

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 2, 2004

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 4:30 pm

In the absence of Chairman Bill Smith, Vice-chair Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

Committee Members present:

Jerry Conger	Dianna Norwood**
Anita Davis	Charles Pattison
Terence Hinson	Mike Sheridan
Kevin McGorty	Jess Van Dyke
Casie Moran	**Was not able to vote – not yet confirmed

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Angel Baratta	Mark Llewellyn
Dave Bright	Phil Maher
Maribel Choice	Nancy Miller
Jim Davis	Jerry Oshesky
Paco de la Fuente	Bryant Paulk
Jack Diestelhorst	Bonnie Pfuntner
Bruce French	Steve Urse
Shelonda Gay	Ray Youmans
Paul Lannom	
Bill Little	

Agenda Modifications

Mr. Mike Sheridan led the meeting since chairman Bill Smith was not in attendance. Mr. Sheridan asked if there were any agenda modifications and Dave Bright stated that there was a revised agenda sheet and the changes were that Ray Youmans name was spelled correctly and Shelonda Gay's name was replaced by Dave Bright's for Item #6. Also in the packet was a revised Agenda Item #3 for the Capital Circle Southeast design/build, and a revised Agenda Item #8 for the Blueprint Master Plan and Capital Budget. Mr. Bright stated that there was a slight difference in the capital budget due to some actions taken by the TCC and there was a slight difference in Item #3 because when they mailed the item out to the CAC the project bids had not been received, and the technical scores could not be released. The item was now complete and would be going out to the IA. Discussion was held as to who got packets in the mail or electronically.

Informational Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

Phil Maher stated that since the last meeting, a leveraging plan and strategy had been developed and was going to be presented to the IMC on September 9th and to the IA on September 20th. The policy was to pursue all reasonable known funding possibilities. Several strategies were included and key points presented. They would continue to pursue partnerships, a resource binder was being compiled that includes a calendar of submittals for grants. Blueprint was also looking at an on-line grant service and certain grants, like FCT grants would always be submitted for each cycle.

Mr. Maher mentioned that three FCT grants were applied for, Timberlane Ravine, Patty Sink, and Copeland Sink and were likely going to be approved. A question was asked about matching dollars and Mr. Maher stated that the two applications Blueprint directly submitted were 50% match and the one submitted through the city was a 60% match. Mr. Davis discussed the high scores received on the applications and that this would be around \$4M of land acquisition total. Mr. Maher also stated that a grant application was submitted to DEP's Office of Greenways and Trails, for two parcels, about 62 acres on Meridian Road from Miller Landing Road to Thompson Circle. It would be for about \$300,000 and there was no match required.

In addition, Blueprint 2000 is preparing to submit an application to the NFWFMD for construction of the Gibby Pond, a stormwater retrofit project located on CCNW south of Tennessee Street. Mr. Maher stated that Blueprint had received word that the application period for the SIB loans was opening up, and last time they were open we received money for CCNW. They are applying for a SIB loan for CCSE this cycle. Mr. Davis stated that there were two other avenues of funding being pursued and those had to deal with SIS. There were two Strategic Intermodal Systems segments in Tallahassee. FDOT had indicated that 75% of FDOT allocations would go to SIS, Capital Circle NW and SW is included. An emphasis would begin to get construction dollars for CCNW funded as part of the SIS process. They were working with the MPO in an attempt to receive project funding: \$29M (I-10 to US 90) and \$43M (US 90 to SR 20).

A question was asked about the location of Gibby Pond and Dave Bright explained the project and location. It is part of the widening of CCNW from I-10 south to US 90 and would be near the intersection of Capital Circle and Tennessee St. The question was asked if anything being done with the widening of I-10 near Lake Jackson would have any impact on Blueprint projects. Mr. Bright explained that the I-10 project was not a Blueprint project.

Jess Van Dyke asked Mr. Maher if there was an effort to coordinate the grant applications for the different types and Mr. Maher stated that there was a meeting scheduled for later in the month to discuss with the City and County coordination efforts. Mr. Hinson asked about 3rd party research firms and Mr. Maher mentioned electronic search methods and programs. Mr. Davis stated that the program would cost \$6500. The county will partner

for \$1500, Blueprint would put in \$1500, and they were trying to get the City of Tallahassee to participate as well.

Item #2 Leveraging Policy and Plan

Mr. Sheridan went over the item stating that there was supplemental attached information and there were 2 options provided:

Option 1: Approve the attached Leveraging Policy and Plan.

Option 2: Provide comments on the attached Leveraging Policy and Plan

The recommended staff action was:

Option 1: Approve the Leveraging Policy and Plan as attached.

Mr. Van Dyke mentioned a correction in spelling (Section 102.05, two locations).

Mr. Conger moved to approve Option 1 and Anita Davis seconded the motion. Charles Pattison asked for clarification about land acquisition conflicts between the City of Tallahassee and the County and Blueprint 2000. Mr. Maher said that it could occur where multiple parties were going for the same piece of land, but hopefully the coordinating efforts would help that and we contact both of them about purchases we are interested in making. Discussion occurred about previous lack of coordination between the Planning Department and the City Stormwater Division and that will hopefully be avoided in the future. Mr. Hinson commented that by being in Tallahassee and the Governor being the President's brother it would seem that we should be getting more federal dollars. Ms. Davis stated that it was all about lobbying. The question was asked how Blueprint goes about lobbying and Mr. Davis discussed the issue.

Michael Sheridan stated that in December or January he thought the CAC should have a meeting that was not an agenda meeting and they should invite all the IA board members and other related parties, including the appropriate City and County officials. They could have a session on how they should go about lobbying and what the political landscape looks like and how they should contact people. He believed that a more formal systematic approach should be done if the rest of the board approved and he would like to do it around Mrs. Davis's schedule due to her past Commission experience. Mr. Pattison stated that he was not quite sure what they were being asked to do. Mr. Sheridan said that it would be a brainstorming session to determine who had influences, who could be contacted, etc. Ms. Moran said that she thought that for a meeting like that they should invite the community to attend. Mr. Sheridan said that he did not think they should have any limitations on who would come. Ms. Davis said that it should be put on the agenda and then let staff bring back data. It was mentioned that it should be held after the November elections and before session starts. Mr. Sheridan reemphasized that it should not be part of a regular agenda. The comment was made by another CAC member that it would be like a workshop.

The motion on the Leveraging Policy and Plan was voted on and passed unanimously.

Item #3 Capital Circle Southeast-Design/Build Award

Mr. Dave Bright stated that this item did have revised agenda materials. He stated that this item was written for the IA approval and no CAC vote was needed. The item was revised because on August 31, 2004, the actual bids were received from the three firms that were short listed in May. The bids came in with a high bid of \$40 M, however the winning bid was \$30.5 M. Mr. Bright stated that to calculate the adjusted score for the design/build, the bid cost was divided by the technical score. The winning team of M, Inc. and C.W. Roberts Joint Venture, with PBS&J and Parsons Brinckerhoff as the key subs, was determined by their technical score (second highest) divided into their bid cost (the low bid). This would be to build the next three miles of Capital Circle from just south of Apalachee Parkway to just south of Tram Rd. One of the other firms provided a virtual video of the future Capital Circle Southeast and it was shown to the CAC.

Ms. Moran asked about the local firm connection. Mr. Bright stated that they were all local team. A question was asked if Blueprint had estimates on the cost that would be going to local firms. Mr. Bright said the bid was \$30.5 M and they may need to ship some things in but most items would be bought local. Local is defined as a four county area. A question was asked if they could provide a report of approximately what percentage of the \$30M would be spent locally. It could be e-mailed to the CAC members and included in the Blueprint presentation to the IA since there was political sensitivity on the issue. Jerry Oshesky said there was nothing that said specifically what would be local, but they could make an educated guess. Mr. Sheridan said that estimating would be ok. Mr. Davis said that almost 90% would be local and there would be almost all local labor. The main purchases that would not be local would be specialty items like the light posts, signal lights, etc. Mr. Sheridan asked if that could be conveyed in an estimate in a report in writing.

Item #4 Blueprint 2000 Web Site

Bonnie Pfunter said they would be adding some project specific pages within the next months. Dianna Norwood said that as a new member she found the web site very easy to navigate. Ms. Pfunter said that the mapping feature was still under construction and was being worked on by the City-County GIS department.

Consent Items

Item #5: Approval of June 1, 2004 Citizen's Advisory Committee Minutes

Mike Sheridan asked if there were any corrections or additions to the June 1 minutes. Terence Hinson moved that they be approved and Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. There was no discussion and they passed unanimously.

Item #6: 2005 Meeting Dates

Mr. Bright stated that this was early to be developing the dates but September 20th would be the last IA meeting for the year and they wanted to get the 2005 dates to them early for scheduling purposes. They attempted to avoid any known commission meetings but they had not been able to coordinate with the MPO since they are reorganizing. Mr. Bright stated it would go to the IMC on September 9th and then on to the IA. There was discussion about moving the March meeting on the 17th to the 16th the Wednesday before. It was not decided if the date would change or not.

Presentations/Discussion/Action

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2005 CAPITAL BUDGET

5:30 pm: A brief pause was taken at this point to see if there were any speaker cards or anyone present wishing to speak on the FY 2005 Capital Budget. No one came forward but it was noted that if anyone did come in and wanted to speak, they would be allowed to speak.

Item #7: Capital Cascade Trail: Alternative Concepts (Blueprint 2000 Map 3)

Dave Bright provided background on the item and stated that Blueprint 2000 and its consultant, Genesis Group, would present to the CAC and discuss the draft alternative concepts currently under development for the Capital Cascade Trail, including the concepts for Franklin Blvd., stormwater treatment ponds, trail locations, and other amenities. This information would also be presented to the IA in October and at an upcoming Public Meeting. Two public meetings have been held, the last one in June and there were comments received from the public on what they would like to see along the trail. BP2K is currently in the process of developing three concept alternatives for the four segments of the St. Augustine Branch / Capital Cascade Trail. Mr. Bright stated that they were very close to completing calibration of the existing conditions stormwater model and it would be used to test how the stormwater conveyance and ponds system for the alternatives would handle the stormwater. Mark Llewellyn from Genesis Group provided a brief summary of the alternatives, what each one included in the way of ponds, trails, plazas, green spaces, etc., and presented design options for the project, which he stated was on schedule. A question was asked during the presentation about the properties near Cascade Park which may be sold by the State; one was identified as the Firestone Building. A question was asked about a pedestrian tunnel going under the railroad tracks on Lafayette Street. Dave Bright state that was a DOT project. Mr. Conger inquired about the group in favor of recreating Centennial Field. Mr. Llewellyn did mention that there had been feedback and it was being taken into consideration.

A question was asked about the original Blueprint plan not envisioning a baseball field. Mr. Davis said that the plan did not mention the actual structures in the park so that detail is not there to determine what would go in and what would not. Mr. Sheridan asked

about a performing arts center going in, and if that conflicted with the Blueprint mission. His understanding was that there was a process that would have to be done to adopt a change to the plan. Mr. McGorty said, that as an author of the Blueprint plan, he agreed that the plan did not specify all the public amenities that would be in the Cascade though there were some visions. His question to Mark Llewellyn was that short of a referendum how/who would decide what the public wants in the park. There have been public hearings but how will conclusions be reached and what was the role of the CAC. Mr. Davis said that they were going through the public process phase, three alternatives would be developed and tested, and then an alternative would be developed by the Blueprint and Consultant staff using information from the technical stormwater evaluation, recommendations from the public meetings, the CAC and TCC, and input from the IA. A draft plan recommendation would be prepared and then be presented to the public, and the Blueprint committees. The plan is scheduled to go to the IA on January 20th for the concept approval and they have the ultimate decision. Mr. McGorty stated that this was the first time that he had heard that there would not be a pond "like Lake Ella" and what has been visualized is that there would be standing water in at least one of the ponds. The preliminary analysis shows that with the low base water flow, there will not be enough water flow to lead to a lake amenity, which could have a dramatic difference on the level of public use of the features.

Mr. Llewellyn said they were dealing with issues such as low base flow and being able to keep the water quality in good condition. Secondly was ground water depth. Mr. Davis said that there were engineering issues that were being looked at, nothing had been decided, and they were intending to have a water feature. Mr. Sheridan made comments in regards to the performing arts center and Civic Center. Further discussion continued on the other segments of the Capital Cascade project. Mr. McGorty asked that in the future staff allocate sufficient time for the discussion on Capital Cascade so that no one feels rushed, the CAC, or the consultants. It was the signature project and they should not be rushed. Mr. Bright said that based on the work that has to be done they were hoping to hold the Oct. 7th meeting but it may be delayed a month so that when they do present it they have a good definition of the alternatives, benefits, and the evaluation of their effectiveness well determined. Discussion was had on the Oct. 7th Cascade meeting and the CAC meeting, possibly overlap the two and have the CAC meeting just be attending the Cascade meeting. Mr. McGorty stressed the importance of involving the public. Mr. Sheridan asked that Blueprint send out an e-mail so that they could coordinate dates and times. Ms Moran said that if an e-mail was sent out about the Cascade meeting, her organization could forward it on to their partners.

Item #8: Blueprint 2000 Master Plan and Capital Budget

Mr. Maher gave background on the Master Plan and the assumptions made about the growth, costs and projects. Mr. Sheridan interrupted to note that an agenda modification was substituted for what was in the packet on this item. Mr. Maher said that the master plan would be a dynamic document updated every year, based on funding/grants received and tax revenue and cost estimates. They were required to bring a balanced plan back to the IA and the financial advisors before they could do additional bond sales. The only

revenue included in this master plan were currently known sources, the sales tax, and the one SIB loan. He then went over highlights of the plan and budget. Mr. Davis summarized that there were \$700M worth of projects and \$520M to spend and that money is programmed out over 15 years. The Master Plan shows a worst-case scenario with no extra money. Out past the year 2010 it is basically a guess as to how the money would be spent. Mr. Maher went into more detail over the schedule.

Mr. McGorty asked about the estimate increase for the Capital Cascade Trail, from \$70M to \$150M. Mr. Davis discussed inflation and other associated cost and he stated that Segments 1,2, and 3 are all currently funded and they are trying to avoid cheapening the product. They discussed that some of the elements of the project were funded and other elements that were not funded by Blueprint and possibly would be needed to be funded by others.

Mr. Maher briefly went over the differences of what was previously submitted to the Committee and the modification. He stated that one of the modifications was that when the bids came in for Capital Circle SE they were lower than what had been budgeted so they were able to move \$3M from CCSE to land bank which gives the flexibility to acquire ROW for roads, stormwater, and greenways early. The other change was that they had land bank separate from flood plain and they were combined.

Three options were presented:

Option 1: Provide Board Guidance and appropriate FY 2005 capital budget

Option 2: Approve the proposed Master Plan submitted as modified with a five-year capital budget and appropriate FY 2005 of the Capital Budget.

Option 3: Convene a subcommittee to review and advise.

Recommended action to the IA was to provide board guidance (Option 1). Kevin McGorty moved Option 2, and he strongly endorsed the direction staff is moving. It was seconded by Jess Van Dyke. Mr. Sheridan stated that he strongly endorsed the motion. Ms. Moran stated that she would like to see more project description, example how many miles for the dollars spent, when it went to the IA. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #9: Blueprint 2000 Real Estate Policy

A modified agenda item and Policy was submitted in the packet and Mr. Sheridan asked for clarification on what the difference was between it and the original provided to the CAC. Mr. Ray Youmans stated that the biggest difference was concerning Blueprint's authority to condemn versus the city and county, and clarification on that matter. There was change, on a new page 5 which stated that the Blueprint Director, with input from the city and county attorney should have authority to approve condemnation sites. The motion to approve was made by Casie Moran and seconded by Terence Hinson. Mr. Davis briefly discussed the policy and went over the key issues. He clarified that for the

land banking there were limitations that would have to be clarified with the IMC. Mr. Jerry Conger expressed concerned that he felt the position of the Director having certain authority was needed, but it would place them in a powerful but exposed position and he wanted to make sure that it had been discussed with the powers that be. He also asked for clarification on the acquisition authority and why an appraiser was not used for property less than \$25,000. It was explained that it was an expense issue and time issue and one was not required by law. Concern was expressed by members of the CAC about a lack of checks and balances in the document. The motion was modified; the policy was approved in principle subject to the city and county review and suggestions of appropriate checks and balances. Both Ms. Moran and Mr. Hinson accepted the modified motion and seconds.

Mr. Youmans continued, mentioning several additional changes that had been made to the amended version of the agenda item. The question was called and it was passed unanimously.

Item #10: Construction Management at Risk for Capital Cascade Trail

No action was required and it was to advise the CAC of a contract methodology. Mr. Bill Little gave a presentation about the CM at Risk and the benefits of the process. The question was raised that some projects would work better under design/build and others under this CM at Risk. When future projects arise, the question was asked if the CAC could be informed as to why a certain design or delivery method was chosen for a project over another.

V. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

VI. Items From Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business there was a motion to adjourn, made by Ms. Davis and seconded by Mr. Hinson. The meeting was adjourned.