

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

Blueprint 2000 Office

2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

Richard Drew called the meeting to order at 4:33 pm.

Committee Members present:

Richard Drew	Kent Wimmer
David Jones	Christic Henry
Ron Pease	Andrew Chin
Dale Landry	Chris Klena
Lamar Taylor	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Charles Hargraves	Gary Phillips
Dave Snyder	Patrice Hanulak
Autumn Calder	Alisha Wetherell
Angela Ivy	Cameron Snipes
Ray Youmans	Patrick Twyman
Shelonda Meeks	Theresa Heiker
Margie Quillman	Harry Reed
Debra Schiro	

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda items.

Information Items

There were no information items.

Consent Items

Item #3: CAC Meeting Minutes (January 22, 2013 & February 7, 2013)

Kent Wimmer moved approval; Ron Pease seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #4: Acceptance of FY 2012 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) & Appropriation of FY 2012 Operating Fund Balance

Lamar Taylor moved to accept the FY 2012 CAFR.

David Jones questioned if the funds that were moved into the Capital Improvement Projects would be allocated for specific projects or if it was available for us on any of them. Patrick Twyman, from City of Tallahassee Accounting, stated that it was dedicated for future appropriation to any of the approved Blueprint projects. The \$7.2M that was in question was the balance that remained from the FY 2012 Operating Budget. It was essentially unexpended sales tax revenues that were not utilized for operating expenses or debt services during FY 2012. It

would be moved into a pot of money that the IA could allocate in the FY 2014 Capital Budget and future years.

Mr. Jones stated that at the meeting on May 30, 2013 he inquired about funding an accessible ball field for the commemoration of Centennial Field. In light of Blueprint moving unallocated dollars, he questioned where and how the funding for the Centennial Field project should be addressed. Funding for it had not been included previously and with additional funds available could a portion of it be allocated for an accessible ball field. He referenced the September 6, 2012 meeting where the subject was discussed. At that time, staff stated that it would be discussed with the Director of Parks and Recreation to move it forward. However it seemed to have been dropped. Before the CAC passed any budget allocations or shifting of fund, he wanted to address the earlier request.

Dale Landry requested that staff investigate the redirecting or allocation of fund to an accessible field for the commemoration of Centennial Field. He too referenced discussions and minutes of the September 6, 2012 CAC and the September 24, 2012 IA meetings for history.

Lamar Taylor stated that it might be more appropriate for the issue to be addressed with Item #11 in the Capital Budget discussion where the IA could address the allocations of the Capital Improvement Plan for FY 2014-2018. The \$7.2 was cash that was not spent in FY 2012. It seemed that the question was whether or not that particular issue had been included in a plan somewhere already. If not, the IA would be the body to direct that. It seemed to him that it was more an issue of dealing with the notion that it would be carried forward.

Mr. Landry stated that he agreed with Mr. Taylor; however it was about being consistent. He felt it appropriate that the CAC bring it forward again and request staff and IA consideration as a point of priority. Mr. Jones concurred.

Ron Pease requested clarification that the money would remain with Blueprint. Mr. Twyman stated that each year, funds were allocated for operating expenses; the CAFR accounted for the way that operating revenue was received and expended. The \$7.2M was the balance of the operating dollars, effectively sales tax revenues, that was left unexpended. There were also two capital funds, from which all project appropriations were made. All sales tax revenue in Blueprint funds remained in one of those three.

Chris Klena seconded Mr. Taylor's motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #5: IRS Audit Results of 2007 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds

Lamar Taylor questioned if there were any additional arbitrage payments that might have been due because of the unexpended proceeds. Patrick Twyman stated that there was no arbitrage or financial impact. **Chris Klena moved to accept the update; Lamar Taylor seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion

Item #6: Lake Jackson Basin Water Quality Project

Autumn Calder gave a brief overview of the item. Kent Wimmer questioned if the County intended to take any action with the wetland fill on the east side of the roadway. Theresa Heiker, with Leon County Growth and Environmental Management, stated that it was actually part of the original project that was previously funded. The County was currently pursuing acquisition of the property. Ms. Heiker stated that the project area was west of the parcel Mr. Wimmer asked about. There were several streams that entered into the wetland area on the west side of Meridian Road and south of Timberlane. That was the area the County would like to address with the funding. **Kent Wimmer moved to accept staff recommendation. Approve the transfer of \$272,254.34 in remaining funds from the Blueprint 2000 Lake Jackson Basin Water Quality budget to Leon County for channel and stream restoration in the Ford's Arm South Watershed. Christic Henry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Item #7: Capital Circle Southwest (W1) Right of Way Adjustment

Charles Hargraves gave a brief overview of the agenda material.

Christic Henry questioned how the adjustment would impact the design of the roadway. Mr. Hargraves explained that the median would be narrower through that area. Also the overall design would be compressed; the most significant visual impact would be to landscaping. The land would be forest land in planted pine and the golden aster preserve instead of the other plantings that were typical of Blueprint projects.

Richard Drew questioned if the "meandering trail" would be straighter in nature through that segment. Mr. Hargraves stated that unfortunately the designer was not on hand to address that however, he suspected that there would be some ability to meander the trail in the overall reduced footprint of the right-of-way. Mr. Drew questioned if it would lead to any compromises in stormwater treatment. Mr. Hargraves stated that it would not.

For the record, Ms. Henry stated a position Tom O'Steen had surfaced in another meeting about the perception of that particular segment of the roadway. They were sensitive to the consistency of the design standard as compared with other segments of Capital Circle. Mr. Hargraves stated that it would be different because of the compressed right-of-way. Also, FDOT's consultant was to begin design in July 2013; up to 50% of the plans could be designed without a completed PD&E however it was nearing the time when a decision had to be made. There was what Blueprint and the local community wanted that was up against Federal requirements to protect the 4f land. It might not be perfect however the amenities and the overall aesthetics would be comparable if in a smaller footprint.

Mr. Drew stated that a number of those issues were raised in the discussion documented in the attached TCC minutes. He encouraged the committee members to read that if they had not yet done so. His major concern was that it would set a precedent and that FDOT would "come to the well" many more times to reduce that. Mr. Hargraves stated that the condition was coming down from FHWA however, because of the funding received, FDOT would support them.

Ron Pease stated that there were many highly qualified staff members within Blueprint and questioned if he was correct in assuming that staff recommendations were a result of that outstanding staff having analyzed the data and supporting the findings. Mr. Hargraves

confirmed that it was and included the consultants from Kimley Horn as well. He apologized for not remembering to invite them because they could have outlined the steps that impacted 4f properties. The consistent message from FDOT on behalf of FHWA was that Blueprint would not win that argument but would spend significant amounts of money fighting it.

Mr. Landry stated that staff would bring the logic however they could not present the cultural impact. The culture, and the relation to the various segments of the community, was what the CAC members brought to the table. The situation seemed to be one where Blueprint was caught between a rock and a hard place.

Mr. Jones stated that he felt it was interesting that the federal government were concern about the correct conservation of that 50-foot of land however they were building a helicopter pad and office complex in the same area. He questioned if there were other ulterior plans for that land that would not be conducive to a greenway. Kent Wimmer stated that federal law required them to avoid protected public lands.

Harry Reed with the CRTPA stated that Mr. Wimmer was correct. FHWA received comments from property owners, one being the US Forest Service who stated that they did not want the land to be impacted. He suggested that the committee consider that they could have input to the design and see what could be done outside of the property line to bring in the types of things they wanted; particularly based on the feedback of the construction of an office complex or helicopter pad. At the same time, without approval from FHWA on the PD&E, the project could not move forward in design. Furthermore, not following federal requirements jeopardized federal funding.

Dale Landry moved Option 1: Reduce the right-of-way from 230-feet to 180-feet in the areas of the Golden Aster Preserve and the US Forest Service's Lake Bradford Tract. This would result in the typical section being modified to remove the 50-feet noted as "natural ground." Kent Wimmer seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Public Hearing – 5:30 PM

Item #10: Proposed FY 2013 Operating Budget

Item #11: Fiscal year 2013-2017 Capital Improvement Plan and Fiscal Year 2013-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan

There were no speakers for the budget.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #8: Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Update and Authorization to Increase Construction Budget

Shawn Kalbli with Wood+Partners, Inc. updated the CAC with the progress of the design concept for Segment 3 and Van Buren Pond. There were discussions on how the water entered and exited the pond as well as safety precautions to deter children from swimming. Mr. Kalbli assured the committee that both safety and security were utmost priorities of the design team.

Charles Hargraves explained that the facility's main function was attenuation rather than treatment. A baffle box system was included in the design to assist with debris removal.

Chris Klena requested clarification of the budget. Mr. Kalbli stated that the infrastructure budget was separate from the landscape and amenities budget. The requested approval of \$5M was for landscape and amenities comparable to the concepts presented.

There was also discussion of the Transmission and Distribution lines for City Electric. For reasons of safety and service/maintenance there were restrictions regarding the space beneath them that required a 20-foot clear sag area. Mr. Kalbli reassured the committee that Wood+Partners could still provide the program they committed to they would simply reconfigure it to conform to the constraint of access for utility vehicles. The Electric Utility was cooperating with Wood+Partners and Blueprint in the siting of the features.

Lamar Taylor requested clarification on the budget allocation in the CIP; essentially it was the requested \$5M reflected in the budget for Segment 3 and Segment 3 of Capital Cascades Trail. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was not. Mr. Taylor clarified that the appropriation would come from the CIP fund. Patrick Twyman confirmed.

Ron Pease asked for clarification on the mission of the project, would it be "world class or first class" etc. Also who established the goals for the project? Mr. Kalbli stated that the mission from the leadership of the City and County was "to make it the most beautiful road in Tallahassee." One component was the road, the other was the park. The project was coordinated through FAMU CAC and many of the ideas were developed by the FAMU School of Architecture and Design Studio. Their concepts were agreed upon as the program elements or features that the park and roadway would have. Mr. Kalbli's office was evolving those pieces into design concepts with cost estimates. They were soliciting input from various CAC's, Leadership Teams, etc of the stakeholders.

Mr. Hargraves stated that the projects were joint efforts between Blueprint and the City. The requested funds were for improvements for the trails, park areas, and stormwater ponds. There were additional improvements to the roadway infrastructure, roadway landscape, etc. that would be funded by the City.

Dale Landry moved to approve the authorization of additional landscape and hardscape design for Segment 3 and Segment 4 at a cost not to exceed \$5M. He also requested that once the concept design was further along, that it be presented to the members of the community to for their input and buy in as well. Especially given the close proximity of the power lines and beliefs about the health impacts of the electromagnetic field they generate. **Chris Klena seconded the motion.**

David Jones asked if, in addition to approving the funding, the Blueprint CAC could provide feedback on the concept. Mr. Hargraves confirmed they absolutely could and noted that it would be an item on the August agenda.

The motion passed 8/0; Ron Pease abstained from the vote.

Item #9: Proposed Revisions to the IA, CAC, and TCC Rules, Bylaws, Policies, and Procedures

Debra Schiro summarized the revision to the bylaws; noting that the majority of the changes were housekeeping in nature. However there were a few substantive changes that she listed.

Lamar Taylor moved approval of the revisions to the IA bylaws. Dale Landry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

The modification to the CAC bylaws received discussion around the inclusion of the Regional Chamber of Commerce which represented Leon, Jefferson, Wakulla, Franklin, and Gadsden counties. The Executive Director is a former Blueprint CAC member, Windell Page.

Kent Wimmer moved that Item F be worded as: "...representative appointed by the Capital City Chamber of Commerce *OR* Regional Chamber." Ron Pease seconded it.

Andrew Chin voice a concern that members who were not residents of Leon County could be making decisions about funding generate within and spent on Leon County. It did not seem appropriate to him. Mr. Wimmer stated as he understood it, 30-40% of sales tax revenue was generated by non-county residents. Mr. Pease stated his support of Mr. Chin's concern.

Mr. Taylor stated that the motion made the language disjunctive and questioned who, or how the "or," would be decided which chamber was represented. He felt it could potentially lead to arguments by the various Chamber Boards. He suggested leaving it as it was currently written.

Christic Henry stated that she did not have a vested interest in the outcome. The majority of the people involved with the Regional Chamber were residents of Leon County. Furthermore, she felt that persons involved would attend the meetings and provide quality input to the discussions.

Mr. Landry noted that within the Civil Rights community, there was a similar situation because the organizations listed were not all Civil Rights organizations; for example TIMA was the Tallahassee Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance. He suggested leaving it as it was because there could be a time when Blueprint had a need for a representative from that organization.

There was active discussion with people speaking over each other. The outcome of the discussion was not clear. Richard. Drew suggested modifying Mr. Wimmer's motion by putting the choice in parenthesis. Mr. Landry offered, **"a representative appointed by a minority chamber of commerce" with the individual entities listed in parenthesis. Mr. Wimmer accepted the modification.**

Shelonda Meek added that historically it had been extremely difficult for the various agencies to submit nominations. It was not unusual for there to be no response at all. If language was included to the effect of rotating through the agencies, it could result in vacant positions for months at a time. This had been an ongoing issue that required significant staff hours and attention.

Chris Klena suggested leaving the language as "at least 13 member" and listed "and" for item F.

David Jones wondered if it would increase the number required to meet a quorum; a problem that already existed in the committee. Mr. Taylor stated that the committee could establish a number for their quorum.

Knowing the people involved, Ms. Henry stated that she assumed the Regional Chamber requested to have a representative on the CAC but was curious if it could be confirmed. Also, for those same reasons, she felt it important to use "and" in the language of the bylaws. Her opinion was that including an additional representative could only help the CAC. Autumn Calder stated that Wayne Tedder received direction from his bosses to examine including the Regional Chamber in the CAC.

The amended motion passed 7/2 with Ron Pease and Christic Henry casting the dissenting votes.

Dale Landry moved approval of the revisions to the CAC bylaws. Chris Klena seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Chris Klena moved approval of the revisions to the TCC bylaws. Christic Henry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Public Hearing – 5:30 PM

Item #10: Proposed FY 2013 Operating Budget

There were no speakers on the budget.

Autumn Calder gave a brief summary of the item noting that the primary increase in the budget was due to Blueprint being fully staffed after years of not having been. Also, \$800K was moved from the Capital Budget to operating to cover the GEC administrative costs, rather than having those cost charged to projects.

Kent Wimmer questioned why travel increased. Shelonda Meeks stated that it was because of professional licenses required by the newer staff members. Chris Klena questioned if Blueprint had considered the potential of having to pay benefits to non-full time employees. Ms. Meeks stated no however, there was one employee who worked more than 30 hours per week that could be affected by that.

Ron Pease questioned the significant increase in temp wages. Ms. Meeks stated that it was the same case as with the GEC. However moving forward, staff would charge their time to the operating budget rather than a project. Dale Landry noted that there was not corresponding increases to the FICA, etc. line items for temps. Ms. Meeks stated that the City was exploring how to handle that for all temp employees across all Departments. It would be updated prior to the next CAC meeting.

Mr. Landry questioned if it would be cheaper for Blueprint to move into a City owned facility. Ms. Meeks stated that Wayne Tedder was evaluating the possibility of moving Blueprint into the Renaissance Center, as that was where the Planning Department was located. Debra Schiro

noted that Blueprint was in year three of a five-year lease that would have to be considered as well.

Item #11: Fiscal year 2013-2017 Capital Improvement Plan and Fiscal Year 2013-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan

There were no speakers on the budget.

Dale Landry stated that based on earlier conversation about funding for Centennial Field. Lamar Taylor explained how unexpended funds from the operating budget were moved to the capital budget, as he understood it. The question, he guessed, was the extent to which the ball field was already taken into account in the allocated costs of the total \$43M of Capital Cascades Trail Segment 2. There were no further allocations to that project. Autumn Calder stated that it was her understanding that funds had not been dedicated nor allocated for Centennial Field. As she understood it, Blueprint would complete the park with the Parks and Recreation Department coming in after the fact to add that component. She suggested that if the CAC felt strongly about it, they could dedicate X dollars for the project for Blueprint to complete or transfer funds to P&R.

Mr. Landry stated that he recalled the conversation from months earlier; the concern was from Dee Crumpler regarding maintenance of the field as well as the cost of maintenance. The response back from P&R was no. The CAC wanted it to be readdressed and Mr. Landry formally requested that staff to have a response by the August meeting. He wanted it to be given consideration and to do what he could to have funding allocated for it in the FY2014 budget. David Jones requested staff to pursue a cost estimate to be included. Charles Hargraves stated from a design perspective there was not space for a functional field. It could only be commemorative field. Mr. Jones concurred.

Christic Henry questioned if the issues was presented to the IA. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was not. Furthermore, he stated that his direction from Wayne Tedder was to add nothing to the park without direct approval from the IA. Everything added since the contract was let has caused or has the potential to cause delays in the opening. Plus, Blueprint was paying non-competitive, unsolicited costs for them. Ms. Henry stated that the IA took seriously the recommendations of the CAC however and it was a means of getting it on their radar.

Kent Wimmer stated that the potential remained of push-back from COT P&R if maintenance cost was the issue. David Jones stated that maintenance on the type of field he suggested would be reduced from standard costs. Furthermore, it would be to their benefit for Blueprint to construct the field given the flexibility of the excess operating funds. He wanted Blueprint through the CAC to allocate funds for the construction of a Centennial Field Commemoration.

Mr. Landry did not think that money was the issue. In his opinion it was whether or not the CAC wanted to ensure there was space dedicated for a universal access commemoration field. He was not concerned with P&R, when the issue was raised at the May CAC, there was an understanding that it would be brought back to the CAC. It had not happened and that was why they were raising the issue again. He requested again for it to be an item for the CAC to make an informed decision about.

David Jones stated that the CAC would like to address a design concept and cost for an accessibly and inclusive Centennial Field project. Mr. Landry also addressed the perception of opening the park without a commemoration to Centennial Field. Chris Klena concurred with both and reiterated the request for an agenda item on the subject. Mr. Taylor reminded the CAC that the discussion could be presented to the IA as part of the Chairman's Update; if it was not included with the Capital Budget, to make the effort to allocate it.

Mr. Wimmer requested an explanation of the de-allocation of the \$800K from the NFWFMD Partnership as well as the \$37K from Lake Lafayette Floodplain. Ms. Calder explained that the NFWFMD Partnership was established in 2003 as an agreement with the District for both agencies to set aside \$500K for five years. That agreement had long since expired. The money was used to acquire conservation easements in the Headwaters of the St. Marks that were later transferred to the District. Also there had been no additional parcels (large tracts were preferred by the WMD) identified for purchase. Furthermore with the loss of grant funding from Florida Forever in 2008-2009 the ability for Blueprint to fund those types of projects was lost as well. It did not preclude future purchases or partnerships for sensitive lands.

Mr. Wimmer questioned why the Partnership was limited to the Headwaters of the St. Marks. Ms. Calder stated that the agreement identified that area specifically to protect the water quality of the basin. She was not as familiar with the Lake Lafayette item however, she stated, no projects had been identified for it. Mr. Wimmer questioned though, the recent request by Blueprint through the CAC to purchase land on the Alford Arm of Lake Lafayette. Ms. Calder stated that it was purchased.

Mr. Taylor questioned if the de-allocations would free up money in the Land Bank; essentially, was it future money or funding that was available in cash. Ms. Calder stated that the only project with future money tied to it was the Headwater of the St. Marks. The Lake Lafayette money was "cash" on hand. The Headwaters of the St. Marks project however continued through 2019 and there were no projects slated for that area. Blueprint had not been approached; and neither the City nor County had projects in that area that Blueprint could fund. Mr. Taylor felt the project was worth keeping open as it was one of the larger environmental projects that Blueprint was founded on. It could however create a drag on other funding sources. He suggested rather than abandoning the project that one options was for staff put more effort into finding a project to fit the funds.

Mr. Wimmer suggested that one possible use of the Lake Lafayette funds was to acquire the submerged interest rights. That would allow for more effective management of the choked areas of the lake, such as Alford Arm. He encouraged Blueprint to be creative in looking for partnerships; in the Water Trust Fund, for example. Chris Klena noted that Katie Kelly was the new Intergovernmental Agency person with the District and encouraged Blueprint to contact her. Mr. Taylor suggested meeting with former CAC members who were extensively involved for input and ideas. He named several: Jess Van Dyke, Kevin McGorty, Kathy Archibald, and Nancy Miller.

Ron Pease stated that it was one thing to register a concern and disappointment of what should have been done based on prior commitments of previous participants on the CAC or IA. He

thought the dilemma was not in just voicing the concern but in taking the word back to Mr. Tedder. Mr. Hargraves and Ms. Calder interjected that the CAC would see the budget again in August before it was presented to the IA in September for approval. Staff would be able to bring an answer before the CAC at that time.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

Kent Wimmer spoke again about the efforts to add a constitutional amendment to the ballot and shared a petition regarding Water and Land Conservation. Richard Drew noted that per Wayne Tedder's comments at the May 30, 2013 meeting he would provide direction to Mr. Wimmer regarding presenting to the City and County Commissions.

Adjourn

Dale Landry moved to adjourn; Andrew Chin seconded the motion which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.