on the boundaries of the City and Blueprint portions of the projects. It sounded as though, he stated, that the City would have the opportunity to make a recommendation about the Blueprint portion of the money and land before the CAC was presented with a design. Mr. Davis clarified that the City would make no recommendation regarding the Blueprint money. They would make a non-binding recommendation of brook and trail versus park and trail. Blueprint agreed with the City regarding the amount of ROW, 175-feet.

Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint normally operated at 50,000-feet; regarding this project in present terms, they were at 100,000-feet. There were no designs. There were no details. The City had not designed the road. They had 31 months in the schedule for design alone. All of the details would be worked out and forthcoming. Concurrently, however, Blueprint was requesting the CAC and IA for the authority to begin the design of their portions; of Segment 3. As part of that there were economies of scale in being able to jointly acquire ROW. He did not know how much of the ROW would be "Blueprint's" because he did not know how much would be needed for the trail. The City did not know how much would be needed for roadway because it had not been designed. The box culvert, however, would be placed in ROW that was currently owned, a la where the ditch was presently. It was way too soon to outline cost allocations. There were concepts only. The details would come if approval to move to design was granted.

Mr. McGorty questioned if the design concept would include both options. Mr. Davis stated that it could if that was what the CAC desired. He suspected however that Blueprint would take the results of the public meetings held by the City; and possibly hold more of their own to define what the community really wanted to have. He did not see the need to design both if there was a clear vision one way or the other. One resident, speaking for the majority of her neighbors, stated it was their neighborhood and they knew what they wanted and could use. It was not for someone who did not live there to dictate to them what should be there. Furthermore, the meetings were attended by County Commissioner Proctor and City Commissioner Ziffer. They would listen to what the community expressed at that meeting and would move accordingly.

Mr. McGorty stated that he respected that, however, the taxpayers of the whole community were funding Blueprint. They also had a stake in it. The largest stakeholder was FAMU. If they went by the philosophy of who attended meetings representing their provincial interests they would never have reached consensus to fund Blueprint 2000. The committee needed to keep in mind that they represented the larger interest of the community and ensuring that the design worked for the community as a whole as well. He was sympathetic with residents, however, the CAC needed to recognize that they had a broad responsibility to ensure that it was a world class design of a unified stormwater and park system. He would feel more comfortable with more involvement from FAMU or that both designs were included in the equation. Mr. Davis stated that, from a conceptual stand point, staff would bring both designs back to the CAC. Rest assured, too, that it would be coordinated with FAMU.

Tom O'Steen moved that Blueprint be allowed to proceed with the design of Segment 3 (staff recommendation). Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #8: Springhill Road Corridor Improvement Concept Report

Dave Bright reviewed the reason for and the results of the Springhill Road Concept Report. Jim Davis reassured Kevin McGorty that Springhill Road was not being moved to Tier 1 nor would any Blueprint money be spent on it. Dave Bright stated that the recommended option was to accept the report, have the Board identify the 130-foot ROW, and have the CRTPA and Planning Departments move ahead with appropriate plans and actions necessary to preserve the corridor right-of-way.

Kevin McGorty moved staff recommendation:

1. Accept the Concept Report regarding future improvements to Springhill Road between Capital Circle SW and Orange Avenue.
2. Instruct CRTPA staff to identify Springhill Road as a future four-lane roadway from Capital Circle SW to Orange Avenue in the CRTPA Regional Mobility Plan currently under development, and correspondingly instruct Planning Department staff to incorporate the segment into the Right-of-Way Needs Map in the Transportation Element of the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan.

It was seconded by Lamar Taylor; it passed unanimously.

Information Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

This item was informational only.

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

Mr. Davis stated that the E3 project was federally funded at \$13.7M or 100% by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). Blueprint solicited it as a Design/Build project and a protest had been lodged by one of the three short-listed firms. Quite candidly, Blueprint was not

sure how it would play out. There was a 50/50 chance Blueprint could lose all of the money and the project would be cancelled. The money was given to Blueprint in February 2010, and they were scheduled to receive bids on June 8, 2010 and because of the protest it could be delayed. The money had to be committed by September 2010 or there was a risk of losing it all. Mr. Davis assured the committee that no one wanted to lose that money. The problem arose in resolving the protest as quickly as possible. The various forms of resolution were being explored. It was in the City's protest mode and FDOT and FHWA were involved. It was in the legal process and more information would follow.

Citizens To Be Heard

As noted in the minutes:

Kelly Layman spoke regarding the budget and Franklin Boulevard.

Frank Terrafirma spoke regarding Franklin Boulevard.

Eric Rosenstein provided a brief comment on the box culvert

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:58 pm.