

# Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 21, 2008

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

Jerry Conger called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.

## Committee Members present:

Jerry Conger	Lamar Taylor
Jess Van Dyke	Kevin McGorty
Steve Amnott	Hugh Brown
Gregg Patterson	Nancy Miller
Tom O’Steen	Kathy Archibald (telephonically)
Scott Balog (telephonically)	

## Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Dave Bright	Margie Quillman
Jim Davis	Angela Richardson
Phil Maher	Ray Youmans
Dave Snyder	Harry Reed
Jim Shepherd	Ryan Wetherall
Meredith Hurd	Ed Ringe
Latesa Turner	Ward Miller
Gary Phillips	

## Agenda Modifications

There were none.

## Director’s Comments

This item was informational only.

## Master Plan / Capital Budget Items

### **Item #1: Blueprint Projects: Corridor and Environmental Breakouts**

Jim Davis stated that staff followed through on the requested research from the May CAC meeting regarding the breakout of cost allocations on corridor and environmental projects. The historical data, from the original article printed in the Tallahassee Democrat regarding the referendum, the split would be 40 % for environmental projects; to include sidewalks, bike lanes, stormwater, etc. Staff recalculated the program and found that with the original program, prior to the \$109M reduction, the split was 48% for environmental. The new program, after the \$109M was taken out was 43% environmental. That did not include any costs associated with bike lanes, sidewalks, or the meandering trails. The inclusion of those, he was certain would drive environmental expenditures into the 50% bracket. The numbers, he felt, reflected an

appropriate split of green and gray projects.

Kathy Archibald stated that the City and County each took 10% of the collected sales tax off the top, in addition to the \$25M for Water Quality projects, for their own lists of projects. Out of that 10%, either the City or the County, possibly both, but one of those entities (noting that she was working from memory; her records were in Tallahassee and she was not) had a significant amount going to bicycle/pedestrian projects. She felt that was possibly what Mr. Jeff Hunter was alluding to with his comment of \$16M in stand alone bike/ped projects at the June 2008 IA meeting. She suggested reference to the City and County's 10% projects be added to the Agenda Item for the IA and also suggested that the IA review how each Agency had utilized those funds. Furthermore, she felt that the 10% allocations should be subject to the Performance Audit also; base on the actual language of the amendment.

**Tom O'Steen moved to request an explanation from the City and County, via the IA, of how those funds, the 10% of sales tax revenue, had been spent over the years.** Not to necessarily participate in the Blueprint Performance Audit; recognizing that each Agency was subject to their internal auditing processes. **Mrs. Archibald requested to include the \$25M for Water Quality as well. Mr. O'Steen agreed. Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

**Item #2: Capital Cascade Trail: Segments 3 & 4 Phase I Improvements; Segment 1 Interim Improvements**

Jim Davis stated that the Board's guidance to staff at the June IA meeting was not to analyze how funds could be reallocated from CCNW/SW but instead, to review Capital Cascade Trail Segments 1, 3 and 4 and identify the highest payoff items. They wanted to see where Blueprint could receive the most "bang for the buck" from the water quality mitigation standpoint possibly at the expense of the amenities.

Ed Ringe discussed the recommended Phase I or interim improvements that were detailed in the agenda item for Segments 3, 4 and 1. Even though the proposed improvements did not include the amenities in the original concept, choosing the off-line treatment for the water would allow them to be included in a second phase of construction.

Kathy Archibald questioned the inclusion of allocations for contamination remediation in each segment and why the current property owners were not responsible for any necessary remediation work. Phil Maher stated that it was dependent upon the future use of the site. The current property owners would not be liable for any contamination that is contained presently, but would be disturbed by future development. Mr. Davis stated that Phase 2 Environmental Analysis would be completed prior to purchase of property in that area. Furthermore, in the case of the Myers Industrial Park part of the conditions of sale were that the current property owner would be released of liability for remediation.

Mrs. Archibald felt that the interim improvements to Segment 1 were a "total waste of money" because they were not great improvements for the cost, they would all be lost in the final improvements to Franklin Boulevard, and the public would think the problem would be solved and question why it still flooded even if the frequency of flooding was reduced. Members of the Committee agreed that it appeared to be a "no win" situation for Blueprint to take it on, even if

simply from a Public Relations perspective.

Kevin McGorty stated that the proposed Segment 1 interim improvements were as ludicrous as the statement of "the number one priority of the IA was to get to the Airport." That was not the battle when the EECC went out on referendum. Furthermore, if this type of short-term thinking was the IA's response to budget cuts they were losing not only money but vision too. Gregg Patterson stated "don't throw out the Blueprint vision due to a few months of economic downturn."

Mr. Ringe stated that \$5M interim improvements were better than the possibility of no improvements if the \$25M necessary did not become available in the out-years as anticipated. Mr. Ringe noted with the interim improvements that flooding would occur once every three years versus three times per year. Mr. O'Steen stated that the original referendum did not indicate that revenue would be added to a pot, and as they went along Blueprint would determine how to spend it. There were specific projects that were identified; that was how support for the referendum occurred. From a Public Relations perspective it would be "very uncomfortable" to spend a significant amount of money for roadway improvements that, for all practical purposes, the public would perceive as having corrected something; the genesis of the Segment 1 project. He suggested, somewhat facetiously, re-advertising the Master Plan that went along with the funding. He felt that was the only way to suggest an interim project, spend that kind of money, and do it with the conscious that the public understood how the money was being spent. He understood the point but it was not Blueprint's task. Phil Maher stated that the Master Plan currently included the \$5M for interim Segment 1 improvements in the year 2019.

Kathy Archibald stated that the other improvements would benefit the system as a whole once it was completed. However, the proposed improvements would be "literally throwing money away" to incorrectly fix a problem that had plagued Tallahassee for many years.

Gregg Patterson questioned if Governor Crist's initiative to accelerate infrastructure in Florida could potentially have a positive effect on Capital Cascade Trail, Segment 1 specifically. Mr. Davis stated that based upon staff conversations with FDOT there would be no positive impact to Blueprint. The amount of money in the pot would not change; they were trying to move some projects forward. If however, some projects on a State level were not to come to fruition and FDOT funds became available as a result, Blueprint was positioning itself to be able to move rapidly into the construction phase on CCNW/SW. Thereby un-encumbering \$47M of Blueprint's money, should they receive that much from FDOT, to be reallocated elsewhere. Mr. Davis was more hopeful that would materialize than in regards to the helpfulness of them advancing other projects.

Nancy Miller stated that the interim plan, in regards to Segments 3 and 4, was a sound plan. The concerns were in regards to Segment 1 and that continued flooding was bad public relations. **Tom O'Steen moved to support interim projects that did not have to be removed or changed in order to implement the Master Plan. Nancy Miller seconded that motion; it passed unanimously.**

### **Item #3: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2009-FY 2013 Blueprint Capital Budget**

Phil Maher stated (segueing into Master Plan agenda item) that staff provided several short term

options that could be quickly implemented. Staff considered what could be done within the next four to five years; with ROW and additional ponds being acquired for Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and Segment 4 in the out years. Also, Segment 3 and 4 were originally separated on the Master Plan, with ROW and Construction broken out. In the revised Master Plan those Segments and the right-of-way/construction items had been consolidated into one line.

Kevin McGorty stated that the CAC requested a review of both legal and financial ramifications of delaying CCNW/SW; as he understood, a legal analysis was not completed. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint was not under contract to construct the roadway. There were, however, strong financial ramifications from the Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) between Blueprint and FDOT. The JPA stated that if Blueprint did not complete the project, FDOT could mandate its completion and that Blueprint would have to fund any cost incurred.

Mr. Maher stated that if Blueprint were to eliminate the construction of CCNW/SW they would lose \$8M because the Federal grant would be gone. If the project were delayed, the money for construction would remain encumbered. The incurred interest savings would be lost on inflation. Jim Davis stated that the \$8M in Federal funds had to be spent within a certain time frame or they would expire.

Lamar Taylor reiterated the sentiment that it would only delay the issue and further increase the cost. He agreed that as unpalatable as it was to look at that source of money, the \$50M from Capital Cascade Trail, and recognize that there was no other option but to complete the corridor project on CCNW/SW. Mr. McGorty stated that they were looking for options. He felt that at a minimum the CAC should recommend that when the economy turned and revenues increased, the funding would be dedicated back to the projects that have been cut. Mr. Taylor agreed that it was important to be mindful of that, however, there were tradeoffs, for example with leveraging.

Mr. McGorty agreed with Mr. Taylor and further stated that he understood the political climate. He reiterated his position of prioritizing the funding the projects that were being cut from the Master Plan. He stated that Capital Cascade Trail as a whole, not specifically Segment 2, was the signature project of Blueprint 2000. If they began fragmenting projects it would disillusion the next group that decided to go out on public referendum and create a gap in trust.

Harry Reed stated that FDOT had a silo structure to their funding system. Being in the position to leverage funds, as Mr. Davis stated, to move into construction, etc. was critical. Tallahassee was lucky to have received funding for Mahan Drive but they were in the 'right place at the right time.'

Jerry Conger reminded the committee that they were previously on record as stating in essence, that when the economy improved they should return to the plan as originally conceived, written, and approved. That statement could be reiterated to the IA if the committee chose to. Mr. Davis spoke briefly on the status of several projects to illustrate that Blueprint was in an optimal position to compete for any additional funding including environmental grants.

**Kevin McGorty moved to approve the Master Plan as presented with the caveat of when funding became available that projects identified for cuts today, in regards to Capital Cascade Trail, would be fully funded before any other project. Steve Amnott seconded the**

**motion; it passed unanimously.**

#### Information Items

**Item #4: Leveraging Update**

This item was informational only.

**Item #5: Capital Circle NW Landscaping and Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Landscaping/Park**

This item was informational only.

**Item #6: Regional Stormwater Pond 1 Snail Update**

This item was informational only.

**Item # 7: Capital Circle NW/SW: SR 20 Parcels**

This item was informational only.

**Item #8: Capital Circle SW PD&E Study – Update on Alignments, Evaluations and Upcoming Alternatives Public Meeting**

Dave Bright stated that since the Agenda was distributed, the date for the Alternatives Public Meeting had been set, for November 13 at TCC. Kathy Archibald stated that there was no distinction, detailed analysis or ranking of the criterion used. Nor could she identify how the community would benefit overall from one alignment to another. Jim Davis stated that it was not supposed to at that time. There was an approved criterion and weighting system that had not yet been applied. It was simply the data collected, to go back to the public explaining that, without orders of magnitude. Mrs. Archibald stated that she was referring to within each category. She was disappointed with what had been presented thus far.

**Item #9: Downgrade of Blueprint 2000 Series 2007 Bond Insurer**

This item was informational only.

**Item #10: FY 2007 Performance Evaluation**

This item was informational only.

#### Consent Items

**Item #11: CAC Minutes: May 15, 2008**

**Kevin McGorty moved to approve the minutes as presented; Jess Van Dyke seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

**Item #12: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 – Design Supplemental Services Approval**

Nancy Miller stated that she wanted to see the use of recycled material/options included in the Scope of Work. Gary Phillips stated he would take it under advisement.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Authorize a new contractual limit of **\$5,461,721.39** for Contract 533 with Genesis Group consistent with this Supplemental Services Request No. 8.

2. Approve the Supplemental Services Request for up to **\$378,400.00** to fund design additions for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 project.
3. Authorize the IMC to finalize and execute the Supplemental Services Request.

**Item #13: Capital Cascade Trail: Segment 2 – Contamination Remediation Authorization**

Gary Phillips gave a brief overview of the areas of remediation. Jim Davis stated that Blueprint intended to have the remediation complete prior to the construction of the park.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Authorize the advertisement for Contamination Remediation Services or utilize one of the City's or County's Environmental Consulting Services Vendors for the CCT Contamination Remediation project, at a cost not to exceed \$500,000 plus a 10 percent contingency.

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a Hazardous Material Firm or utilize one of the City's or County's Environmental Consulting Services Vendors. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.
2. Authorize a budget of **\$550,000**, which includes a ten percent contingency of \$50,000.
3. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate and award a contract with the selected firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
4. Waive the MBE/WBE requirements for these services in that no qualified local firm exists.

**Item #14: Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue – Design Supplemental**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Authorize a new contractual limit for Contract 772 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. for consultant services for the Capital Circle NW/SW Project (US 90 to Orange Avenue) in the amount of \$5,467,000 which includes the previous contract amount of \$5,207,000 (including Supplemental Agreements Numbers 1 through 8 with H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
2. Authorize Supplemental Agreement #9 with H.W. Lochner, Inc. an amount not to exceed \$110,000
3. Authorize the reinstatement of \$50,000 in Supplemental Agreement No. 7 for post-design services; and,
4. Authorize the replenishment of approximately \$100,000 for contingency.
5. The \$260,000 requested in this agenda item will come from the project's construction budget.

**Item #15: Proposed Meeting Dates**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve dates as presented.

**Kevin McGorty moved to approve the consent agenda; it was seconded by Tom O'Steen. It passed unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion

**Item #16: Modification of the Fiscal Year 2009 Operating Budget Request**

Phil Maher stated that the modification was to include a temporary attorney for approximately 10 months and authorize a budget change of \$50,000. Kevin McGorty questioned if there could be any assistance from the City or County Attorney Offices if law suits grew beyond the expected scope. Mr. Davis stated that, like the City and County in similar situations, if that were to occur Blueprint would contract the legal services out with the expense being charged to the related project as a ROW outlay. **Kevin McGorty moved to approve the modification; it was seconded by Nancy Miller. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Item #17: CAC Appointments**

Dave Bright reiterated for the Committee what was stated in the agenda item. He noted that the nominees would not become active until the nominations were acted on by the Board. It was noted that with the return of Burt Davy there would be two Planning Commissioners on the CAC and that would be added to future meeting notices. **Nancy Miller moved to accept the nominations; it was seconded by Gregg Patterson. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Item #18: CAC Status Report on Blueprint 2000**

**Tom O'Steen moved to approve the report as presented. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

**The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:32 pm.**