

Blueprint 2000 SPECIALCAC Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, July 21, 2011
 Blueprint 2000 Office
 2727 Apalachee Parkway, First Floor Conference Room

Lamar Taylor, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:44 pm.

Committee Members present:

Tom O'Steen	Windell Page
Lamar Taylor	Christic Henry
Burt Davy	Dale Landry
Ron Pease	Erin Ennis
David Jones	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Wayne Tedder	George Reynolds
Dave Bright	Latesa Turner
Dave Snyder	Margie Quillman (telephonically)
Jim Shepherd	Jim Davis (telephonically)
Gary Phillips	Paco de la Fuente
Marek Romanowski	Scott Ross
Ray Youmans	Beckye Simpson
Angela Richardson	Christina Parades
Carlana Hoffman	Roshaunda Bradley
Shelonda Meeks	

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications.

Information Items

There were no information items.

Consent Items

There were no consent items.

--

Presentations/Discuss

Item #2: Blueprint 2000 Management Review

Item #1: Blueprint 2000 and Planning Department Restructuring

The Blueprint 2000 and Planning Department Restructuring agenda item was not held as a separate discussion from the Blueprint 2000 Management Review agenda item. The Restructuring item piggybacked onto the discussion of the management report.

Scott Ross, Budget Director for Leon County, gave a brief overview of the presentation given to the Intergovernmental Agency at their June 20, 2011, meeting. A detailed copy of his presentation (and the IA discussion) is available in the associated file at Blueprint 2000. He specifically noted that there would be no organizational changes to the CAC.

Lamar Taylor questioned, in terms of utilizing existing City or County staff in lieu of consultants, if there was capacity at either entity to take on additional work. Mr. Ross confirmed; the review committee interviewed the Directors of both Public Works Departments who indicated that there was capacity to do some of the analysis or review work. Mr. Tedder would be in a good position to coordinate that as the Director. Mr. Taylor stated that he had no qualms with saving money, however, he wanted to ensure that they were comparing apples to apples. That the comparisons were on equal ground, meaning employee cost comparisons would include benefits etc versus what might not be paid at the consultant level.

Also in terms of scaling back, with the compartmentalization of projects, Mr. Taylor questioned if projects could be divided in a way that would be fairly seamless? His main concern was that Blueprint had accomplished a tremendous amount of work in a very short period of time. Notwithstanding the fact that all of the funded projects were in the works, they still needed to be completed. Particularly to the extent that, by dispersing portions to the City or County, projects could become bogged down in bureaucratic process. Mr. Taylor was concerned that it would reflect negatively on the organization itself and assuredly on the renewal or extension of the sales tax.

Mr. Taylor question staff as to how much right of way (ROW) was left to obtain for funded projects. Mr. Tedder stated that ROW would need to be funded for Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3, Capital Circle Southwest (Blueprint received \$2.7M for design of CCSW from FDOT) once designed; currently however there was no money for ROW or construction of CCSW. Mr. Taylor stated that Segment 3 was the real issue; Mr. Tedder concurred. Mr. Taylor felt that one of the most impressive qualities of Blueprint was its ability to obtain ROW ultimately with an efficient and cost effective process. Notwithstanding the fact that policy is to pay over appraisal, in regards to the incentive policy. Mr. Ross stated that the Management Review Committee was not making a judgment on that, only noting that the three Agencies, all managed by virtually the same people, all had different policies. That was something each of the Agencies could choose to review; he noted that the City was currently contracted with Blueprint for

the ROW acquisition on FAMU Way.

Mr. Taylor stated that Mr. Ross was reiterating his point. That some of the comparisons, while in the main were worthy of review, simply pointing out a difference without also explaining that there might be good reason for it, particularly in respect to the ROW process... Mr. Ross interjected that from the perspective of governmental accountability the thresholds with the City and County were set and included extra oversight. There was a trade off to whether you wanted something to move fast or wanted all of the accountability behind it. In their recommendation the Management Review Committee thought the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) should be more involved in the process than they currently were.

Mr. Taylor stated that the IMC had always had the ability to be involved in the processes however they cancelled the meetings. Mr. Ross stated that they pointed that out in the review. Mr. Tedder, as Planning Director and Director of PLACE would be able to have much more access to the IMC than there was in the past. Mr. Ross stated that they did not include 'why' meetings were missed just that it was one of the problems they identified. A member of the GEC staff clarified that the meetings were cancelled by the managers themselves, not by Blueprint. Mr. Ross concurred and stated that the Management Review Committee recommended that the IMC resume the meetings and take a more active role in Blueprint.

Mr. Ross stated that in regards to County capacity, the idea was not to slow the projects down but to review ways to save money and streamline processes. All governments were doing that. If the County could use existing resources to manage some of the contracts and reduce a layer of consultant contracting and oversight where possible, that would be a great thing. They did not want to slow it down just for City or County staff to bring all engineering in-house and not have general consulting because the projects would stall. Continuity was critical, he stated.

Mr. Taylor suggested that another approach could be to renegotiate the terms of the contract, keep it outsourced, and downsize County and City staff. If there was capacity ... it was another option. Mr. Ross stated that the County had looked at privatizing, they downsized staff, and the engineers still say they could be more involved in the process. Just to say downsize County staff...they had looked at privatization with the consultants to help Blueprint 2000 complete their mandate. They had accomplished a lot of projects but it had also cost a lot of money. With overhead charges, bonuses, and built in escalators for pay, those were things that would not ordinarily be seen in government structure. The benefits were being paid ... you've been around seven-years and the contract was extended to 2015; that was 15-years. That was an ingrained bureaucracy. Mr. Taylor stated that he understood... Mr. Ross interrupted saying that was why they looked at it. They did not go through each Letter of Agreement (LOA). Some might need more consultant help than others, but there might be other ones... That was why they requested, they (IA) approved that Mr. Tedder review each issue on an objective basis to see what could be paired down for cost savings.

Mr. Taylor wholeheartedly endorsed that proposal, but again the structure for the accountability had always been in place. If the issue was "is Blueprint and the City and County and the citizens getting the benefit of the contract" that was an oversight responsibility of the IMC. To the extent they have not then the contract needed to be renegotiated. The accountability was an issue in terms of keeping the contractor in line with what they were supposed to do in terms of deliverables. It was not necessarily an issue of saying it was inherent improvement in accountability, because you overlay a bureaucracy on it. To compare apples to apples on accountability, another issue for accountability, was holding the contractor to the terms of the contract or renegotiating the terms.

Mr. Ross stated that was done under the terms of the previous Blueprint 2000 Executive Director. The Management Review Committee thought it would be better to review the LOAs because that was where the money was. The overhead rates in the LOAs were not rates that one would normally see in government. If they were paying excessive rates but could look at something and make a blended model they might save money and get more projects done.

Tom O'Steen stated that unfortunately he was the only institutional knowledge of where Blueprint began to where it was currently. He stated that he did not want Mr. Ross to take any of the questions as personal attacks because they were not on any of the Management Review Committee individually. However, what they had produced in the form of the report and restructuring plan was significantly at odds with what Blueprint was about to change to. The genesis of the entire program was NOT to have City and County staff design, permit, and construct the (Tier 1) infrastructure projects. It was one of the main tenets of the entire program. It grew, frankly, out of a significant frustration that while both governments had perfectly capable staff to do those types of projects, the projects were not happening. There was more infighting between the two governments that did not promote progress for very long periods of time.

A citizens group came together (the EECC) and their main points were securing funding through a sales tax extension, the identification of specific projects, and a structure that specifically did not do (what the Management Review Committee had set into motion) was based on a very real dissatisfaction in the community. The EECC pretty well went from business to environmental activist groups. It was not a road-builders coalition or rich people on the north side of town coalition; it was a relatively broad group of individuals that came together to make things happen. To make it happen faster and look different than they had in the past. To remove the political problem between the two local governments that seemed to precluding progress from occurring.

Mr. O'Steen stated that while he was not a numbers guy and thanked Mr. Taylor for taking that on, the same questions were raised. What was the budget of the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department? How did it match up with the construction projects that had been completed over the same period of time? What were those construction projects? Did they follow the same tenets? Did they have the same appearance, aesthetics, and character as Blueprint projects?

Then, if at the end of the day the numbers between Blueprint and the City Public Works Department were significantly skewed, then there were discussion to be had about budgets and pricing issues, etc. Which was Mr. Taylor's point, no one voted for the sales tax extension with the express understanding that the projects would cost five times what they normally would otherwise; the support would not have been there. The projects had generalized budgets attached to them with identified sources of the budgets which came from the City, County and independent consultant staff estimating projected costs.

As a prime example, Cascades Park had far exceeded the initial construction cost they envisioned for it. But so had the vision for what the project was to become. To the point of the projects proceeding over a long period of time with, not just significant, but out of this world public involvement including both governments as well as the general public, well advertised and extremely well attended by the public to say, 'here's an even better idea' than those people who had a concept of a park that could help address flooding on Franklin Boulevard and do something positive for the downtown area. It has expanded way beyond the original concepts or imaginations. Without trying to step on any City or County staff toes, he did not think the elements of Cascades Park would have come from government staff. They did not come from the consultants; some of those who originally envisioned what Cascades Park could be. There were far more creative minds and talent that eventually came to bear and make it something that will be absolutely remarkable; perhaps, not even comparable to other places in the state.

The idea of evaluating a program with regard to 'could it be more cost effective' was a fine and admirable task. One thing that was said in the presentation that Mr. O'Steen hoped was not true or he might have taken out of context because it was what he wanted to hear was that it seemed as though the outcome of the report was predicated before the report. The comment was (related to hiring of a new Blueprint Director), "*We didn't want to hire someone and change the organizational structure of it two months later.*" If the report had only been made available in June it seemed as though there was an orchestrated effort to reorganize the program in advance of finding the documentation that made the suggestion to reorganize the program. He understood that in the economic times, both governments were looking to pare down their budgets while at the same time retaining as much personnel and resources they have. However, it seemed like they were given a report to substantiate an effort to keep City and County Public Works Departments busy. Whereas, to Mr. Taylor's point, perhaps they were overstaffed already.

Mr. Ross stated that no one was saying that there were extra or wasted resources or capacity at the City or County. Nor that the way Blueprint 2000 operates would change. The reporting of the new Blueprint Director, through Mr. Tedder (Director of PLACE) was not intended to slow the processes down. It was a way to ensure that things continued to move forward. When the Management Review Committee met in January 2011, they had collected extensive amounts of data and interviewed Blueprint 2000 staff and saw where changes could potentially be made. They then learned that Phil Maher would retire, creating another opportunity to look at doing things differently. The report put ideas forth for the IMC to review. They did; they put Mr. Tedder in on an interim

basis; it worked well and the IA voted for the transition. There were no preconceived notions regarding the report.

Blueprint 2000, as reported through the Performance Audits, walked on water, Mr. Ross stated. He could not find anything negative to say about the Agency. Some of the later performance audits were mostly "fluff and vanilla" and the recommendation was not to use that company again. The money could be better spent elsewhere.

The intent was to use the consultants in a coordinated way with existing resources as they were available, stated Mr. Ross. That was for Mr. Tedder to determine with Misters Gabe Menendez and Tony Park, Directors of City and County Public Works respectively, how to do that. Mr. Ross noted that the other local governments also hired consultants; his point was that Blueprint might not need as many layers of consultants to accomplish the project list. It was reported at the beginning of the program, that the costs for Blueprint 2000 would fluctuate with the General Engineering Contract; those costs had stayed relatively consistent. There could be good reason for that, but should they pay the overhead charges that were allowable by FDOT and by their models. Government, through its innate structure could pickup much of the overhead costs that were billed out by private companies.

Dave Snyder, Program Manager for Blueprint 2000, stated that the workload for the Agency had not diminished. In fact, it was heavier than it had ever been. Projects had moved from design to construction. There were projects that were currently under construction and demanded significant amounts of staff time and effort. As a point of clarification, he stated, there was not "layer after layer" of consultants. The team was comprised of project managers and specially selected experts (i.e. surveyor, drainage engineer, geo-tech engineer, etc.) utilized for specific tasks as needed. They did not over see anything; they do actual, specialized work which was necessary for the completion of the project.

He further stated that Blueprint had been extremely successful in leveraging funds; \$9M for N-2 and \$2.7M for design of W-1 from FDOT just that year. He and Dave Bright had recently worked out a spreadsheet of funding received through grants and other programs; it was in excess of \$110M above and beyond sales tax dollars and during a recession. That was possible because of Blueprint's reputation of getting the job done; that's why FDOT and other agencies gave the money to Blueprint.

In the comparison of 'apples to apples' the amount of time to complete a project was not factored into the 7.5% (management costs) for Blueprint to accomplish projects. Mr. Snyder stated that he found it impossible to believe that the County only charged 1% for Orange Avenue because it was such a difficult project. That number seemed extremely low. The time factor was the critical piece. Blueprint got the job done, as they had been charged to do; and they were doing it well.

He understood the need for audit given the timing and. The standard answer to it would always be, 'there's a way to do it more efficiently.' Mr. Tedder's charge was to review

that and do something given that the Executive Director and Finance Manger were no longer with Blueprint.

Mr. Snyder also wanted it to be completely clear and well known that the workload at Blueprint had not diminished. Staff worked 11 hour days, handling a \$25M world-class park and had \$50M in roadway construction coming up – and a project that just received an additional \$10M to extend it further south. As well as more design work coming up on CCSW. That one, Blueprint did not even know was coming. They were handed \$2.7M by FDOT because FDOT was confident in Blueprint's reputation of getting it done.

Tom O'Steen stated he had one more point to make and would unfortunately have to leave after that. The sales tax, however, would be up for extension in a few years. He was unaware of the City or County's positions; would they support it? Would they want another round of Blueprint projects to be the frontrunners? Whether there was another civic cause that might be a better thing, in their view, to receive those (potential) funds?

Mr. O'Steen thought it worthy to consider that the Blueprint program had Tier 1 and Tier 2 lists. There were many more projects to be completed and funding if the sales tax were to be extended and the funding plugged into the Blueprint program. Not to mention the projects that had been moved to the back burner because of issues like having design money but not for construction. If the money was there (the sales tax extension), the program was in place that had achieved a great deal that would be able to take advantage of those funds in the same way they were approved the first time. Whether the voters would chose to do that again, he did not have a clue. However, evaluation of what had been accomplished in the time of Blueprint and compared it to either the City or County, in the same window of time, looking for similar numbers of projects of that significance ... he dared say, they would be hard pressed to do it.

Blueprint was a phenomenal success, potentially for coincidental reasons, but certainly "beyond the wildest expectations" of the original EECC concepts. They had an idea; maybe it was the right time or it merged well with what the community wanted. In anyone's professional career there were always highlights that one was extremely proud to have been a part of; Blueprint was absolutely one of Mr. O'Steen's highlights. He would forever be grateful and feel lucky to have known the individuals and been a part of what became Cascades Park and a completed beltway around our community; the purchase of conservation lands to secure stormwater-sheds and headwaters.

He was certain that the sensitivity and concern of the CAC was conveyed about where they thought the review and restructure was headed from the nature of their questions. He reiterated that it was not personal, it was however, hard to watch something that was done so well suddenly become the victim of an effort which appeared to be to cannibalize it and for whatever purposes, diminish its success.

Ron Pease stated that he might not be able to speak with the same amount of emotion and sensitivity as Mr. O'Steen. He explained that he was a newer member of the CAC but he

also felt emotion and sensitivity to what had transpired. It seemed that Blueprint was paying the price for the uniqueness of its structure and origin of effort. It was as though the uniqueness had caught up with them. Perhaps, because of the time they were living in and the concerns over the economy or employment. It seemed to him that they were where they were due to a degree of lack of oversight by the IMC that should have been keeping tabs if there were concerns about the operation and costs of projects. That horse was out of the barn some time ago, he stated.

The question of why the Executive Director of Blueprint had more purchasing authority than the persons he reported to ... that decision did not happen recently. It was from sometime in the past and had been true for many years. He was not sure it was an issue that was truly relevant to the current issues. Mr. O'Steen knew the history because of his years of involvement. Mr. Pease stated he was not as familiar with the history but had tried to learn it over the last two years. However, what questions were asked or how much research was done? Ms. Thompson stated at the IA meeting that the IMC had been discussing the issue since the first of the year (2011). Perhaps, as far as anyone knew, it was before that. Who researched the history? Who spoke with the people that were involved from the beginning? Including Mr. O'Steen or a current member of the City Commission, who was one of the founding members of Blueprint. At the IA she (Nancy Miller) pointed out that she wanted more detail; requesting that from Mr. Ross. During the course of the meeting where recommended action was taken, he did not hear any comments from anyone who could have provided the history or rationale of how the program developed.

He was not in favor of spending tax payers money, his money more than was necessary to get a good, efficient job done. Up to that point in time, however, there had not been a question regarding the costs. By the figures and charts shown in the report he could see the concern. That had been a long time coming. He was not sure if any of the CAC members had been interviewed or had an opportunity for input. He was not sure what the role of the CAC was any longer. Perhaps the acting or new Director would have thoughts on that. He could not see where the CAC had been asked to participate in the research or move that was not just a recommendation. It had been approved, a fete accompli. The meeting with the CAC should have been held a long time ago.

Mr. Ross stated that the report noted that the CAC's role should remain unchanged. Mr. Pease stated that he saw that and appreciated it, however he was no longer sure of what their role was. They were sitting around a table discussing something that had been decided and voted on already.

Dale Landry stated that he, flat out, did not like any of it. It made no sense whatsoever to him. A couple of items that were said concerned him from the perspective of his position as the President of NAACP. Blueprint was a citizen's initiative, with input by voters. He questioned if Blueprint was established in the referendum process, on the ballot, or after the fact? He was concerned because he had seen that type of foolishness before and it angered him. Some people sitting on a commission decide to override what the citizens voted on, to forward their own agenda. He was in strong opposition to the actions taken

and was not opposed to seeking support or review to the federal level if necessary.

He was bothered on a personal level because the staff of Blueprint were good people and had always been prompt and efficient in their responses to him. The process always involved coming to a common ground of understanding. It looked like government was stepping in once Blueprint was successful to say they then wanted to run it. He did not care if it was City or County; he had watched Blueprint struggle without money, leverage the funds available to bring in more and move projects forward.

Mr. Taylor echoed Mr. O'Steen's point; there was a considerable bit of energy and passion however it was not directed at any on personally or negatively. Mr. Ross acknowledged that the Management Review Committee were the ones who did the study at the direction of the IMC. As someone pointed out annual audits only looked at one year. Looking at all seven years together was when the vision could come for potential changes. He did not see Blueprint 2000 in its current capacity changing; he requested Mr. Tedder's confirmation. They were looking at LOAs to save money.

Mr. Taylor stated that ultimately the recommendations were fairly innocuous. They were basically saying they were going to try to take an Intergovernmental Agency, merge it with another Intergovernmental Agency (Planning) and essentially try to obtain some efficiency from that process. As well, the CAC was still part of that process and essentially serving the same role as always, being kept abreast of the projects and having input directly to the IA through the Chairman's report. Aside from the reorganization the things that were of concern were the overall impact on the Agency in terms of efficiencies, results and timing of the projects, etc. The Agency, even though it was an Intergovernmental Agency like the Planning Department, Blueprint had an elevated status within the community because it was unique. He put forth that there were potentially people in the community that thought Blueprint had little to do with local government or was a government agency. It had its own identity. Lumping it in the PLACE Department with Planning would very likely water down the perceived independence and status.

There was value in having Blueprint 2000 as a stand alone entity. From a financial side there was a dedicated funding source, the sales tax. It was to pay bond debt service. Those bonds had been issued, were outstanding, and were sold to pay project costs. The Planning Department was funded from general revenue from ad valorem taxes. He would hate to see sales tax dollars bled off, indirectly because they were able to offset other costs. There were ways to do it without actually having to funnel costs here or there, he stated. For example, how City or County staff would be paid if they were working on Blueprint projects. If the idea was to obtain efficiencies by using City or County staff, what dollars would they be paid from; sales tax or ad valorem tax dollars? Sales tax dollars were designated to go to the Blueprint projects.

Having the dedicated funding source paired off and flowing directly to Blueprint was something Mr. Taylor stated he would be concerned about. He would hate to see even a well intended leveraging of sales tax dollars to deal with, uplift, or backfill funding for

projects that should have been funded by ad valorem tax dollars. That would have an impact on the perceived effectiveness of the Agency in the community when they tried for a sales tax extension. Overall, they were optics and good management to wall off the revenue sources, however, all of that had been proposed from the stand point of leveling some criticism. With a "hey, let's shine a light on this problem, an overfunding of outside consultants." As Mr. Pease pointed out however, that did not happen yesterday. The fact that there might have been some bureaucracy or agency capture, he stated he understood the difficulties of working with people day to day to get in their face and say "you need to write this down." That was the role of the IMC to exercise avenues of accountability.

Windell Page stated that he accepted that change was inevitable and could be good. He concurred infallibly with many of the perspectives as they related to changes for the better. Blueprint had been extremely successful in its achievement of spending with minority and women owned businesses. The numbers of expenditures across the board, Blueprint's percentage goals had been very robust in their spending. As President of the Tallahassee Chamber he knew that the City and County were both challenged to spend those robust percentages with MBEs. Anytime that spending was in single digits it was not considered robust. He accepted the fact that there might be recommendations and changes, hopefully, for the better. However he would like the CAC to at least be aware that Blueprint's achievements as related to diversity could be effected if it were to go to the City or County where MBE spending was not as robust.

Christic Henry stated that as the CONA representative she was curious what exactly were the efficiencies they hoped to achieve by merging the two Intergovernmental Agencies? Mr. Ross stated an immediate one would be in not hiring a Financial Manager. There would be an economy of scale in the PIO functions that could be achieved using the existing City and County PIO offices and with using some of the staff engineering resources available on the TCC. Potentially, there was also opportunity to save on overhead costs that were currently paid out of sales tax dollars. That was why Mr. Tedder would be reviewing the nine LOAs and/or contracts to see what could be pared down while still receiving a quality product.

Ms. Henry stated that Mr. Snyder spoke of the workload being as busy as ever. Even with some neighborhoods being unhappy about eminent domain issues that had arisen with the purchasing of ROW, one thing they were happy about was the efficiency of the projects. When government compounded itself, those types of efficiencies were sometimes lost. It could bring other problems, especially from a public perspective. Fiscal efficiencies were great but how would they impact the time efficiencies that Blueprint was able to attain by its uniqueness. How would it impact the ability to complete the projects in a timely manner? Would there be increased "red tape" by the compounded responsibilities?

Mr. Ross stated that they had been involved with multiple management reviews the TDC, CVB, Growth Management, EDC, etc and every one had involved the implementation of greater efficiencies because they found new or different perspectives from which to view

the situations. Whether all recommendations were implemented or that they might not really work after all, or change another thing instead; Mr. Tedder would have that flexibility. He would take his plan for the 19 recommendations back to the IA. Some, as was stated earlier, were innocuous. One, however, that was frustrating from a management perspective, was that Blueprint's records were stored in four separate locations. Trying to find records for Blueprint was difficult with his staff having to go to the County Clerk's office, the City's Treasurer Clerk, Blueprint, or the (storage) church. Those types of improvements to efficiencies would make it easier for Blueprint. All that was really happening to Blueprint, Mr. Ross stated, was that it was changing its reporting structure to go through the Director of PLACE. For everything else, Mr. Tedder had been instructed to review processes to see where they could find economies of scale and savings.

David Jones stated that he was relatively new and still learning the history as well. As the Representative of the Disabled Community, his first objective was to always look out for their needs, ensuring that the projects were accessible and usable for everyone. As well as a life long environmentalist and citizen of Tallahassee who wanted to see good things continue to happen here with conservation in mind. His main concern with more City and County involvement was ADA compliance. There were multiple existing violations that the City and County have not addresses; some they had but many that they had not. There was a lack of through preliminary design for the minimum standards of ADA compliance but for universal design. His experience with government, City and County, was that many times constraints of budget or oversight resulted in planning for the minimum with hope that it would get them by. Their standards were lower from the beginning, in his experience. Whereas Blueprint with consultants was more cutting edge or currently schooled or aware of accessibility in universal design produced a much better product from design to construction than might happen otherwise.

Secondly, from a personal perspective, he had proposed to the County the construction of a Miracle League Sports Field for people with disabilities. The County was receptive and donated money and land at Tom Brown. With that start, they went to the City for another partner and the vision grew. There was more buy in, the City donated an existing field with infrastructure. The project took off and was completed with minimal financial input because of donations. Private consultants, architects, engineers, and contractors helped complete it. He learned from that experience how government agencies sometimes are hindered in the process, even when it is their project or they were involved in the project. With a more private community based effort projects simply moved faster with very positive outcomes. He was quite concerned with the transition to a more bureaucratic approach to getting the projects done that had been identified as so valuable. There were limitations but a good thing that came out of the report was that the program should consider evaluating what could be done better. It did feel like a threat because he did not want to see a good program, that worked well, changed to become another government project. He was protective and proud of what had been accomplished. He was open minded enough to see the value in the review, but cautioned the Management Review Committee, Mr. Tedder, the IMC and IA not to be drastic in their proposal to completely change the direction of success.

Mr. Ross stated that Mr. Tedder would work with the IMC to ensure that did not happen. They were looking to finish the projects and do whatever they could. They looked at it as an opportunity to... they did not see a change in the CAC, the projects would keep going, they changed the reporting structure and looked at the LOAs to see what could be pared down and where they could save money.

Erin Ennis stated that anything that shed more light on the finances was important. The CAC had struggled in the past with the clarity of some of the financial reporting. They had been asked to approve a budget that was difficult to understand. She had known Mr. Tedder for many years and knew that he was a quality person who would add value to any project he touched. At the same time, she thought that if the Blueprint program was diluted in any way it would struggle to obtain citizen funding (support for the sales tax extension) because the citizens have believed in Blueprint. They had seen concrete things come out of it.

Ms. Ennis stated that the CAC needed to be restructured. She had been personally offended that they were not informed of the change of leadership at the time it was happening. She had been personally offended that they had to read about it in the local paper. The CAC was not an advisory committee and it was a joke to call them that. The Intergovernmental Agency asked for their time, their commitment, and then sends them literally a quarter inch of paperwork, much of the time very technical paperwork and asks them to come to the meetings prepared. Then they did not really care what the CAC's opinion really was or if they did they did not demonstrate it. They would either have to either make it a Citizens Advisory Committee or restructure it.

Mr. Landry stated that the information about the differences in the MBE numbers of Blueprint and the City and County were problematic for him. When a light was shone on one thing it hits many other things in the process. Also, he agreed with Ms. Ennis and questioned what advisory role they played. He sat on many other advisory boards where the members were listened to and given respect. Lastly, regarding the restructuring of management, he questioned who the former Executive Director reported to. It was clarified that he reported directly to the IMC. However, now that position would report to someone (Director of PLACE) who reported to the IMC. That too was problematic because the raw data was filtered through another person; who could be told to keep things quiet or not bring information out in meetings. They could have done that before but why was the additional filter necessary?

Mr. Landry asked Mr. Tedder to clarify the purpose of the Planning Department. Mr. Tedder stated that they managed the comprehensive plan for the City and County. They oversaw the Canopy Road CAC, the Planning Commission, and were members of the Water Resource Board, and did contracts to some degree, although not nearly to the extent that Blueprint did. Mr. Landry questioned what their MBE participation numbers were. Mr. Tedder stated that the Planning Department contracted under the City's procurement policies; however Blueprint would remain the same. Mr. Paige stated that the City's overall MBE participation number was in the 7% range. Blueprint was closer to 15-17%.

Mr. Landry again asked why was it necessary to go the route chosen. The CAC had asked its questions, however, as a representative of the NAACP he would have to follow up on that individually. Mr. Landry questioned when the Planning Department had last been audited. Mr. Tedder stated it had been approximately eight years ago. Mr. Ross stated the list of MBEs that were used by Blueprint 2000 was specified by the City and County. They had to receive approval for the use of other vendors.

Mr. Landry stated that as a result of the management review of Blueprint 2000 the City and County decided to restructure Blueprint underneath another Intergovernmental Agency. Mr. Tedder stated, no. Mr. Landry asked for clarification. Mr. Tedder stated that he wanted to give everyone the opportunity to speak before he gave a start to finish from his perspective.

Mr. Tedder outlined his history, in the Planning Department for 14-years and before that with a local consulting firm doing engineering, planning, and surveying. He had been the Director of the Planning Department for more than seven years. He thoroughly enjoyed working with the Planning Department because it granted him access to every single department in the City or County and was on a first name basis with each of the Directors of those departments.

Mr. Tedder stated that he met with Blueprint staff two days after the IA meeting, and reiterated to the CAC the same message that he was not coming into Blueprint, guns blazing telling folks to pack their offices. It would take a significant amount of time to go through the issues that were raised. Given the fact that the Executive Director and Finance Manager positions were vacant, his priority was in doing both those jobs and making sure projects moved forward as quickly as possible. He could hire someone else later. Keeping the projects moving for the community was his number one priority.

Regarding minority participation, that was one of the first things he checked coming into Blueprint. Mr. Snyder pulled together the information and stated Blueprint averaged 15-17% MBE, but was greater than 20% on construction. He had no intention of changing that and hoped Mr. Landry would not make that an issue because it was not for him. If some of the consultants were moved out of Blueprint that might affect the MBE participation, and that would be one of the factors he considered if he made any recommendations.

His second priority would be the hiring of the Blueprint manager to handle the day-to-day operations. There were many technical questions and problems to handle daily. Cascades Park was a prime example. It was an exceptionally complicated project. Once the Manager was hired and had a good understanding of what Blueprint was about, he would address the recommendations. Yes, the CAC was an extremely important part of Blueprint. He could not imagine not having a CAC to ensure the politicians stayed honest to the original intent. Essentially, that was the role of the CAC.

Mr. Landry stated that he hoped Mr. Tedder understood, that was why they requested the special meeting and were asking the questions of him and the Management Review

Committee. They meant no disrespect, truly. His concern was that they had to read about it in the paper. He was angry that the process did not include the CAC; that changes were made without their knowledge or input.

Burt Davy stated that he, Mr. Tedder and Ms. Henry sat on an interview committee for the Executive Director position. Had Mr. Tedder been an applicant as opposed to an interviewer, Mr. Davy stated that Mr. Tedder would have had his vote, hands down. What was being stated by the CAC members was not, in his opinion, a reflection on Mr. Tedder. Mr. Tedder understood.

He had read the report, albeit not in great detail as he was not a management consultant and did not do that type of work. If he could find fault in it, however, it would be that after the Management Review Committee reached their findings they did not give existing staff the opportunity to respond to them to determine if they perhaps had a skewed view of one thing or another. Mr. Ross stated that normally they would have done that. However because the executive leadership was involved with Blueprint at the time of the review and with the time constraints of the June 20th meeting time of the IA, the senior management team did not want it to be delayed to September and have only an interim arrangement, they thought it important to take it to the IA in June. Normally, he repeated, they would have turned the report over to anyone they reviewed to ask for comments, but the principals were no longer at Blueprint and time was sensitive, they were instructed to prepare the report for the IA meeting.

Mr. Davy stated that he appreciated that. While the principals, meaning Jim Davis and Phil Maher, were not working for Blueprint any longer they were certainly available. Their review and comments could have still happened. He too was particularly disturbed to have read it in the newspaper. That there were no consultations or discussions on it; it was done. In the meeting itself several of the elected commissioners stated they had just gotten the report at the meeting, yet an hour later they voted on it unanimously. He could not help but have the feeling watching it, that it was a done deal from the beginning. The quickness of it, the fact that it was issued late on a Friday and the elected commissioners did not receive it until Monday morning...no one had a chance to review it yet they voted on it. That was a serious problem for him. He wrote off a rather terse email to all of the commissioners. Reading back over it maybe it was too terse; enough that no one responded to it. Out of twelve commissioners he only received two phone calls.

It was voted on by the IA as an agenda modification, added the day of the meeting so that no one knew it would be presented. It went to the City Commission as a ratification as an added agenda item; again, no one knew it would be there. It went to the County Commission on the consent agenda. There was no discussion on it; none. No one could have any discussion on it because it was a done deal.

As a member of the CAC, the Planning Commission, and other bodies, stated Mr. Davy, he was part of government. It was a direct reflection on him as part of government. That was not the way to do business; government was supposed to operate in the sunshine. Granted, no laws were violated; no sunshine laws were violated, he was certain.

However, to see that Mr. Long stated that public input was not wanted ... he quoted, *"they did not want everyone in the world reacting to the report prior to the Board getting the document to review."* Yes, stated Mr. Davy, everyone would react to the report. The Democrat had an editorial about it. Gerald Ensley wrote a column about it. As a member of government, that was...icky.

Mr. Taylor stated that the CAC definitely needed to impart to the IA that no matter how productive or innocuous the recommendations might have been, the well had been poisoned by the process through which they were presented. He understood, in some way, why they followed the process they choose. Perhaps there was concern that there would be the wrong kind of input provided prior to public discussion. He did not know if things could be orchestrated in that way, to prevent public input and not be the recipient of the backlash they were experiencing from no one having input.

He stated that he learned about the report two hours prior to the IA meeting from Jim Davis but still had no idea what it was about. Being the first speaker at the IA, however, it would have been awkward for him to preempt the IMC or IA. He decided not to do that, instead choosing to listen to their discussion of it through the meeting. Blueprint was created by a citizen's initiative and the delivery of the report did not speak to the IMC's value of anyone else's input. It was critical that it was conveyed and would be included in his September Chairman's report to the IA.

Burt Davy stated that he understood the history because he served on the initial CAC for six years through the formation of Blueprint. The only committee he regretted not having served on was the EECC. He was deeply concerned that the move would be perceived as Blueprint now being part of local government. He was concerned that the sales tax extension would be harmed because of it.

Mr. Davy stated that he spoke with Gary Yordon, of Governance, Inc. and one of the people involved in creating Blueprint and Mr. Yordon requested he relay the following: Mr. Yordon felt that any extension of the sales tax was in serious jeopardy because the way the Management Review report was handled. He sent a text to Anita Favors Thompson stating, "You killed it." That was his impression from a public relations perspective.

Shelonda Meeks stated that she wanted to make clear that regarding Mr. Ross' comments on Blueprint's record keeping practices, at the time of the review Blueprint was in the midst of physically relocating the offices. They were packing boxes and moving from a larger space in Koger to the current, much smaller SunTrust location. Their records were in multiple locations due to constraints in storage. Some older records were moved to the church building for storage. Furthermore, when Blueprint was originally organized decisions were made regarding who would handle various portions of the program. The financial needs of Blueprint were handled by the City because all procurement and invoice payments were with them. Therefore all financial records had to be with them. The IA also decided, so that there would be shared services, the County Clerk of Court would be the Clerk for Blueprint. Consequently some records are stored with the City,

some with the County for those reasons. Mr. Ross stated that they understood those reasons but thought it needed to be changed; that all records should be maintained by the City. Mr. Landry stated that Mr. Davis' explained to him on his CAC orientation tour that Blueprint used the church for storage because of space restrictions at the office. He felt it was a wise use of space owned by Blueprint rather than paying for storage elsewhere.

Mr. Davy stated that was the beauty of Blueprint; the ability to move, to run through the line and dodge...to get things done. He reminded everyone of the projects Blueprint had accomplished: Cascades Park under construction, Capital Circle, Martha Wellman Park. Places that were neat and added real value to the community. Could the City or County have done the same, he asked. Of course they could, but would they have been done as quickly and effectively? He was not a numbers guy but understood that the Blueprint projects cost more. As a tax payer he was fine with that because... Mr. Taylor interjected that the projects were voted on, that was the key. The projects that were voted on were approved and were being accomplished. Mr. Davy continued that it came back to the Executive Director having, for example, the authority of a \$750K threshold for acquisition; the County Administrator and City Manager not. As a tax payer, Mr. Davy stated that he wanted the Blueprint Director to have that ability. The projects were finished or in progress and were good projects!

Comparing that to the City, he rhetorically asked, how long did the Blair Stone Road extension take? Projects with the City and County historically were bogged down by the bureaucracy and politics. Blueprint did not; for many reasons, one being they had a specific list of projects. The other was that they had flexibility to "dodge and weave." He did not think anything illegal or unethical ever happened. Blueprint worked; it was not broken. Why were they trying to fix something that was not broken?

Mr. Tedder stated that it was important to realize that Blueprint was not moving under any City or County agency. It was standing alone as before. He was simply managing two Departments that had the same reporting structure. He understood the City system, was in it for 14-years and managing in it for seven. He had the ability for daily access to the City Manager and County Administrator because of him being so involved with other Departments' business. He offered the example of the Riley House involvement with the Smokey Hollow component of Cascades Park and that he had the perfect person in the Planning Department to facilitate that. Blueprint had the design components down; they would be working with the Riley House to come up with a design that could be implemented in the future.

When he was working in the Planning Department he was pulled by the 'issue of the day.' City and County staff were pulled from projects to solve those issues. The beauty of Blueprint from his perspective was that they had the luxury of rocking and rolling; the ability to focus on the project without the concern of Joe Q. Public's issue with trash on the side of the road. However, everything done by Blueprint related to other City or County Departments – utility coordination, etc. He had the experience and relationship with the Directors of those departments to quickly resolve those issues. He was not

making a sales pitch, he was enjoying the opportunity. Blueprint staff was excellent. It was almost a break for him to deal with Blueprint issues compared to the Planning Department.

There had been concern about his availability or capacity to serve over both departments. Last October, Mr. Tedder stated that he had the opportunity to serve as an Assistant City Manager on an interim basis, and realized that he was able to appoint someone to run the Planning Department during that time. That allowed him to oversee the Department but in a different role. The Planning Department continued to function well and while that was not part of the discussion that was where they were at the time of the Blueprint review. He was also in the process of hiring a Planning Manager; his number two was retiring the following day. There was an interim manager there as well.

The day-to-day operations would be run by the new Department Managers. Mr. Tedder would be coordinating the issues between the bigger picture of the City, County and Blueprint of which there were many. A good example of that were greenways; Blueprint had done an exceptional job on the acquisition of greenway property. Each one of those was in the Greenways Master Plan, which the Planning Department coordinated. The Planning Department could show Mr. Bright the map and he would get the money and make the acquisition. They had a great relationship! He was looking forward to the opportunity to bridge the gaps.

Mr. Tedder stated that he was exceedingly interested in the success of the sales tax extension and having another round of Blueprint. He had watched the ways it had changed the community and wanted to be involved with it. His personal belief on the Tier 2 projects, that to that point have been unfunded, was that they should be reevaluated to see if the priorities had shifted. He thought there would be a substantial list of other projects they might want to consider; possibly additional greenways or connector roadways. Simply moving those projects up without evaluation might not be the best decision. He had the ability through his involvement in the Greenways Master Plan, the Water Sewer Long Range Master Plan, the Long Range Transportation Plan to see the bigger picture for Tallahassee, the big issues for the City and County, and the opportunity for the sales tax extension and the impact that would have for the community. He understood the needs of the community because he had worked five sector plans for Tallahassee. All of that was to say that the Planning Department had done a significant amount of planning since Blueprint's inception. Furthermore, a lot of planning had been done to try to pull some of those ideas together for the next round of Blueprint.

Regarding the lack of participation or communication with the CAC on the part of the IMC, he understood the negative connotation. The reviewers met with the original members of the EECC for at least two meetings. They tried to reach out, to talk to the group that founded Blueprint with their idea. Mr. Tedder was involved in one of those meetings. He did not want the IMC characterized as not being thoughtful of Blueprint and what it meant because they went to the original EECC members, some of whom were also members of the CAC (Kevin McGorty and Tom O'Steen plus two members of the City Commission, Mark Mustian and Nancy Miller). Mr. Tedder knew that Mr. McGorty

declined to participate in the meetings stating that he was ready to retire from that role.

Ron Pease stated that he hoped Mr. Tedder would be able to, in the future, educate the IMC in regard to the interest, involvement and their responsibility to use an advisory council such as the Blueprint CAC. Also, did Mr. Tedder anticipate any change in the professional staffing of Blueprint? Mr. Tedder stated no. He had worked with a lot of folks and there had not been a second...Blueprint's response to requests had been immediate. As long as that need was out there, the community would need people like Blueprint staff, like LPA.

Mr. Taylor asked to begin wrapping up the conversations as they were nearing the end of their two hours. He thanked Scott Ross and Beckye Simpson for the presentation stating that it was informative. He thanked Mr. Tedder as well. He stated that he had the opportunity for some one-on-one time with Mr. Tedder and had been super impressed with his skill, dedication, and ability to jump in and run with it. As Ms. Ennis pointed out, there was a unique way the financial information had been presented in the past. Those that were in the system understood it but it had a steep learning curve and if one was away from it for awhile it was difficult to get back. The work Mr. Tedder had done to simplify the reporting of Blueprint's finances was very good, from Mr. Taylor's perspective.

He reminded the CAC that there would be another meeting prior to the September IA. However the take-away from the meeting and the report to the IA, from his perspective, would be to summarize the views that were expressed by the members. He was open to anyone from the group presenting if they so chose to also. Subject to reading the minutes, the views seemed to focus on:

1. frustration with being left out of the process and not being informed ahead of time of the report's recommendations and proposals
2. concern about the Agency's loss of independence from an optical perspective, at least
3. concern about whatever happens not having an adverse impact on the effectiveness of bringing the projects to completion
4. recognition that a reconsideration of the cost structures, in light of time; a fresh perspective; fiscal efficiencies
5. concerns about ensuring that the MBE participation remained as robust as it was under the established structure
6. no matter what the overall good intentions of the reorganization of Blueprint might be, that it overall not have an adverse impact on the timing, effectiveness, scale, scope, and overall vision and look of the projects

Windell Page stated he would be more specific regarding the overall look of the projects. It might not be the politically correct way to say it, however, the supply diversity also remains on the table as related to the completion of the projects. Christic Henry requested to add that they were concerned about not only fiscal efficiencies but the overall maintenance of efficiencies with the projects that were on going. That was

crucial, especially important to have neighborhood buy-in to the project. Mr. Taylor stated that Franklin Boulevard came to mind with that statement and of course, the completion of Cascades Park as well as Segment 3 of Capital Cascades Trail.

Mr. Tedder stated that there was one concern he had after reading the Management Review report regarding the participation of the CAC members. He had requested Blueprint legal counsel review the issue because the last thing he wanted was the perception of inappropriate participation of committee members. The report raised two issues, one with Kevin McGorty regarding the length of tenure on the CAC was actually a non-issue; staff reported the details of it to the City and County O&B folks who were fine with it. The second with Tom O'Steen regarding a potential conflict of interest because of his employment with Moore Bass, needed a cure. The County Attorney's office was dealing with another committee with conflict issues. They had found a conflict potential based on state statues that the IA would need to recognize and approve his participation by a formal vote. It had been done before and did not appear to be a significant issue, but a technicality that needed to be addressed. The CAC would need to make a recommendation on it however, Mr. Tedder stated that he would prefer to have a formal presentation made by Blueprint legal counsel at the August 25th CAC meeting.

Dave Bright stated that Mr. O'Steen's position would come up for renewal in November. It would be one of five appointments going before the Board in September. If Mr. O'Steen continued to serve it would have to be specifically pointed out to the IA. In either the CAC or IA action they would apply whatever action and acknowledgement that was necessary to allow him to serve.

Mr. Tedder stated that as a precaution Mr. O'Steen should not vote on issues at the August CAC meeting. Once the IA cured the issue he would have full voting status and participation again. Again, Mr. O'Steen could participate but could not vote.

Mr. Landry stated in support of Mr. Pease's last comments, the IMC was fully aware of the existence of the CAC. They did not have to go to the EECC. They were also aware of legal issues regarding the CAC because each member was appointed. To that extent, they knew. He was extremely upset by their blatant disregard of the CAC. Mr. Davy stated that he was not sure which was worse: being ignored or the IMC not knowing the CAC existed. It was one or the other, both were bad. Mr. Landry stated that the IA received the Chairman's report; they knew. Mr. Taylor stated that the Chairman position could also have been more vocal.

Mr. Taylor stated that Ms. Ennis' point on Agendas was good, however he felt it was more for the internal structure of the CAC. I thought they had more ability to insert their selves for example; they could set the tone and agenda for each of their meetings. They did not have to have presentation ad nauseum or graphics. They were nice and he understood that they were to help the members relate to the designs for certain segments of the community to weigh in on how wide projects were or their accessibility. It was more than the fiscal structure; it was the physical and environmental as well. The detail, in terms of the presentations related to that, however there were ways they could insert

them selves more. It was worth the CAC reviewing because obviously they were not vocal enough or much of a threat several weeks earlier.

Burt Davy stated that a new definition of the CAC and its role and duties was something that should come out of the review and meeting. The CAC's duties were very minimal according to the actual ballot language; to review the budget, period. They had expanded that over the years. It needed to be redefined; he suggested the members outline the duties they felt they should be doing. It needed to be presented to the IA and have them affirm or deny it. As a member of the committee he needed to know where they stood. Were they wasting their time? Were they making recommendations that were meaningless to the IA? Or did they have some weight? If the IA agreed with what the CAC described their duties as being, then they were on board. Short of that he was not sure what they were doing or why.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:38 pm.