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Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, August 29, 2013  
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2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

Richard Drew called the meeting to order at 4:40 pm.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richard Drew</th>
<th>Kent Wimmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>Christie Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Pease</td>
<td>Andrew Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Landry</td>
<td>Chris Klena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henree Martin</td>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Hinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Hargraves</th>
<th>Alisha Wetherell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Chris Lisenby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder</td>
<td>George Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy</td>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications:**

There were two agenda modifications, one regarding one of the CAC meeting dates; another for the budget item to make the narrative consistent with the table.

**Information Items**

**Item #1: Project Updates**

Regarding Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest, Richard Drew questioned if any additional culverts would be placed underneath to allow for water flow or animal crossings. Mr. Hargraves stated that there were three boxed culverts to be place with the primary intent for animal crossings. It would also allow for water to flow through as well. Furthermore, there would be a bridge at Gum Swamp Road.

Kent Wimmer questioned if there would be a curb cut for the hand launch recreational access to the Chain of Lakes. Dave Snyder clarified that the area referred to by Mr. Wimmer would be in the Capital Circle Southwest (W1) project.

**Consent Items**

**Item #2: CAC Meeting Minutes (May 30, 2013 & June 4, 2013)**

Tom O’Steen noted one correction of Lee Daniel’s name from the May 30th minute. With that amended Mr. O’Steen moved approval. Chris Klena seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.
Item #3: Proposed 2014 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules
Autumn Calder noted that the amended date was for the September IA meeting due to a conflict with the CRA schedule. The correct date would be September 15, 2014. Tom O'Steen moved approval; Terence Hinson seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #4: Approval to Accept Donations for Blueprint 2000 Projects
Autumn Calder stated that a policy was in place at Blueprint to accept donations to Cascades Park. The item extended it to include other projects as well. Tom O'Steen questioned what would happen if a donation was made for an item that was previously included in the construction budget; where would the offset go? Mr. Hargraves stated that money was moved to the general fund for the project. Mr. O'Steen stated that he supported the item and further requested that if there were changes to project budgets that the CAC had previously approved, that it be brought back at least as an information item. Not so much to approve it per se, but to understand it from a budget reconciliation process and how money moved. Many of the items and funding were to stay with the priority projects; not taken out and added to an unallocated funds account for use in other areas. Tom O'Steen moved approval; Christic Henry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #5: Citizen's Advisory Committee Appointments
Autumn Calder gave a brief overview of the agenda item. George Smith who, when approved, would replace Lamar Taylor as the financial representative for the EECC, was introduced. Henree Martin moved to accept both George Smith and the reappointment of Andrew Chin. Chris Klena seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Richard Drew announced that he would be resigning from position of Chair the CAC and from the committee by the end of the year. Henree Martin stated that, should Terence Hinson accept the now vacant position of Chair, a new vice chair would need to be selected when appropriate. Ms. Calder stated that could occur at the next meeting.

Item #6: Centennial Field Commemoration Concept
Autumn Calder spoke to the history of discussion from previous CAC meetings and an overview of the agenda item. Richard Drew clarified that the images shown were from Messer Field and questioned what types of operation and maintenance issues were experienced there. Chris Lisenby from City Parks and Recreation stated that there were a few issues with heat and seam separation and curling. Periodically, City staff had to go in to flatten the mat and reseal the seam. Chris Klena asked him to define periodically. He was not certain.

Richard Drew questioned how long the field had been in place. David Jones stated that the field was constructed approximately seven years earlier. Henree Martin stated that the Friends of Centennial Field were purists. She felt that the clay field would be more of a commemoration; she wondered if they would object to the rubberized option. Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint staff met with representatives of their group who were interested in a universally accessible field. They preferred the clay option and felt that the stabilized clay options would provide that.
Andrew Clay questioned the purpose of the fence at Messer Field and why it was a secure area. Mr. Lisenby stated that it was located adjacent to the skate park and the unwanted activity that went with that. It was locked to prevent vandalism.

Ms. Martin stated that she understood that play on it would be discouraged because it was a commemorative field. Ms. Calder stated that it was a passive area intended for family or small group play but certainly no team activity.

Kent Wimmer questioned if field turf had been considered. It would provide a firm and stable surface yet be more robust and require less maintenance. David Jones stated that many of the questions would probably be answered during his presentation however he was waiting for staff to complete theirs. Ms. Calder finished out the staff presentation and staff recommendation.

Mr. Wimmer questioned what the recommendation of Parks and Recreation would be. Mr. Lisenby stated that Parks and Rec had one rubberized field and maintained 85 clay fields; that was what they were accustomed to and were best at. Which was better would be based on perspective. However if the goal was to commemorate what was there originally, they would go with a clay field.

While the presentation for the universally accessible and inclusive field was loaded, David Jones stated that the minutes would reflect that the concept was first presented to Blueprint more than one year earlier. However Wayne Tedder requested Mr. Jones hold off on pursuing it due to completion deadlines at the park. When a meeting was finally scheduled Mr. Tedder and Mr. Hargraves did not attend. Mr. Jones stated the opportunity to provide input to staff on options for a more holistic approach.

Mr. Jones stated that the proposed field was for a small active play and gathering area for children and people with disabilities at Cascades Park. There was opportunity with Cascades Park to include people from all segments of the community. Many features in the park were modern interpretations of the original aspects of the character of the area. The concept of the miracle field invited activity with a modern approach and inclusive feel. All too often the disability community was left out or an afterthought. This was a chance for a comprehensive community approach and a place for the people with disabilities to feel welcome in the park.

He appreciated that Blueprint included a representative of the disabled community to speak for the desires, needs, wants, and rights to be included in the planning of our community. While he tried to represent the broad constituency, disabilities were often not seen, understood, or recognized. There were as many different disabilities as there were people and abilities varied from one extreme to the other. Trying to provide inclusion and universal design into community programs was critical from the beginning to accomplish that.

Ms. Martin complimented Mr. Jones for his passionate advocacy and stated that she felt the issues were two-fold. She spoke to the history of the creation of Blueprint and the re-creation of Centennial Field. She compared the fans of that field to the people who lived in Smokey Hollow. It was historic and held the significance of that. She was shocked that there were no other places available within the project other than sidewalks. Tom O'Steen stated that the
difference was that while the sidewalks, discovery garden and other gathering spaces had ADA accessible routes, there was no large open area for unstructured, free play.

Mr. Jones clarified that the park was being constructed for “us” not “them.” There were people with disabilities in every demographic and anyone could join the club at any time. While there were accessible spaces, someone in an electric wheelchair could not play in the fountain; the Discovery Garden might be accessible. However, no one from Blueprint shared plans or asked for input on its accessibility for children, or adults, with disabilities. As for Smokey Hollow, it too was a modern concept of the history. That was what a Centennial Field commemoration should be as well. Historical and delivering the message “we” want and enjoy active lifestyles.

Dale Landry stated that because of segregation Centennial Field was not well spoken of by the black community. He was not in favor of commemorating it because of that. He returned to the cost several times stating that $37K was such a small percentage of the overall cost of the park to facilitate inclusion with the larger community. He did not understand how Blueprint or City staff could not consider including it.

Andrew Chin spoke in support of looking at it from the scale and proportions it had to the overall cost. Also, there was a difference between staff recommendation of the surface and what was requested by Mr. Jones. It was only one third the surface area of the staff analysis. He fully supported the notion of an inclusive hard surface play area. Furthermore, he speculated that it would be used by many families of all abilities for the easy and convenience of clean, dry children when they leave. It became a matter of marking the memory versus recreating the field. The idea of children playing was, in his mind, the best marker of the activity that was there.

Terence Hinson supported the idea and expressed a few concerns; one being the limited flat space for passive enjoyment. The proposed area was that but with the adjacent sidewalk and slope toward Boca Chuba pond, he wondered if there would there be any liability issues. Mr. Jones reiterated that the space was not for organized, team play. Furthermore, he shared options for design that would address Mr. Hinson’s concerns that could easily be accommodated. People would gravitate to it because children want to run and play. Because of that, safety would always be a concern; however, signage listing recommended or allowed play equipment and parents would be the primary enforcers.

Mr. Jones stated that if a clay field was constructed, people would be more inclined to use it as a ball field; if it looked like a field, it would be a field. If it looked like a playground for children, it would be used as such.

Mr. Wimmer offered again the compromise of astro-turf as a firm and stable surface that could serve the purpose of accessibility and require minimal maintenance. Mr. Jones stated that the disability community did not want anything special. They wanted the equal opportunity to be out there doing what everyone else was doing, enjoying the park. If it meant a flat, smooth surface adjacent to grassy area, he thought the disability community would wholeheartedly support it. As much as he loved grass and dirt, he did not support astro-turf because it would not be accessible for wheelchairs. He did support equal access and opportunity.
Tom O’Steen stated that there seemed to be aspects of what was presented that was not felt to be correct, in terms of the materials, from both sides. Furthermore, with all due respect to non-inclusion that the Centennial Field group might represent, they had been active in wanting something in that location since the late 1990’s when the EECC began conversation about Blueprint. Mr. O’Steen moved for all parties come together to find a way to work together to accomplish this; Chris Klena seconded his motion. Mr. Jones stated that he wanted and had been trying to do that for the last year. Ms. Martin stated that she felt if Lane Green and Mr. Jones were to meet these issues would be resolved.

Ron Pease stated that in all his time on the CAC the preceding had been one of the more meaningful discussions had and made him proud to be a member of the group. He supported the motion and called the question.

Mr. Drew suggested, if the motion passed, that staff consider installing pervious concrete underneath the rubberized surface. Secondly, was to be mindful in the choice of color on the mats to support it being as comfortable a temperature as possible.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Item #7: Cascades Park Update and Request for Additional Funding**

Charles Hargraves gave of the agenda item. Tom O’Steen stated he was concerned about the total construction cost of the park and asked for that number. Gary Phillips noted that it was listed in Item #10 however it was $33.5M including the additional funding requested in the subject time. Mr. O’Steen stated that as a member of the Sales Tax Committee, the request for the extension of the tax was approaching however the park still was not open. It appeared that it could be later in 2014. His concern was that continued overruns and cost escalation for the project would be damaging to the potential. He felt it would be difficult to explain to the population at large, why $33M had been spent on something they did not have access to yet.

Mr. O’Steen further noted that some of the prices listed were estimates. Mr. Hargraves stated that some of the amenities, such as the new restroom, were in process. There were also items that were completely new to the project, for example the ‘green screen’ on the Meridian Point Building, which impacted the cost and schedule. Mr. O’Steen circled back to the point, that the park was not yet open to the public. From the larger perspective of the people who have not been a part of the evolution of the project and the benefit to the community, he expressed a nagging feeling that it was not a positive direction to continue in. Even with unforeseen elements, like the karst anomaly, the bottom line was that it was an estimate of $1M. The agenda item stated that there was a potential of delaying the opening further because of the karst issue, he hoped that it was not the case and that staff found a way prevent further delays.

Coming back to cost and delays, Mr. O’Steen stated that the Amphitheater was the perfect example. In the redesign of that structure, no one thought of adequate framing for the equipment necessary for the types of events that were anticipated, he asked. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was anticipated but not funded.
Christic Henry clarified that the issues listed were the ones known to date. Mr. Hargraves confirmed that and stated that Blueprint was working with the contractor to identify the last expenses. Also, staff had been directed to nail down the cost so as not to have to return to that point. She questioned if there would be a need for noise mitigation and who would be responsible for funding that. Mr. Hargraves stated that he was not certain however he hoped that the efforts made by Blueprint would alleviate the need for mitigation.

Dale Landry noted that it was the City and County Commissioners that made changes to the park in response to the outcry from citizens, especially in regards to Smokey Hollow and the Amphitheater. He suggested that it the citizen led cost increases be listed as well as those the contractor was responsible for. Mr. O'Steen concurred and suggested that Blueprint develop a strong presentation on the evolution of the unfunded to funded amenities.

Ron Pease agreed with Mr. O'Steen and stated that he could not, in good conscience vote in the affirmative for the increase. The term “directed amenities” was used loosely in several conversations. Over the last couple of years questions had surfaced around “who” was directing the changes to projects and ultimately the budgets as well. Before he could support the increase, he would like to have the “directed amenities” identified and how much of the overrun they represented. It was something he felt very strongly about even as he understood that when dealing with a project of the size, scope, and cost such as Cascades Park there were many unexpected occurrences that resulted in overages.

Kent Wimmer questioned where the money would come from if the increase was approved. Mr. Hargraves stated that it would not come from any other project. Richard Drew quoted the agenda item, “the funding source will be unallocated funds and will not affect funding of other Blueprint 2000 projects.” He questioned why there was that much money left over and where it would have come from to be able to support that type of cost overrun.

Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint anticipated a surplus of $640K from the Franklin Boulevard project. Dave Snyder stated that there was an additional surplus of $900K from the Capital Circle Southeast (E2) project. Most of that would be spent installing landscaping and irrigation through that segment however the remainder would be used to make up the overages at Cascades Park. Furthermore he reminded the CAC that while the addition of amenities had created delays and cost overruns, the purpose of the project was to manage stormwater in the downtown area. Tallahassee experienced 14 inches of rain in March and both segments, the Park and Franklin Boulevard, preformed beautifully without a single incident of flooding. On top of the stormwater infrastructure were world class amenities. When you are standing in the middle of it you are proud to have been involved with the project and the changing of the landscape of Tallahassee.

Tom O'Steen brought his original point home again in recommending that if there was anyway Blueprint could open the park in phases to please do so. The faster it was opened the more support there would be from voters to extend the next round of sales tax. If not, he genuinely believe there would be a significant community perception of Blueprint having spent a lot of money, the words “world class” were irrelevant until it was experienced. Each person could, probably did have very different opinions of what it meant anyway. His bottom line was open
the park, in phases if necessary, to allow people that world class experience.

Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint was receiving pressure from the City Manager about opening it as soon as possible. There was also concern for the safety and liability of the areas of ongoing construction. Mr. O'Steen suggested fencing off the construction area and allowing the public to access the other two-thirds of the park.

Mr. O'Steen reiterated his other concerns on the total cost of the project, cost overruns, why things were not included in the initial budget, that still were not completed, and that there still was the ability for someone to come out in a few months with “we thought of something else.” The closer to the end of construction the project came it was almost inevitable. Mr. Hargraves agreed. Mr. Drew suggested that if two-thirds of the park could be opened for people to use and fall in love with would be incredibly beneficial. The citizens were out of patience for that remaining third to be complete.

Mr. Hargraves stated that if the increase was not approved, there were limited funds remaining in the project and the shortfall would result in unfinished items. The improvements that were directed by the IA but unfunded were included on the list. He did not want the CAC to approve the increase out of fear that the contractor would file delay claims while Blueprint waited for funding approval however it was a reality.

To Mr. Pease’s earlier point Mr. Landry stated that there were a few instances where it was clearly identified as to who was directing the change (the IA, County, City Stormwater, etc). There were also several that did not. He supported the request for a comprehensive listing of which department, office, or agency directed the changes.

Regarding Mr. Hargraves last statement, Mr. Landry questioned what course of action Blueprint would take if the funding was not approved. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was critical to have some funds for the required karst repairs. However, if the sentiment was not to approve the increase, short of fixing that, Blueprint would meet with management and decide what amenities would not be completed. Mr. Drew stated that if the CAC chose not to approve the increase the item itself would still move forward to the IA, would it not. Mr. Hargraves confirmed that it would with the outcome of the CAC action.

David Jones asked how much of the day-to-day items and smaller decisions that moved the projects forward were later communicated to the IA. Furthermore, who was responsible for making those decisions? Who was the management Mr. Hargraves spoke of when he said that Blueprint would meet with them to determine what would not be completed. Mr. Hargraves explained that it was the Intergovernmental Management Committee, the City Manager and County Administrator, before moving on to the IA.

There was some discussion specifically regarding the process the Centennial Field item would take. Autumn Calder stated that it might be that Wayne Tedder opted to pull the item from the IA agenda to give staff the opportunity to meet with Mr. Jones and the Fans of Centennial Field to work out the details. Mr. Jones stated that was the same opinion and attitude expressed a year earlier. Not only did they not make any progress there was a 180-degree shift from what he was
last told. That was the reason he questioned the process and if he needed to get more involved in other areas to pursue what he has understood the CAC has agreed to do.

Mr. Landry moved to pull the Centennial Field item from the IA agenda to allow for meetings between Mr. Jones, the Fans of Centennial Field and Blueprint staff. Chris Kleena seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Landry expanded that he wanted to send a strong message to Mr. Tedder and the IA of how the CAC felt about Centennial Field.

Ron Pease questioned how many handicap spaces were included in the parking areas. Mr. Snyder identified the available spaces throughout the park. Mr. Jones stated that a certain number of spaces were required based on a ratio of ADA to total spaces. Mr. O’Steen stated that was exactly the problem however, it was a percentage of the parking spaces that had been constructed as opposed to the appropriate percentage of people who require accessible spaces from the population that could occupy the entire park. It had always been presumed that the majority of parking spaces would be served by the state parking garages and distant locations. It was never envisioned to construct adequate parking for the park. He further suggested that to the extent possible Blueprint convert as many spaces as possible to ADA accessible spaces. Otherwise it was disproportionate.

Mr. Jones stated that he felt that lack of handicap parking spaces was part of the City’s position for not creating a universal access Centennial Field. Mr. Landry and Mr. O’Steen were correct because accessible spaces in surrounding parking garages were not helpful. Mr. Hargraves stated that he would meet with the Engineer of Record and review the options. Mr. Pease stated that discussion on access for the elderly and disabled communities was not a new conversation but rather it was on going, in terms of parking and restroom facilities.

**Mr. O’Steen moved to move option one with the comments that the CAC was “extremely concerned with cost overruns and add-ons without a clear understanding of who’s directing those changes and concerned about the future continuation of requests for more money; also to strongly suggest that it open in phases.” Terence Hinson seconded the motion.**

Terence Hinson stated that it was up to the CAC to trust but verify. It was possible that there could be other overruns because the community was involved. The CAC would have to be ready to deal with that and understand that it was asset for the community. They just had to get it open.

Mr. Pease stated that there was a distinct difference between wanting to know more information about the directive that the CAC played no role in voting for or against as opposed to rubber stamping.

Mr. Jones stated that the park was an investment in the community and the CAC was making a statement. He felt they should do all they could to stand behind it and make it bigger than any one individual and to take confidence in the numbers. He was in favor of asking for more because the community was getting more. However he acknowledged that it was possible to make mistakes. When staff recommended doing away with the miracle type field they made a mistake.
Regarding cost overruns Mr. Drew stated that he was concerned about the alum project; he did not understand why there was not adequate stormwater knowledge before the preliminary design. The Barber Shop building was a wonderful with great history however he felt it was being under used. He did not understand why it would be shut off from the public versus using it as an education tool. Mr. Hargraves stated that code requirements restricted the use of the building.

The motion passed 9 to 0 with Ron Pease abstaining.

**Item #8: Approval to Extend General Engineering Consultant Contract**
Charles Hargraves summarized the agenda item. Richard Drew questioned the cost of the GEC. Mr. Hargraves stated that the budgeted amount was $1,687,000.00 and noted that it was decreasing as projects were decreasing. Kent Wimmer noted that some expenses had shifted to the Operating Budget in the form of IT support, etc. Terence Hinson moved approval; Kent Wimmer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #9: Fiscal year 2014 Blueprint Operating Budget**
Charles Hargraves stated that it was the second time that the proposed Operating Budget had been presented to the CAC. There was a downward adjustment to the IT costs.

Tom O'Steen requested clarification of the deviation from the previous in temporary wages. Mr. Hargraves stated Wayne Tedder made the decision to have all IT services handled by city staff versus GEC a staff person. That was part of the cost that Mr. Wimmer noted in the earlier discussion of the decrease of GEC costs.

Charles Hargraves summarized the agenda item. There were no significant changes since it was last presented.

There were none.

There were none.

Tom O'Steen moved to adjourn; Terence Hinson seconded the motion which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:14 pm.
Terence Hinson called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence Hinson</td>
<td>Kent Wimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>Christic Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Pease</td>
<td>Chris Klena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Chin</td>
<td>George Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hargraves</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Shelonda Meeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder</td>
<td>Susan Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

**Information**

**Item #1: Cascades Park Lower Pond Remediation Update**

This item was provided as informational only. Bill Jordan gave an in-depth presentation on the remediation efforts in Boca Chuba Pond. Mr. Jordan confirmed that there was no sinkhole however there were “several in the making.” Charles Hargraves stated that Blueprint would continue to monitor the water levels. Dave Snyder stated that approximately one-acre of concrete had been pumped into the anomalies; 18-inches of clay would be installed from elevation 70, at the bottom of the pond, up the sides to elevation 80.

**Item #5: Election of CAC Vice-Chair**

Christic Henry nominated Kent Wimmer; Ron Pease seconded the nomination. Mr. Wimmer stated that he would be happy to serve. It passed unanimously.

**Item #6: Citizen’s Advisory Committee Appointment**

Autumn Calder stated that the EECC nominated Jim Stevenson to fill the Biologist/Environmental Specialist position vacated by Richard Drew. He could attend meetings however would not be official until approved by the IA in February 2014. If approved, his first official CAC meeting would be April 10, 2014.

Christic Henry moved to accept Mr. Stevenson’s nomination; Chris Klena seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.
Item #4: CAC Meeting Minutes (August 29, 2013)
Chris Klena moved approval of the August 29, 2013 minutes. George Smith seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

Item #2: Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Update
Gary Phillips presented the latest on Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 with photos of progress and options available.

Regarding the electric distribution lines Kent Wimmer questioned if they would be put underground. Mr. Phillips stated that most would be.

David Jones confirmed that Blueprint would be funding the playground equipment as part of the construction process. Mr. Phillips confirmed they would. Mr. Jones wanted to be certain that accessibility of the equipment was addressed as well as the route to the equipment. Mr. Phillips agreed and committed to confirming the design through Susan Tanski with the City; who was the lead designer. Autumn Calder suggested sending the design specs to Mr. Jones for feedback as well.

Item #3: Cascades Park Update and Funding Request Information
Gary Philips and Autumn Calder gave an update of the Park and shared the latest commercial promoting the park. Blueprint and the City anticipated opening the park in March or April of 2014. There would be elements that would be added after the opening though.

Ron Pease requested that as information was shared, that it be a broader approach than strictly social media so the senior segments of the community would have access to it as well. Ms. Calder spoke to informational handouts and community signs that could be displayed in visitor’s centers, library, senior center, etc.

Mr. Wimmer questioned what decision was made on the field surface at Centennial Field. David Jones stated that he spoke at the IA who directed that Blueprint and City Parks & Rec work through the issues with Mr. Jones. The outcome of a meeting with Dee Crumpler was that he had no objection to a rubberized surface. Mr. Jones’ understanding was therefore, that was what would be constructed. No progress had been made because meeting schedules had been difficult to coordinate.

Mr. Hargraves concurred with Mr. Jones and stated that it seemed that everyone was “on deck.” However, in a recent phone call from Ashely Edwards, the interim Director of Parks & Rec, shared that they would not be moving forward with a rubberized surface at Centennial Field because of the working group issues and dealing with what was already on their plate.
Mr. Jones stated that for all the issues that were to be sorted out, Parks & Rec would have no reason to hold up construction of the whole project. There was not even a design concept; it would be less than two months for construction. He felt that the problem came with personal problems with the concept. What he understood from the IA was that they were to move forward. They met with the Friends of Centennial Field who were in complete agreement on a universal and accessible design.

Mr. Jones questioned what Parks & Rec need other than time and money for plans to be developed. As he understood it, money was found from the close out of other projects. Mr. Hargraves stated that there was no funding dedicated for Centennial Field. If plans were developed and a cost estimate completed, Mr. Hargraves was confident that funding could be earmarked.

Ron Pease questioned if there was anything the CAC could do to facilitate moving ahead and being supportive as well. He felt that the CAC hear the message however there was conflicting information too. Mr. Hargraves stated that the CAC could make any recommendation they chose too. However, he could not suggest a recommendation that might go against the direction he had been given by City Management. Mr. Pease suggested that the CAC ask Mr. Hargraves or Mr. Tedder to request that City Parks & Rec reconsider their ceasing activity in the planning of it.

Andrew Chin stated that he understood the position of the City in not wanting to add something so close to the completion of the project. He acknowledged that opening day was a big day and he personally feared that if it was set aside there would be no funding for it when timing was better. He suggested that Blueprint encumber the funds for the future construction of Centennial Field. As it stood, there was no commitment to including it in the park. Encumbering funds would be a strong commitment to the effort. Mr. Jones stated that was what he wanted, a commitment to construction.

Terence Hinson stated that the CAC asked Blueprint to review and respond to the issue; what was the response or conclusion to that? Ms. Calder stated that direction from the CAC was to meet with Mr. Jones, the Fans of Centennial Field, Parks & Rec, and other identified stakeholders to discuss Mr. Jones’ concept. The Fans had no issue with the concept. The next step would have been to present it to the CAC for a discussion on the identification of funding, initiating design.

The fact of the situation was that there were 3.5 months to complete the park. Staff did not have the ability to focus on the concept on top of that. They were under tremendous pressure to have the park completed by March 2014. There were integral pieces that were taking precedent, like signage for example.

Christie Henry questioned if the existing plans could be “tweaked.” Mr. Hargraves stated that there were no plans for the design. Ms. Calder stated that the original design was for the parterre or formal garden however, no one liked it.

Mr. Hinson stated that continued discussions and reports back to the CAC were progress however he recognized that they were running out of time to complete all outstanding pieces and
open the park on time. He felt that staff had to be given leeway to accomplish that. He understood that it sounded like a delay, maybe that’s what it was. However, he understood that the priority was opening the park. The construction of Centennial Field could come in the future.

Mr. Jones stated that it was a small playground, insignificant in the grand scheme of the overall project. When he received positive feedback from staff and the commissioners he began talking it up throughout the community. The disability community was excited about “their piece of the pie.” To say the idea is good and one day it will happen would not be well received by the community. Ms. Henry stated that was the reason behind the commitment to funding. She did not feel like Mr. Jones was asking for construction but commitment to take back to his constituency. It might not be completed by March but it would be a part of the park. Mr. Hargraves stated that the commitment would have to come from City Parks & Rec as the owner. However Blueprint staff could commit to work on it.

Mr. Jones stated that his biggest problem with the process was “pressure from Management, (or) Leadership.” After his experience with the IA in September he saw that they only make major decisions. The commitment to this field was a minor decision however. Without resolution and clear direction he would take it to the IA again in February.

Mr. Chin stated that without a quorum they could not make an official motion however he wondered if the CAC could make a formal request of staff. Ms. Calder stated that as the Chair, Mr. Hinson could write a letter on behalf of the CAC, or the members present, to Mr. Hargraves, Mr. Tedder, the City Manager, and County Administrator. Mr. Jones questioned who the Chair and Vice-Chair of the IA were. Mr. Calder stated that it was Kristen Dozier and Scott Maddox respectively.

Mr. Chin questioned what was necessary to get Centennial Field play area on the list of unfinished amenities. Ms. Calder stated that it was already on the list maintained by staff of all unfinished features and amenities. Mr. Chin stated that would help in assigning dollar amounts and priorities.

Mr. Pease asked if funding for the renovation of the Electric building was from Blueprint. Mr. Hargraves confirmed that it was from City funds, not Blueprint.

There were none.

There were none.

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:15 pm.
#2

Project Updates
SUBJECT/TITLE: Project Updates

Date: February 24, 2014 Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Charles Hargraves Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This agenda item provides the Board with an update on current Blueprint 2000 projects.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Capital Cascade Trail - Segment 3 (Segment 3 Map included as Attachment 1)

Segments 3B and 3C
The City of Tallahassee, in conjunction with Blueprint 2000 solicited bids for the joint construction of the City of Tallahassee’s FAMU Way Extension, Phase 1 and Blueprint’s Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 3B and 3C. M of Tallahassee, Inc. was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder meeting the bid requirements, including minority business enterprise (MBE) and charitable contribution goals. In coordination with Blueprint, the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department will negotiate and award the contract to M of Tallahassee, Inc. Attachment 2 shows the official bid sheet for FAMU Way/CCT Segment 3.

The total construction contract amount is $27,108,199.10 with the Blueprint 2000 portion at $18,815,777.75 as shown below. Blueprint 2000 has an approved budget of $22,000,000 that includes construction, contingency, construction engineering inspection and post design services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency</td>
<td>$18,815,777.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tallahassee Public Works</td>
<td>$ 7,011,940.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tallahassee Underground Utilities</td>
<td>$ 1,280,480.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,108,199.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction is expected to begin in February 2014 and includes a 900 calendar day construction schedule. While the final design for FAMU Way Extension Phase 2 is not yet complete, the bid package included an additive alternate to include Phase 2 at a later date once plans had been finalized. M of Tallahassee, Inc. also submitted the lowest competitive bid for the Phase 2 work and the City has the option of adding the Phase 2 work to the contract at a later date.

Segment 3D (West of Cleveland Street to Central Drainage Ditch)
The western portion of the CCT-Segment 3, known as Segment 3D is being designed and permitted as a standalone project. Blueprint’s consultant has completed the subsurface utility
excavations and soil borings within CSX right-of-way to determine existing conditions and assist with project design. Design and permitting will proceed forward within the next few months.

Capital Cascade Trail - Segment 4
The Economic and Environment Consensus Committee (EECC) vision for this project was to improve and enhance the Central Drainage Ditch (CDD) with attenuation areas for water quality and to create an urban greenway with bicycle and pedestrian walkways.

Kimley-Horn and Associates (KHA) has completed the modeling for the proposed City of Tallahassee channel improvements to the CDD between Gamble Street and Springhill Road and recommended that the City be allowed to proceed with this project. The Technical Coordinating Committee concurred that the City be allowed to proceed.

Staff, along with KHA, is currently working with City and County Stormwater representatives to develop a scope of services to evaluate the overall water quality in the floodplain. Results and recommended options based on these and other analyses will be presented at future meetings in an effort to update the Segment 4 Preferred Concept before moving into a design phase.

Capital Circle NW/SW (N-2)
Summary: The project corridor begins north of Orange Avenue and extends to just south of Tennessee Street, a distance of approximately 2.55 miles. For this capacity improvement project, the current two lane rural facility is being expanded to a six lane, urban facility complete with curb and gutters. In addition to the reconstruction and widening of the roadway, improvements include the construction of four bridges, retaining walls, stormwater management facilities, wetland creation, improved street lighting, signalization, signing and pavement markings, the addition of pedestrian, bicycle and recreational amenities as well as the installation of extensive landscaping. A project map is included as Attachment 3.

The original contract amount is $56.69 million and the anticipated completion date is August, 2015. Construction is 38% complete.

Detailed Update: The contract for construction was signed with Anderson Columbia Co., Inc. on September 4, 2012. Per FDOT request, the project has been divided into two separate contracts north of the Blountstown Highway (SR 20) intersection. The amount bid for the southern portion is $32,739,571.94 and for the northern it is $23,946,624.31, giving the total bid of $56,686,196.25.

The project scope includes widening of the existing two-lane undivided rural roadway to a six-lane divided urban (curb and gutter) facility. New traffic signals will be provided at Blountstown Highway and Gum Road Intersections. Provisions for a future traffic signal will be made at the CCNW intersection with Moore Circle/SR 20 Frontage Road. The project includes significant landscaping as well as pedestrian, bicycle and recreational amenities.

Blueprint issued the Notice To Proceed to the contractor on November 21, 2012. Since the project is located within the environmentally sensitive areas and crosses the Gum Swamp, one of the most important aspects of the project is protection of the environment. In addition to standard
erossion control facilities, some innovative measures, like the Mobile Chitosan-Enhanced Sand Filtration System, have been implemented to ensure that the turbid stormwater does not progress into the open waters or affect water quality of the project area. The chitosan system uses a natural polymer to coagulate fine solid particles suspended in storm water, adjusts acidity of water to environmentally harmless levels and provides sand filtration of treated water.

The project includes installation of wetland mitigation areas at the Broadmoor Pond and Delta Pond parcels. In the initial stages of the project, clearing of the wetland mitigation areas has been done concurrently with drainage ponds construction and the overhead and underground utilities relocation and installation.

Thirty-eight percent of construction has been completed at the current 40% contract time used. The project critical path is close to the original schedule, in spite of weather impacts. The original project duration was 977 calendar days, and the expected project completion date is July 26, 2015. This does not account for an additional 56 days for inclement weather.

Capital Circle SW (W-1)
State Road 263 from US 319 (Crawfordville Road) to SR 20 (Blountstown Highway), a distance of approximately 6.7 miles, is part of a circumferential roadway corridor being improved to provide a connection from SR 8 (Interstate 10) to points south and east of the City of Tallahassee and Leon County as well as to the Tallahassee Regional Airport. Blueprint 2000 is currently finishing the PD&E Study for this segment of roadway with a final public meeting on the project slated for spring of 2014. Design of Capital Circle SW will be paid for and administered by FDOT District Three. Blueprint 2000 is in the process of obtaining Federal Highway Administration approval of the PD&E Study.

Proposed corridor improvements consist of a six-lane urban roadway with bike lanes, curb and gutter and five-foot and ten-foot sidewalks within a maximum 230-foot right-of-way. The right-of-way has been reduced to 180 feet to minimize impacts to the US Forest Service property and the Golden Aster Nature Preserve located along the project corridor. Right-of-way acquisition will be necessary to provide for both the improved transportation corridor and the improved stormwater management facilities.

Cascades Park
See Agenda Item: Cascades Park Update

Capital Cascades Connector Bridge
See Agenda Item: Cascades Connector Bridge Status Update

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1 – Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Project Map
Attachment 2 – Official Bid Sheet for FAMU Way/CCT Segment 3
Attachment 3 – Capital Circle NW/SW Project Map
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen's Excavation</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W.Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M of Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$29,995,000.00</td>
<td>$32,436,386.37</td>
<td>$32,785,892.60</td>
<td>$27,108,199.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Local Preference**: Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
- **Charitable Contribution**: No, No, No, Yes
- **MBE**: 29, 25, 27, 31

**Awarded to**: M of Tallahassee

**Approved by**: [Signature]

**Posted date & time**: 1/03/2014 2:30 PM  
**By**: Robert Threewitts
#3

Cascades Connector
Bridge Status Update
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascades Connector Bridge Update

Date: February 24, 2014  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Charles Hargraves  Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to update the IA on the Capital Cascades Connector Bridge design and construction schedule.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Blueprint staff has been working to address a potential safety concern related to the bridge railing design to deter the possibility of objects being dropped or thrown onto South Monroe Street.

The bridge’s 42” railing design meets Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) specifications, and Blueprint has included video surveillance and signage in the design to discourage prohibited activities. However, as part of Blueprint’s Airspace Agreement with FDOT, FDOT reserves the right in the future to retrofit the bridge railing to install fencing that may reduce the possibility of objects being thrown or dropped should issues occur after construction is completed.

The bridge has been designed with a significant amount of community input and will be a gateway element for downtown. In an effort to be proactive, Blueprint has contracted with the Engineer of Record (FIGG Bridge Engineers) to analyze railing retrofit changes to the bridge that will maintain its current aesthetic and intent. This analysis and minor design update, if necessary, will be completed by the end of February 2014. Funding of the retrofit analysis and design are coming out of project contingency. Below are the project milestones:

- Construction Engineering and Inspection Advertisement and Selection - Complete
- Re-Use Water Line Installation underneath South Monroe Street - Complete
- Construction Bid Advertisement - March 2014
- Utility Relocation (COT Electric) - March 2014
- Construction Bid Opening - April 2014
- Limited Notice-to-Proceed - May 2014
- Notice-to-Proceed - June 2014
- Project Completion - May 2015
Action by the CAC and TCC: This item was presented to the CAC, but no action was taken. This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENT(S): none
IA Meeting Minutes
(September 16, 2013)
### MEMBERS PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner John Dailey</td>
<td>Commissioner Andrew Gillum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bryan Desloge</td>
<td>Mayor John Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Kristin Dozier, Chair</td>
<td>Commissioner Nancy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bill Proctor</td>
<td>Commissioner Gil Ziffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Mary Ann Lindley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Nick Maddox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Jane Sauls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY/COUNTY STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Barber, EPER</td>
<td>Vincent Long, County Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Shelonda Meeks, Blueprint 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cooke, City of Tallahassee</td>
<td>John Powell, City of Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Crumpler, COT Parks &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>Harry Reed, CRTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Daniel, Leon County</td>
<td>Scott Ross, BOCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arielle Franklin, BOCC</td>
<td>Lew Shelley, City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hurst, City of Tallahassee</td>
<td>Rita Stevens, City of Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hargraves, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Wayne Tedder, PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Patrick Twyman, City of Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Jackson, City of Tallahassee</td>
<td>Gary Zirin, BOCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Jones, BOCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHERS PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wings S. Benton, Myers Park resident</td>
<td>Donna Head, Myers Park NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Berger, Woodland Drives NA</td>
<td>Howard Holtzendorf, Myers Park resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Campbell</td>
<td>Sandy Holtzendorf, Myers Park resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Carswell, SC Presents</td>
<td>David Jones, CAC member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Cosper, Myers Park NA</td>
<td>Scott Lawley, SC Presents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Clark</td>
<td>Susan Mayo Lorch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Clark</td>
<td>Maribel Nicholson- Choice, Greenberg Traurig*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Clay</td>
<td>Charles Oxendine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie Connor, Myers Park NA</td>
<td>Clifton Savoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Couch, FSU</td>
<td>Robin Sellers, Woodland Drives NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Cox, KCCI</td>
<td>Dave Snyder, Michael Baker, Jr.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Crosby</td>
<td>Charles Stratton, Broad &amp; Cassel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becki Dutta, Myers Park NA</td>
<td>Peter Stone, Woodlane NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Frederick</td>
<td>Margie Quillman, Michael Baker, Jr.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Gates, Genesis</td>
<td>Mary van Toe, Capital City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commissioner Kristen Dozier called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

I. **AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**

    Autumn Calder stated that there were two supplemental materials for item #6, Citizen’s Advisory Committee Appointments; and replacement of the resolution in item #10, Adoption of the FY 2014 Blueprint Operating Budget & Resolution No. 2013-02.

II. **CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) CHAIRMAN’S REPORT**

    Charles Hargraves updated the Board of recent CAC activities. The minutes were attached for reference as well.

III. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

    1. **CAC Meeting Minutes (May 30 & June 4, 2013)**

       This item was presented as informational only.

    2. **Project Updates**

       This item was presented as informational only.

IV. **CONSENT ITEMS**

    3. **IA Meeting Minutes (June 17, 2013)**

       **RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

       **Option 1:** Approve minutes as provided.

       **Action by TCC and CAC:** This item was not presented to the TCC or CAC.

    4. **Proposed 2014 IA, TCC and CAC Meeting Schedules**

       **RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

       **Option 1:** Approve the dates as presented.

       **Action by TCC and CAC:** The dates were approved by the TCC and CAC.

    5. **Approval to Negotiate a Contract for External Auditing Services**
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Authorize the Blueprint 2000 Director to approve the acceptance of donations from outside groups and individuals less than $1,000,000 per donation, consistent with the Blueprint 2000 Leveraging Policy. The donation awards shall be for approved projects where the project Budget has been approved by the Agency.

Action by TCC and CAC: The CAC voted 10-0 in favor of option 1. This item was not presented to the TCC.

Commissioner Desloge moved the consent agenda; Commissioner Ziffer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

5. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

6. Citizen’s Advisory Committee Appointments

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the following nominations:
Representative from the EECC, Financial Expert: George Smith
Representative from the Education Community: Andrew Chin

Action by TCC and CAC: The CAC voted 10-0 in favor of Option 1. This item was not presented to the TCC.

Commissioner Nick Maddox moved staff recommendation; second by Commissioner Desloge. It passed unanimously.

8. Approval to Extend General Engineering Consultant Contract

Charles Hargraves gave a brief synopsis of the item. Mayor Marks questioned if the company name had changed due to recent purchase. Mr. Hargraves confirmed that at while the company was purchased by another firm, at present the name was still Michael Baker Jr. Inc. He further confirmed that the contract would be amended to reflect the appropriate name when the change was completed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the extension of Michael Baker Jr.’s contract with Blueprint 2000 for an additional one year period.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Commissioner Ziffer moved approval; Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.
9. Maintenance Costs of Sales Tax Funded Projects

Charles Hargraves gave a brief synopsis of the item. He pointed out that costs listed in the agenda item for the City did not include costs for Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 and 4. Wayne Tedder stated that the item was provided at the request of the Board to clearly illustrate the maintenance costs of Blueprint projects as funded by the City and County.

Commissioner Desloge noted that the genesis was in one Agency having a better deal than another. Mr. Tedder stated that the maintenance costs were equally distributed between both the City and County. Commissioner Desloge stated that he felt that it could be handled on a project by project basis.

Commissioner Dozier agreed and stated that both Commissioner Nick Maddox and Commissioner Gillum raised the issues in months past; neither had any comments to add to the item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Option 1: Accept status report on maintenance costs of sales tax funded projects.

**Action by TCC and CAC:** This item was not presented to the CAC or TCC.

Commissioner Desloge moved acceptance of the report. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

7. Cascades Park Update

Commissioner Dozier requested that staff begin item #7 until it was time for the public hearing to begin and complete the presentation once the public hearing was closed.

Charles Hargraves stated that purpose of the item was to provide an update on construction as well as request additional funding associated with additional work, costs due to project extension, and unforeseen items. The additional work items were outlined in A – H in the item. Costs related to the project extension were described in I – L. The unforeseen items were at M and N; as well as project contingencies.

Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint contracted with Sandco, Inc. to complete the construction of the Smokey Hollow Commemoration. The anticipated completion date of that portion was March 15, 2014 (not December 30, 2013 as listed in the agenda item). Completion of the karst repair was expected by February 2014. The Amphitheater was progressing well and the upper pond, Smokey Hollow Pond, was nearing completion.

Mr. Hargraves directed the Board to page 51 of the agenda for the breakdown of costs. Staff was requesting approval of an additional $1,067,000.00 to be provided from unallocated sales tax dollars from other projects. Furthermore, staff requested an additional $500,000 to serve as
contingency on the karst repairs. Funding was from unused funds from the Franklin Boulevard project.

Commissioner Ziffer questioned if he could move approval of all items except the amphitheater and sound study discussion. Commissioner Dozier stated that she and Mr. Tedder felt it best to keep the item intact given that the sound study discussion was a small portion of the larger item. However, she did not want to hold up the meeting; therefore, barring any questions from the Board on other items, she requested staff move into the presentation on the amphitheater and sound study. Commissioner Miller stated that she agreed with Commissioner Ziffer that there were many sub-projects, so to speak, other than the amphitheater and sound study. She felt that it would be easier to approve the other items.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Option 1: Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park by adding $1,067,000.00 to Project Funding and Contingency. Should the karst repair exceed the estimated cost, staff is recommending additional funding up to $500,000.00 to be allocated from remaining funds in the Franklin Boulevard project.

**TCC and CAC Action:** The CAC voted 10-0 in favor of option 1 with one member abstaining. The CAC was extremely concerned about continued cost overruns and project add-ons without a clear understanding of who directed the additional work. Additionally, the CAC was concerned about a continuation of funding requests particularly in light of the Park not being open and thoroughly suggested opening the Park in phases.

This item was not presented to the TCC.

Commissioner Ziffer moved approval of all items with the exception of items related to the Amphitheater, including E.1. Noise Study and Mixing Platform Revisions and E.2. Grid System. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dozier commented on funding for the Meridian Point Building. She noted that it was a City issue however, if things were to move quickly on the City’s part in the acquisition of the property, she was concerned about putting money into the existing building to make it usable for a year. She did not mind the investment if it would be a longer period of time. She requested that the City keep the Board informed as to the progress of the acquisition. Commissioner Miller stated that while she had seen no movement on the issue, the City was hopeful of a quick turnaround. Commissioner Gillum stated that he had discussed the Meridian Point Building with Dr. Eric Baron with FSU and City management. There was an agreement for the transfer of the property. The land swap piece remained unresolved; while there were many pieces and would require Cabinet and City Commission approval, there were no major obstacles with the University.

Mayor Marks questioned item G and a cost of $250,000 for the amphitheater restroom. Mr. Tedder stated that the cost was based on the concept plans of a standalone facility located in an area of the park without restrooms, near both the Amphitheater and the Discover Garden. Also,
it's a larger facility with accommodations for 8-12 stalls for each gender. Commissioner Miller requested that “family” restrooms be included in the design. Mr. Tedder stated that they were tentatively in the plan.

Commissioner called the vote on Item 7 with the exception of 7.E; a separate vote would be held for it. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. David Jones, the CAC representative for the Disabled Community, spoke of concerns from that community regarding Cascades Park. At the August 29, 2013 CAC meeting there was an agenda item to address Centennial Field. Staff recommended in that item that construction move forward with a grass and clay field rather than an accessible universal play field recommended by the CAC as an alternative. Mr. Jones initially requested this alternative more than one year earlier to ensure that a portion of the park was inviting to people of all abilities and demographics; also to show the welcoming attitude of the Tallahassee community for diversity.

That process did not happen in part because of staff vacancies, transitions, and newly hired employees through Blueprint and City Parks and Rec. Because of those delays however, the proposal never made it before the IA. When the CAC was requested to approve the reallocation of funds from Cascades Park to a general fund to be used for other projects, Mr. Jones brought the Centennial Field alternative to the front again.

The CAC once again supported further research and inclusion of a universally accessible, rubberized field and requested support of the IA for it as well.

VI.  PUBLIC HEARING

10. Adoption of the FY 2014 Blueprint Operating Budget & Resolution No. 2013-02

Wayne Tedder stated that there were no significant changes since the presentation at the June IA meeting with the exception of City services. Blueprint received notice from the City that the cost of services provided by Budget and Policy would increase; the outline of that was included as Attachment 1. This inclusion increased the total operating budget to $3,086,892.00.

There were no speakers on the item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1: Adopt the FY 2014 Blueprint Operating Budget as presented and approve the FY 2014 Operating Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2013-02).

**Action by TCC and CAC:** A Public Hearing was advertised and held during the Blueprint 2000 CAC meeting on June 4, 2013. There were no speakers.

Commissioner Gillum moved adoption of the operating budget; Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion.
Commissioner Miller noted the almost 24% increase over FY13 on personnel services and requested clarification. Mr. Tedder stated that one of his charges as Director of PLACE was to look at reducing operating costs of Blueprint and ensure the funds were allocated to capital projects. Some of the ways he had restructured the department was in reducing the GEC staff by three people and hiring temporary employees to fill those duties.

Mr. Hargraves read the resolution into the record. **The item passed unanimously.**


Mr. Tedder stated that nothing of substance had changed since the June presentation and summarized the allocations for the Board.

There were no speakers on the item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1: Adopt the FY 2014-FY 2018 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2014 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt the Budget Resolution.

**Action by TCC and CAC:** A Public Hearing was advertised and held during the Blueprint 2000 CAC meeting on June 4, 2013. There were no speakers.

Commissioner Miller stated that the way Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 and the FAMU Way improvements section was worded sounded as if it was at the City’s expense. Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint would be completing and funding the stormwater improvements as well as the trail, which would parallel FAMU Way. It would however be bid as one project.

Mr. Hargraves read the resolution into the record. **Commissioner Ziffer moved adoption; Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

V. **PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS – continued**

7. **Cascades Park Update- continued**

Regarding Mr. Jones comments to the Board, Commissioner Dozier opened the floor to comment. Mr. Hargraves confirmed that Blueprint would indeed bring the item before the Board. Commissioner Miller stated that she was concerned with the continual additions to Cascades Park. Looking at Segment 4, where the water quality treatment would be done, was still estimated at “to be determined.” Much had been done for Cascades Park, it had grown to much more than expected. With all due respect, she felt it too bad when someone comes in at the end of the line. Still, she was experiencing “sticker shock” and yet the Board kept adding to it when there were two segments that remained to be constructed.
Commissioner Dozier stated that while there had been changes in construction costs the majority of the amenities were planned from the beginning; just not funded. From her perspective, she did not feel that it had “mushroomed” however. There had been many fundraising conversations, particularly around Smokey Hollow and funding was identified. However, she suggested that the Board wait until the item was presented by staff for a full discussion to occur.

E. Amphitheater-
   E.1 Noise Study and Mixing Platform Revisions
   E.2 Grid System

Commissioner Dozier stated that she would be recusing herself from voting the item because she was related to the person who completed the sound test. She did not believe that she had a conflict of interest and would still participate in the discussion.

Mr. Tedder gave an overview of the sound study and methodology used. Furthermore, the Meyers Park and Woodland Drive neighborhoods hired Siebein & Associates, a private consultant to conduct their own sound tests and to review the material collected by Blueprint. They requested that Mr. Tedder hold off on presenting the findings of the sound study to allow them time to review the data and draw their own conclusions. However, as an employee of the City and County he would be delivering the information to the Board.

Commissioner Gillum questioned how the survey accounted for the delays in the schedule. Mr. Tedder stated that Scott Carswell was recording activities of the sound test in three to five minute intervals that could then be compared to the survey data. Also, there was a range of low to high within each of the test periods.

Scott Carswell, producer from The Moon, spoke to the actual decibel levels of the study. Mr. Carswell provided the Board with a written summary of the analysis. (The document has been made a part of the record and is available at the Blueprint 2000 offices upon request.) He stated that the purpose of the event was to test the house system, which would be permanently installed at the amphitheater, as well as a touring or concert system. He spoke to the range of sound from a range of performances that were possible at the amphitheater. The sound test was pushed to what was considered to be the maximum of those possibilities from both systems.

Sound readings were taken at the perimeter of the park, at the mix position, and at various points throughout the neighborhood. Mr. Carswell spoke briefly about the individual sound tests. He noted that the test including heavy bass was “way too loud in the park for any event” as well as the Oakland Street location. As he went through the report he stressed the importance of the application of the sound system, as much as the regulation of dB.

Commissioner Ziffer stated that while he was not present at the sound test, it seemed from the responses of the neighborhoods that it was significantly louder than what was predicted. Mr. Tedder stated that his original intent was to hit 85 dBA at the property line. Commissioner Ziffer interjected, that it apparently went much higher than that. Mr. Tedder stated that Mr. Carswell was coordinating with the consultant from the neighborhood, and together, pushed to the louder
levels which were beyond what Mr. Tedder anticipated. Mr. Carswell clarified that the dB levels were listed on the test sheets; specifically that Test #3 would be at 110 dBA. The second test was at 85 dBA.

Mr. Carswell stated that four types of sound were used for both systems: track recordings, a band (both acoustical duo and a full band), spoken word, and pink noise (having equal noise power in all octaves). Regarding the house system, Mr. Carswell felt confident that the needs would be well below the proposed noise ordinance limit of 85 dBA. He described the individual levels of each test the details of which are available in the presentation on file at the Blueprint office. The loudest test of the house system produced readings of 98 dBA at the mix booth. At that however, the perimeter readings were 80 dBA and neighborhood readings of 60 dBA (normal conversation range). His professional opinion of the house system was that, even if used unsupervised, it would not be of significant impact to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Regarding the touring system, Mr. Carswell stated that based on the observation during the test by the sound engineers and consultants on site, the volume level necessary to accommodate touring act requirements and audiences, would need a dB level of 95 in the mix position. That created an average dB level at the perimeter that would comply with the proposed ordinance. Single point observations at the perimeter however could get readings slightly above the ordinance. He suggested one way to deal with it was to use a smaller array system and adjust the aim of speakers toward the center of the audience. He reiterated that the application of the system was as important as the dB levels.

Furthermore, Mr. Carswell recommended that there be further study to define the operational perimeters of the touring system. Including, but not limited to smaller systems aimed to the center of the audience and possibly consider a C-weighted restriction on the Park; potentially on the ordinance in general. It needed to be considered because the low frequency sound would generate a higher dB rating than a higher frequency even though the loudness was the same.

Commissioner Dozier requested that the residents of Myers Park and Woodland Drives neighborhoods who were waiving their speaking time in support of Robert Clay’s statement to identify their selves to give the Board an idea of how many of the audience he represented.

Robert Clay, 1303 Beard Street, stated that he was speaking on behalf of the presidents of the Myers Park and Woodland Drive neighborhood associations. Mr. Clay stated that he was present in the mixing booth during the sound test and commended the professionalism of all parties. He felt it was a successful test and laid the foundation for working together in the future.

The neighborhoods made five requests of the IA which they provided to the Board in writing (The document has been made a part of the record and is available at the Blueprint 2000 offices upon request): (1) immediately establish a working group comprised of Blueprint 2000 staff, Scott Carswell and team, and representatives of the neighborhoods, (2) affirm that Siebein would be included in future tests, (3) affirm that Siebein have the opportunity to evaluate any design proposals before changes are made, (4) require that prior to any staff recommendations go before the IA for approval, that the working group be allowed to review the data analysis and
recommendation, and (5) that IA agenda material provide feedback from Siebein whether it supported the staff recommendation or not.

Mayor Marks requested that Mr. Clay describe what the proposed working group might look like. Mr. Clay stated that it was original proposed by Blueprint staff to help monitor and management events over time, mitigating impacts, and work to make the park a success. Mr. Tedder stated that it was not quite accurate; Blueprint had no responsibility beyond the construction of the park. What he believed Mr. Clay was referring to was a sub-group, approved individually by the City and County Commissions that would advise Dee Crumpler and Lee Daniel for the ticketed events. There was no discussion of that working group regarding the design or construction. Commissioner Dozier stated that she thought those discussions had taken place at the City regarding Amphitheater management in general that would take place by City Parks and Recreation.

Wendy Gray, 1047 Myers Park Drive, stated that Commissioner Scott Maddox suggested at an IA meeting that a working group be created to move through the issues of design. There was also a discussion of incorporation of that group with the stage committee, etc. through the City. She thought it might have gotten mixed up with other activities since then and requested that the Board consider implementing it.

Lee Daniel stated that the Stage Committee, as per the Interlocal Agreement, consisted of representatives of both neighborhoods, KCCI, FSU Seven Days of Opening Nights, FAMU Lyceum Series, Dee Crumpler, and himself. The purpose of the committee was to work on issues surrounding the 10 ticketed events. There was no responsibility with the committee regarding any local event through City Parks & Rec. The Stage Committee would develop the master calendar, suggestions on types of entertainment, neighborhood concerns, and other issues specific to those 10 regional, ticketed events.

Commissioner Miller stated that she was unclear on what the neighborhood was asking for; a separate stage committee separate and apart or an expansion of the current committee. Furthermore, she was not certain if the scope of work had yet been defined for it. Commissioner Dozier stated that her sense was it could be part of the fuller conversations that remained. She requested that the Board hear the remaining speakers before comments or further discussion.

Cindy Cosper, 520 Oakland Avenue, stated that she supported the five recommendations presented. The heavy bass made a difference as well as the genre selected. Some choices were “very acceptable and nice” and she felt confident that “things could be controlled.” Other choices were “very loud” and at some points “extremely irritating.” She was concerned for the personal safety for attendees if the decibel levels were 95 in that area, quoting OSHA safety concerns. She requested the Board consider the C-weighting and the genre of events scheduled.

Susan Mayo-Norch, 543 E. Jennings Street, there were no testing devices located near her home. She stated that the noise she heard was the heavy bass sounds. She likened it to the boom of bass from cars at a stop sign. She felt that part of the issue was the terrain. She requested that sound meters moved further out or arranged in different locations for subsequent tests.
Cliff Savoy, 519 Oakland Avenue, spoke to the effect of the increase noise levels on wildlife, specifically birds. Having lost much of his sight, he derived great joy from bird song and the peacefulness of the backyard sanctuary he created for the birds. He considered anything that disrupted that quietude noise pollution. It was mid-afternoon the next day before the birdsong returned. The impact was greater than a few hours based on his observations following the test.

Vivian Young, 411 Oakland Avenue, stated that the numbers reported in the presentation seemed to be averages of an area as large as 800 homes. She thought that was somewhat misleading because some areas were greatly impacted while others were hardly impacted at all. Furthermore, it went on the assumption that 85 dBA were appropriate level for sound. The ordinance had not even been adopted by the City yet already caused great concern from some residents. As they understood it, she stated, was the highest in the state. The assumption that it was acceptable was a separate issue to be determined.

Regarding the working group, she reiterated that it was Commissioner Scott Maddox that recommended at an IA meeting that a separate committee be established and the neighborhoods be involved. Furthermore, she stated the neighbors raised more than $6,000.00 to hire Siebein & Associates. Personally, she was dismayed that a professional acoustical engineer was not part of the original design of the facility. They raised the money because of their concern and desire to be part of the process of reviewing and analyzing recommendations. She requested better communication and more involvement in the process in terms of an ongoing working group that reviewed any changes to ensure they were made in a comprehensive and holistic manner.

Mary Fredrick, 805 Circle Drive, stated that the working group was necessary because communication was not flowing. She was in touch with the City’s Communications Department and carbon copied Commissioner Miller as well, about improved communications through a Facebook page like what was done with Gaines Street.

Jeanne Conner, 534 Oakland Avenue, stated in response to Mayor Marks, the working group was supposed to establish communications and avoid conflicts. She likened it to the working group for the Historical Preservation District and the successes it had because of all interest groups coming together for the betterment to the community. Regarding the test itself, she stated that from 7:00 to 8:00 pm she “like to have when out of my mind” because it was so loud. Her third point was that residents were repeatedly told that it was designed “wrong,” that it was “too late” and “nothing could be done.” There was science, technology, and experimentation that could be used. She encouraged the establishment of the working group and that it was not too late to make it work.

Commissioner Miller stated that she understood from the June meeting that Mr. Tedder would be establishing a system of communication and requested explanation. Mr. Tedder stated that the Facebook page had not been created because it was time consuming to get it right. He focused staff on the actual work on the ground. He was concerned that the neighborhood felt there had not been strong communication from Blueprint. Mr. Tedder was personally in contact with the HOA presidents throughout the entire process. The date was set and communicated to them by August 23, 2013. Letters could have been sent then however, Blueprint chose to work with the
HOA presidents to disseminate the information to the residents. Commissioner Miller stated that's not working so a different approach was necessary. Mr. Tedder agreed.

Dee Crumpler stated that the stage committee, one component of the Interlocal Agreement, would be an ongoing committee whose purpose was greater than the design of the Amphitheater. In addition to the representatives mentioned earlier by Mr. Daniel, there would be representatives from the Police Department and Real Estate Division as well.

Commissioner Ziffer asked if, based upon the experience, Mr. Carswell could come to a balance between the needs of performers and the concerns of the residents. Mr. Carswell stated that he felt they could. Topography undeniably impacted the sound, however.

Commissioner Ziffer stated that he took issue with the comment that it was designed incorrectly. He had been involved with fundraising for Cascades Park for many years and the amphitheater had always been oriented toward the hill because the topography was perfect from a seating perspective. You wanted the audience to look down at the entertainers. Beyond that, he stated he did not want to be involved in the selection of genres or judging one as good and another as not. He felt it inappropriate for the Commissions.

Furthermore, stated Commissioner Ziffer, he was opposed to opening the park in piece-meal fashion. He preferred to open it once complete. He did not have any positive feelings about opening in the cold of January or February even if the karst issues could be sorted.

Tying everything together, Commission Ziffer stated that he was not opposed to forming the working group. He thought the steps taken had been appropriate and still he was listening closely to the speakers. There was clearly a breakdown in the communication process. He pushed for resolution between the City, the neighborhoods, and performers because he didn’t want to listen to the same things come February.

Commissioner Nick Maddox moved to comply with the five requests made by the Myers Park and Woodland Drives neighborhoods and reimburse the HOAs the $6K for Sieben & Associates. Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dozier questioned if such a reimbursement would be possible given purchasing rules. Mr. Tedder stated that because it was a Professional Service there could be more flexibility; if it was the direction of the Board staff would figure out a way to make it happen and in compliance with policies.

Commissioner Lindley questioned if the neighborhoods wanted to be reimbursed or if they preferred to have skin in the game. Commissioner Nick Maddox stated that he thought it was their attempt to make skin in the game. In his opinion, they should not have to pay to have skin in the game however it showed their dedication to being included.

Commissioner Ziffer stated that item one, establishing the working group, was the intro. However points two through five were, in his opinion, things that might come out of that committee. He wondered if Commissioner Nick Maddox might consider just the establishment
of the committee and let them create the ground rules. Or did the Board want to dictate the other points. Commissioner Nick Maddox stated that he could agree with that as long as the committee that was formed reviewed points two through five and make recommendations back to the IA for acceptance. Commissioner Desloge state that he supported it as well as long as it was in the spirit of the original points.

Commissioner Dailey stated that he supported the motion on the table and offered a friendly amendment. He stated that simply reimbursing the neighborhood made them whole. He felt it appropriate for staff to bring back a budget amendment to consider putting Siebein or another company on retainer moving forward. He was curious if Blueprint would have to go through the typical RFP process or could Blueprint select Siebein. He did not speculate what the duration or cost would be. He was also in support of the working group’s involvement with the design process.

Mr. Tedder stated that the next item included funding for construction. Commissioner Nick Maddox wondered if Mr. Tedder thought it best that Commissioner Dailey hold his motion until the next item. Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint identified an amount of the sound study; if the Board chose to increase it, Blueprint could use Siebein & Associates as necessary. He didn’t expect that Siebein would re-analyze all data and begin making changes to the park. That would be extremely messy and cause significant delays to construction of the Amphitheater. However, there were certain decision points that seemed more appropriate to bring them in on.

Commissioner Ziffer requested Commissioner Daily suggest a dollar amount. Commissioner Dailey suggested a budget amendment of $50K knowing that it was likely that Blueprint would not spend nearly that much. It was merely to provide enough cushion to execute a contract. Furthermore, if policy did not prohibit it, he would like to see Blueprint move forward with the firm selected by the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Dozier questioned if the motion should be amended to adopt 7E with an additional $50K (total $100K). Mr. Tedder stated yes.

Commissioner Dailey also requested that the City update the County Commission on the status of the noise ordinance. It did not need to be a formal presentation he stated. Also, it would be interesting to change the focus a bit not only on decibel levels but on creative and temporary noise mitigation ideas. He felt that with Siebein’s experience, they were certain to have interesting ideas and success stories, even on a temporary basis, in other communities.

Commissioner Nick Maddox stated that, like Commissioner Ziffer he preferred to see the park completed before opening, rather than doing it piece meal. He suggested taking a formal vote to solidify that position. Commissioner Ziffer stated that if March were the target date for opening, it was only six months out and that was not much time to coordinate such an event. He understood that there were variables to be worked out however he strongly encouraged the Board to focus on a target date rather than the nebulous “fall or spring.”

Commissioner Dozier stated that the project had to be trisected with the TDC working on the stage Committee, the City with the noise ordinance, and Blueprint IA with infrastructure. She
stated that having been at the sound test, it was too loud during the first hour and as a ticket holder, would not want to be in that space with it that loud. She requested that the City give consideration to decoupling the broader noise ordinance from the regulation of the Amphitheater. Specifically, however, bass levels should be considered.

Mayor Marks stated that regarding the noise ordinance he did not see any reason why they would not take into consideration what had already been completed. He commended the neighbors for their input and praised staff for the dedicated effort on Cascades Park and other projects as well.

Commissioner Gillum agreed with Mayor Marks and further stated that the noise study at Cascades Park would benefit the noise ordinance as a whole. He requested clarification on the C-weighted level. Mr. Carswell stated that an 85 dBA would probably jump to 95 as a C-weight. It would take balance and was a place that Siebein & Associates could support the process. He agreed with Commissioner Dozier in the review of various areas based on differing criteria. The Amphitheater had 700-feet between the Seaboard rail line and the first house going uphill through trees. It could have the opposite effect; the Amphitheater could have a higher number than other areas of the city or county. A blanket rating across the county with a 15 point drop at midnight, for example would significantly impact many businesses in the community. That was at dBA, a c-weighing could make it much more dramatic.

Commissioner Gillum stated that the IA was not the decision making place for the noise ordinance; in fact Commissioner Miller’s target issue committee was the lead on it. He suggested that the City use the data that was collected through the process at Cascades Park for two reasons, (1) so that it did not have to be duplicated and (2) to keep it on a parallel track. Decoupling whatever might be decided for the broader community from the Amphitheater.

Commissioner Miller stated that having worked on the noise ordinance through her target issue committee she was curious, if a special district was created for the Myers Park and Woodland Park Drive neighborhoods, what would happen in the future when other neighborhoods petitioned the commission for their own special district. That was the reason the target issue committee decided that it was imperative to get the perimeters, hours, and numbers right in the established districts.

She clarified for the Board that the proposed ordinance would be city wide and currently there three districts: residential, commercial, SEA districts (Special Exemption Areas). Those areas had generated the most discussion because of the nature of the districts; places like Tennessee Street and Cascades Park. She noted however that there were several such districts across the city. There was a draft ordinance out for public review and feedback. With the presentation and discussion at that meeting, it was obvious to her that dBCs would have to be included; although most ordinances addressed dBAs only.

Commissioner Ziffer called the question on Commissioner Nick Maddox’s motion of accepting recommendation one, the formation of a working group, who would reflect on recommendations two through five; plus reimbursement of the HOAs the $6K for Siebein & Associates. The motion passed unanimously.
Commissioner Ziffer moved approval of E.1 and E.2 with E.1 being raised to $100K (E.2 remained $120K). Commissioner Lindley seconded the motion.

Commissioner Miller stated that she felt if Blueprint had hired and acoustical engineer in the beginning it would not have been as effective as the process had been. She was sorry that the neighbors had to do it their selves however they had their own consultant who reported only to them and allowed the development of trust. That could then be transferred to the Blueprint team.

Commissioner Nick Maddox requested clarification on hiring the consultant outright without an RFP process. City Manager Anita Favors Thompson stated that by City policy the process could be formally waived by the City Commission. Commissioner Doziers stated that while Blueprint followed City procurement policy it would be the same process with the County. Several members requested to complete the task while everyone was present.

It passed unanimously.

Commissioner Desloge moved that the procurement rules be waived in that case so that up to $50K could be used to hire Siebein & Associates. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

Mayor Marks stated that he had concerns with it being single source procurement. The Board was taking action on an item that would typically be vetted through a public hearing process. While present might think it a great idea but there could be citizens who might not.

Commissioner Dozier stated that both Commissions had to be extraordinarily careful with procurement policy. At the same time it was likely that any vote could upset someone. In that particular case, given that it was the consultant chosen by the neighborhoods and that it was the basis of the whole discussion up to that point, the circumstance before them was atypical.

Mayor Marks stated that he was not concern with who was hired; it was the allocation of the money that concerned him. Commissioner Miller stated that as she understood it, they were not waiving the rule to change the budget. It was for the single source procurement of the consultant. Commissioner Nick Maddox stated that he agreed with using Siebein. And yet, "waiving the rules" regarding procurement gave him pause.

The vote passed 8-2; Mayor Marks and Commissioner Nick Maddox cast the dissenting votes; Commissioner Dozier recused herself from voting.

VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

IX. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Chairman Dozier adjourned the meeting at 7:40 pm.

APPROVED:  

__________________________  ATTEST:
Kristin Dozier  
Chair of Blueprint 2000 IA  

__________________________  
Shelonda Meeks  
Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
#5

Proposed IA Meeting
Date Change –
June 2014
SUBJECT/TITLE: Proposed IA Meeting Date Change – June 2014

Date: February 24, 2014
Contact Person: Shelonda Meeks

Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This agenda item is a request to change the meeting date for the June 2014 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting from June 16, 2014 to June 30, 2014.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Vice-chairman Scott Maddox has requested that the meeting date be changed to allow him to be present for his first meeting as the Chair of the IA. Blueprint staff has coordinated with Commission Aides and staff to select the proposed date. Below are the dates of this year’s remaining IA meetings:

- Monday, June 30, 2014, from 3:00-5:00 pm, if approved
- Monday, September 15, 2014, from 5:00-8:00 pm (FY 2014 Budget Public Hearing at 5:30 pm)

BLUEPRINT 2000 PROJECT DEFINITIONS REPORT CONSISTENCY:
Not applicable.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Change the meeting date for the June 2014 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting from June 16, 2014 to June 30, 2014.

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Option 1: Change the meeting date for the June 2014 Intergovernmental Agency (IA) meeting from June 16, 2014 to June 30, 2014.

Attachments:
None
Proposed Increase to Annual Limitation on Funding for Professional Services Agreement for Outside Counsel on CCNW/SW
**Agenda Item**

**SUBJECT/TITLE:** Proposed Increase to Annual Limitation on Funding for Professional Services Agreement for Outside Counsel on CCNW/SW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>February 24, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Debra W. Schiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested By:</td>
<td>Blueprint 2000 Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Item:</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**

This item requests approval of an increase of the annual funding limitation in the Professional Services Agreement for outside counsel on the CCNW/SW Project, and as needed for other construction-related matters on Blueprint projects, to a new limitation of **$75,000.00**.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**

Due to the level of complexity with regard to the specialized area of construction law and the management of construction-related claims with contractors, Blueprint has determined it is most advantageous to hire outside counsel to handle these increasingly complicated issues. Accordingly, Blueprint considered a number of reputable law firms that regularly operate in the intricacies of construction law, and decided that the law firm of Gardner, Bist, Weiner, et. al., is best-suited, particularly Mr. Michael P. Bist and his associate Erin W. Duncan.

Blueprint has entered into a Professional Services Agreement with the law firm such that the firm will represent Blueprint on legal construction-related matters in the N2 CCNW/SW Project, and as needed for other construction-related matters on Blueprint projects. However, the degree of complications associated with the N2 and other Blueprint projects requires significant work hours for adequate representation of Blueprint’s and the public’s interest. Additionally, Blueprint’s Executive Director was capped to approving the funding limitation to $25,000.00, based on his levels of authority pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement and applicable By-Laws and policies. Furthermore, if the funding limitation is not increased, it would risk a halt of all work and legal representation by the law firm (which may occur at a critical point) until such time as the additional limitation is approved and allocated. Therefore, Blueprint has calculated that the annual funding limitation should more appropriately be $75,000.00, and now requests the IA to approve this increased limitation.
OPTIONS:

Option 1: Approve $75,000.00 as the annual funding limitation for the Professional Services Agreement in the N2 CCNW/SW Project, and as needed for other construction-related matters on Blueprint projects.

Option 2: Not approve $75,000.00 as the annual funding limitation for the Professional Services Agreement in the N2 CCNW/SW Project, and as needed for other construction-related matters on Blueprint projects, and provide direction to staff.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1: Approve $75,000.00 as the annual funding limitation for the Professional Services Agreement in the N2 CCNW/SW Project, and as needed for other construction-related matters on Blueprint projects.

Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report Consistency: Not applicable.

Action by the CAC and TCC: This item was not presented to either the CAC or the TCC.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1: Professional Services Agreement
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT entered into this 26th day of January, 2014, by and between the LEON COUNTY – CITY OF TALLAHASSEE, BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY, hereinafter referred to as “Agency,” and the law firm of GARDNER, BIST, WIENER, WADSWORTH, BOWDEN, BUSH, DEE, LAVIA & WRIGHT, P.A., hereinafter referred to as “Attorney.”

The Agency is desirous of obtaining, and the Attorney is desirous of rendering, certain legal services required by the Agency as specifically set forth in the scope of services below and the other terms and conditions of this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, for valuable consideration and the mutual promises between the parties hereto, it is agreed as follows:

1. **Scope of Services.**

   (i) The Attorney shall serve as legal counsel and advisor for the Agency, and shall provide representation for the Agency, including related legal, administrative, and regulatory proceedings and processes with respect to:

   a) Contract No. 2721 of the Agency’s N2 Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Corridor Improvement Project (“Project”) entered into with Anderson Columbia Company, Inc. and its subcontractors.

   b) Any matters, pursuant to applicable Florida law, arising from the Project and/or any other Agency construction-related matters assigned to the Attorney by the Agency from time to time, exclusive of any condemnation/eminent domain matters.
The Attorney shall render the above professional services as may be specifically requested by the Agency, from time to time and as needed, to the extent the same are within this Scope of Services. Such requested services shall include all services as are reasonably required to adequately represent the Agency in such regard, after a joint determination is made by the Attorney and the Agency that there is no conflict of interest in the matter.

(ii) Blueprint’s Legal Counsel shall be the Coordinating Attorney with respect to provision of services by the Attorney. Blueprint’s Executive Director and/or Manager may consult directly with the Attorney on an as-needed basis. To meet consistency with this Agreement and to keep Coordinating Attorney apprised, the Attorney shall copy Blueprint’s Legal Counsel on all communications the Attorney has with the Agency.

(iii) Condemnation Services & Conflict of Interest.

a) Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, Attorney shall not provide representation to the Agency in any matters specifically regarding condemnation or eminent domain matters or issues; nor shall the provision of legal services to third parties by Attorney in any condemnation or eminent domain matters or issues involving the Agency be prohibited or deemed a conflict of interest, including, but not limited to, representation of clients whose property is deemed necessary for a public purposes, the qualification of witnesses and attorneys in such proceedings and the value of their services, and in matters pertaining to the value of real property or the impact of a “taking” on the value of real property (hereinafter referred to as the “Condemnation Services”), so long as the Provision of Condemnation Services are provided by attorneys and paralegals employed by the Attorney.
other than those identified in subparagraph 2(ii) of this Agreement for third parties in matters involving the Agency.

b) If the provision of such Condemnation Services for a third party could be construed to be a conflict of interest with the Agency, those attorneys and paralegals employed by the Attorney identified in subparagraph 2(ii) of this Agreement shall immediately notify Blueprint’s Legal Counsel and none of those attorneys and paralegals employed by the Attorney identified in subparagraph 2(ii) shall in any way participate and/or communicate with the Attorney regarding its representation of the third party, nor shall the Attorney or those attorneys and paralegals employed by the Attorney identified in subparagraph 2(ii) share with one another any information obtained in their course of representation of either the Agency or third party.

c) The Agency hereby consents and agrees to the provision of such legal services by Attorney, other than those identified in subparagraph 2(ii), to third parties in any matters deemed Condemnation Services, as per the terms of this Agreement.

2. **Compensation.** The Attorney shall be compensated, at the hourly billing rates set forth below, for all services rendered, provided that such services are within the Scope of Services and that funding therefore has been authorized at the time of rendition. Such rates may be modified from time to time by mutual written agreement between Attorney and Blueprint’s Executive Director, or his designee. Additionally, the Agency shall compensate the Attorney for the following costs, fees and expenses incurred in rendering services to the Agency:

   (i) **at cost,** for all approved fees and costs incurred in rendering services to the Agency, including long distance telephone charges, postage, messenger services, out-of-state computer-aided research costs, consultant costs, filing fees, and litigation costs;
(ii) at the rate of $0.25 per page for all copies and facsimile transmissions made.

Hourly Rates: Lead attorney Michael P. Bist at $300.00, associate attorney Erin W. Duncan at $175.00, and certified legal assistant Cynthia T. Ragans at $100.00. The Attorney must provide at least 30 days’ notice of any proposed change in the hourly fee schedule, which must be agreed to in writing by the Agency.

3. **Invoices.** On or before the 30th day of each month, the Attorney shall prepare and submit an invoice for fees, costs, and expenses incurred in providing services during the preceding month. Invoices must include a cover page, on Attorney’s firm stationary stating the subject matter being invoiced, the date of the invoice, the invoice number submitted chronologically, and the amount due. Invoices shall provide detail as to specific and cumulative time expended in 10ths of an hour, disbursements made, and expenses incurred in providing services during the preceding month and on each specific matter or case from its origination, as may be required by Blueprint’s Legal Counsel. Unless otherwise directed, in writing by Blueprint’s Legal Counsel, original invoices shall be submitted to Blueprint’s Legal Counsel, 2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200, Tallahassee, FL 32301. Invoices shall reference this Agreement (both by subject matter and by contract number).

4. **Maintenance of Professional Standards.** All work performed by the Attorney shall be in accordance with the highest standards of the legal profession. The Attorney shall maintain familiarity with applicable code(s) of professional responsibility and shall ensure that at no time does its representation cause it to be in a position of violation of the standards of conduct set by those rules. In the event of any questions concerning conflict of interest between the Agency and any other client represented by the Attorney, the same shall be disclosed to
Blueprint’s Legal Counsel immediately upon the issue being raised. In the event Blueprint’s Legal Counsel, or her designee, shall determine that a conflict of interest or appearance thereof exists, Blueprint’s Legal Counsel, upon consultation with Blueprint’s Executive Director and/or Manager, may immediately terminate this Agreement.

5. **Primary Service Responsibility.** Debra W. Schiro, Blueprint’s Legal Counsel shall have primary responsibility, with respect to the Agency for oversight and coordination of services provided under this Agreement. In addition, Blueprint’s Legal Counsel and Assistant Legal Counsel may provide legal services to the Attorney, if the circumstances warrant and as needed, upon coordination of the Attorney and Blueprint’s Legal Counsel. Services under this Agreement will primarily be provided by Michael P. Bist. Should the Attorney be authorized by the Agency to engage services of any expert consultant for this matter, then a separate agreement between the Agency and the expert shall be executed.

6. **Term.** This Agreement is for an indefinite term, however, it is limited to the time required to close/complete matters related to Contract No. 2721 of the Agency’s Project, as well as any claims, disputes, and/or causes of action that may arise as a result of the Project or other Agency construction-related matters. This Agreement may be terminated by either party for the convenience of that party upon thirty (30) days’ written notice.

7. **Limitation on Funding.** The funding limitation for services under this Agreement is $25,000.00, which limitation may be increased by written notice from Blueprint’s Legal Counsel, upon approval of Blueprint’s Executive Director and/or Manager, or approval as may be required by the Intergovernmental Management Committee or the Intergovernmental Agency. The Attorney and Blueprint’s Legal Counsel shall work closely together to monitor, on an on-going basis, time expended and expenses incurred by the Attorney in providing services, to
anticipate the need for future services, and to estimate the costs being requested by the Agency to ensure that adequate funding is available for all such services. The Attorney shall provide prompt written notice to Blueprint’s Legal Counsel at such time as the total of prior billings and current, but unbilled, fees, costs, and expenses equals approximately eighty percent (80%) of such funding limitation.

8. **Construction of Agreement.** The validity, construction and effect of this Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Florida.

9. **Captions.** The captions in the Agreement are for convenience only, are not a part of this Agreement and do not in any way limit or amplify the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

LEON COUNTY–CITY OF TALLAHASSEE  
BLUEPRINT 2000  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY  

By: Wayne Toddler  
Executive Director

GARDNER, BIST, WIENER, WADSWORTH, BOWDEN, BUSH, DEE, LAVIA & WRIGHT, P.A.

By: Michael P. Bist  
President

Approved as to Form:

Debra W. Schiro  
Blueprint Legal Counsel

ATTEST:  
James O. Cooke, IV  
City Treasurer-Clerk

Professional Services Agreement  
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Comprehensive Annual Financial Report Fiscal Year 2013
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Acceptance of FY 2013 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2013 Operating Fund Balance

Date: February 24, 2014
Contact Person: Wayne Tedder/Rita Stevens

REQUESTED BY: Blueprint 2000 Staff

Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item is to present to the Intergovernmental Agency Board Blueprint’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the year ended September 30, 2013, and the appropriation of Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 encumbrances and unexpended operating budget funds.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The Blueprint 2000 FY 2013 CAFR has been completed. In addition to the financial statements, the CAFR includes the opinion of the external auditors, their management letter, and the auditor’s reports on compliance and internal controls. It should be noted, as in previous years, the Agency received an unqualified opinion from the external auditors, Thomas, Howell, Ferguson and Law Redd, Crona, and Munroe, P.A.s.

At the end of the fiscal year, $9,416,489 remained unexpended. $5,526 is encumbered for contracts, and $9,410,963 is available for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund. Staff is requesting the Board approve an increase in the FY 2014 adopted budget of $5,526 for outstanding encumbrances and $9,410,963 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$28,754,137</td>
<td>Approved FY 2014 Operating Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>FY 2013 Carryover for Encumbrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,410,963</td>
<td>FY 2013 Unexpended Balance transfer to Capital Projects Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,170,626</td>
<td>Total FY 2014 Amended Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Accept the FY 2013 CAFR and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2014 Operating Budget of $5,526 for encumbrances and $9,410,963 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund.

Option 2: Provide alternate direction to staff.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Option 1: Accept the FY 2013 CAFR and approve additional appropriation to the FY 2014 Operating Budget of $5,526 for encumbrances and $9,410,963 for transfer to the Capital Projects Fund.
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Agenda Item
Item Title: Acceptance of FY 2013 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Appropriation of FY 2013 Operating Fund Balance
Meeting Date: February 24, 2014
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Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report Consistency: Not applicable.

Action by the CAC and TCC: The CAC was provided an update on the FY 2013 CAFR but did not take any action. The TCC did not review this item.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Management Letter (to be provided)
Attachment 2: FY 2013 CAFR document (to be provided)
Florida Department of Transportation Bold Landscape Initiative and Adjustment to CCNW/SW Landscape
SUBJECT/TITLE: Florida Department of Transportation Bold Landscape Initiative and Adjustment to CCNW/SW Landscape

Date: February 24, 2014
Contact Person: Charles Hargreaves

Requested By: Jeff Caster, FDOT
Type of Item: Discussion/Presentation

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is two-fold, 1) present to the IA the Florida Department of Transportation’s Bold Landscape Initiative (Bold Initiative) for the State Highway System, and 2) obtain authorization to incorporate elements of the Bold Initiative on Capital Circle in areas yet to be completed (Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest project area and the future Capital Circle Southwest project) and in areas where the current landscape is in decline and needs replacement (Capital Circle Southeast).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

FDOT Bold Landscape Initiative Background
FDOT has adopted a program to “implement bold roadside beautification project using many large trees, and few if any shrubs to produce the highest visual impact and distinctive sense of place at the lowest design, construction and maintenance cost” (Business of Beautification, Attachment 1). Many of Blueprint 2000’s completed and current projects are along state roadways and are influenced by the FDOT Highway Beautification Policy (Attachment 2).

Jeff Caster presented FDOT’s Bold Landscape Initiative to the Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee on December 5, 2013. He is a State Transportation Landscape Architect for the Florida Department of Transportation. He is charged with implementing FDOT’s Bold Landscape Initiative and reviewing landscape plans for projects impacting the state roadway system.

The Bold Initiative is an opportunity to reduce maintenance requirements and therefore reduce maintenance costs. For example, planting large trees widely spaced with few shrubs will accommodate large mowing machines, which is an efficient maintenance practice. An example of a local project that has a landscape similar to that envisioned by the Bold Initiative is the Blair Stone Road Extension. In this corridor, large trees such as magnolias and crepe myrtles are planted in the right of way and in the median, and the shrubs and ground covers are limited to the major intersections.
Blueprint 2000 Design Guidelines
In April 2004, the IA adopted Multi Modal Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines) for Blueprint projects. The Design Guidelines provide design parameters for landscaping, roadway sections, drainage conveyance/stormwater, fencing, lighting, signage, hardscape elements, maintenance and utility locations/screening. Since its adoption, the Blueprint 2000 landscape design for the Capital Circle projects have been developed using these guidelines.

Comparing the Bold Initiative to the Blueprint 2000 Design Guidelines
The Bold Initiative and the Blueprint Design Guidelines have the same objective: create safe, low maintenance, attractive landscapes. Both share priorities such as: 1) “right plant in right place”, sustainable and non-invasive as well as native, 2) create lasting curb-appearance and contribute to creating a sense of place, and 3) design for minimal maintenance. Yet, the landscape design for the Capital Circle projects (both completed and underway) has an abundance of shrubs and groundcovers, which is in contrast with the intent of the Bold Initiative.

The objectives of the Blueprint Design Guidelines and the Blueprint overall philosophy can still be met by incorporating elements of the Bold Initiative to the landscape plans for Blueprint projects. The advantage of applying the Bold Initiative to the landscape plans is the reduced cost to maintain.

Applying the Bold Initiative to the Blueprint 2000 Capital Circle Projects
The landscape for the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (CCNW/SW) project is designed but not yet installed. The design was based on the Blueprint Design Guidelines and an objective to match the landscape design in the completed segments of Capital Circle. When the landscape design was reviewed by FDOT, it was not approved due to an abundance of shrubs and groundcover and the already completed corridor’s history of failing landscape. In addition, should Blueprint incorporate elements of the Bold Initiative into the landscape design it may allow for additional funding from FDOT.

It is recommended that we reduce the number of shrubs and groundcover in the current CCNW/SW landscape design in order to increase the survivability of the planted vegetation and reduce the maintenance costs. For example, by reducing the shrubs and groundcover by 50%, the annual maintenance costs could be reduced by more than $50,000 per year. Below is a table illustrating the estimated cost savings that could be accomplished by incorporating the Bold Initiative into the current design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Landscape Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnish and Install Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs and Ground Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Maintenance</strong> **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*costs do not include the addition of trees to replace shrubs and groundcover.  
**estimates are based on maintenance costs of comparative projects and should not be used for future budget request amounts.
OPTIONS:

Option 1: Authorize the incorporation of Bold Initiative design elements into the landscape for Blueprint 2000 projects in 1) areas yet to be completed such as the Capital Circle Northwest-Southwest project (N-2) and the Capital Circle Southwest project (W-1), and 2) areas where the existing landscape is in decline such as the Capital Circle Southeast projects (E-1, E-2, and E-3).

Option 2: Provide alternate direction to staff.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Option 1: Authorize the incorporation of Bold Initiative design elements into the landscape for Blueprint 2000 projects in 1) areas yet to be completed such as the Capital Circle Northwest-Southwest project (N-2) and the Capital Circle Southwest project (W-1), and 2) areas where the existing landscape is in decline such as the Capital Circle Southeast projects (E-1, E-2, and E-3).

Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report Consistency: Landscape design is not detailed to this level in the Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report project summaries. However, this request is consistent with the objectives of the adopted Multi Modal Design Guidelines for Blueprint 2000 projects and the Blueprint 2000 holistic philosophy as described in the 1999 Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee report.

Action by the CAC and TCC: A presentation to the TCC on the FDOT Bold Initiative was provided on December 5, 2013, but no action was taken. On February 6, 2014 the CAC approved the recommended action with the additional direction to modify the existing Blueprint 2000 Design Guidelines to incorporate the Bold Initiative and to include in the modification that palms and crepe myrtles should not be used in landscape design.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Business of Beautification
Attachment 2: FDOT Highway Beautification Policy
POLICY

Effective: May 15, 2013
Office: Production Support
Topic No.: 000-650-011-c

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

It is the policy of the Florida Department of Transportation to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance Florida’s natural resources and scenic beauty when constructing and maintaining the State Highway System. Under this policy, Florida can have:

- The nation’s most beautiful highways that attract and grow business.
- Safe roadsides that are durable, and ecologically and economically sustainable.
- Measurable returns on investments that grow in value over time.

In carrying out this policy, the Department will:

- Make highway beautification everyone’s business.
- Accommodate existing and proposed trees and other long lived plants by consistently integrating landscape conservation and highway beautification into the processes that are used to plan, design, construct, and maintain roadways.
- Utilize design strategies that enhance Florida’s distinctive sense of place, create lasting curb appeal, and minimize the cost to conserve and maintain high quality landscapes.
- Accept responsibility for maintenance of the state’s highest priority landscapes, as established by the Department, when necessary to implement this policy.
- Develop and implement a system to track costs and accomplishments of programs contributing to highway beautification.

Ananth Prasad, P.E.
Secretary
Business of Beautification

To me, in sum, beautification means our total concern for the physical and human quality we pass on to our children and the future. Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, 1993

Now and for the next few years, to make Florida the most attractive place to do business, to attract visitors and businesses to invest more time and money in Florida, the Department can implement bold roadside beautification projects using many large trees, and few if any shrubs. With thoughtful site specific design, this Consistent, Predictable, and Repeatable approach will produce the highest visual impact and distinctive sense of place at the lowest design, construction, and maintenance cost. Ten, twenty, thirty, and forty foot tall or taller trees generously and safely placed at the most highly traveled interchanges and gateways into and through the state (Florida’s most visible landscapes) will instantly create a welcoming and enjoyable experience; the first and lasting impression of the state and individual communities. Overstocked Florida based nurseries are discounting large trees by 50% or more, and in at least one case offering 0% financing. Palms, especially in Central and South Florida, are the state’s signature trees; what visitors and investors expect to see, what they pay to see. Palms are the only type of trees that can feasibly and effectively be transplanted (and re-transplanted if need be) when mature. No other type tree can provide such instant impact, and be as resilient to Florida’s extreme weather events. Each District, in conjunction with other agencies, can identify and program the ten highest priority roadside landscapes (e.g., state line, sea ports, airports, rail stations, scenic highways, beaches, historic sites, resorts, REDI communities, national parks and forests); where beautification is most able to help attract and grow business. Decisions about the selection, placement, and care of trees can continue to be made with full participation of the local governments and maintaining agencies. Where necessary to fully implement highest priority projects, the Department can budget and accept responsibility for landscape maintenance.

For the future, as the economy strengthens and as the highest priority roadside landscapes are being completed, beautification can be routinely integrated into the processes used to plan, design, construct, and maintain roadways; roadways that accommodate bold performing landscapes that enhance private enterprise and public health and safety. Roadside landscape projects can mimic natural processes that manage stormwater, filter air, abate noise, shade pedestrians, conserve energy, provide habitat, and be beautiful. Bold leadership at all levels within the Department can make it possible to create and sustain memorable landscapes that contribute to the State’s overall well being.
Emphasis can increase on conservation and management of existing trees, and planting roadways with many small trees that will grow large. There can be less emphasis on planting large trees. Less expensive smaller trees and widespread planting of tree seedlings will grow quickly to beautify and reforest urban, suburban, and rural roadways. Planting and managing a diverse community of native and non-native tree species reinforces thebold landscapes already in place, and helps overcome other design, construction, and maintenance challenges. This simple and sound investment approach grows in value and pays meaningful environmental and economic dividends indefinitely, unimpeded by current or future recessions.

**Let’s get to work** making beauty everyone’s business at the Department of Transportation. A work plan developed by the District Landscape Architects and Managers describes strategies, tactics, and measures that can, upon implementation, increase and sustain the return on Florida’s investment in highway beautification.

**Work Plan Highlights:**
- Strengthen the Department’s Highway Beautification Policy to show renewed commitment.
- Increase landscape expertise in each District planning, design, construction, and maintenance office.
- Address landscape conservation and improvements early in roadway planning, project development, and design (including drainage, utilities, ped/bike). The roadway design needs to safely accommodate the landscape design.
- Develop landscape project performance measures and targets tied to other department programs (safety, pedestrian and bicyclists, safe routes to schools, accessibility, drainage, transit, maintenance).
- Document the direct economic benefits of each landscape project, including number of full-time and part-time employees, suppliers, nurseries, etc.
- Develop system to track and monitor landscape projects over time and space. Create a report card for landscape projects with annual report cards on how the project matured and the cost and quality of care. Document what has been invested, where, and how the investment is growing.

- Utilize landscape projects to enhance mobility and safety, e.g., midblock crossing, delineation, headlight glare, traffic calming, etc.
- Upgrade online resources for landscape stakeholders. Include instruction and information about roadside landscape design, construction, and maintenance.
- Emphasize “right plant in right place”, “sustainable”, and “non-invasive” as well as “native”.
- Establish specifications and method of payment for landscape soil to be placed during roadway construction and for soil replacement when necessary during landscape construction.
- As stand-alone projects, enhance oversight during landscape construction:
  - Develop process for maintaining agency to participate in final acceptance.
  - Revise inspection reports to include mulch, weeds, litter, etc.
  - Develop minimum education and experience requirements for landscape CEI.
  - Authorize post design services for RLA of record.
  - Develop process to pay contractor during establishment periods.
- Improve landscape maintenance. Determine design life of the landscape project, and who and how maintenance will be paid for the duration. During design, establish a maintenance cost limit that cannot be exceeded. Review and approve landscape maintenance plans and projected annual maintenance costs before completing design. Determine if investment on front end can save on long term maintenance. Reconfirm agreements before installation. Develop and retain expertise in the art and science of tree care, roadside forestry, land and landscape management for safety, value, beauty, and soil and water quality.
- Develop programmatic landscape recommendations and requirements to minimize maintenance, e.g., large trees widely spaced with few shrubs to accommodate large machine moving. Establish design guidelines for low and high maintenance commitments.
- Publish online photo gallery of successful landscape projects.
- Include landscape quality in customer satisfaction surveys.
- Explore opportunities for public private partnerships for landscape design, construction, and maintenance.
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Cascades Park Update
SUBJECT/TITLE: Cascades Park Update

Date: February 24, 2014
Contact Person: Wayne Tedder
Requested By: Wayne Tedder
Type of Item: Discussion/Presentation

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of the agenda item is to update the IA on the construction in the Park, the progress on the Cascades Park Sound Study, and to request authorization to fund the circulation, parking and safety improvements for areas anticipated to be utilized by citizens to access the Park.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Grand Opening Update
Cascades Park will open on March 14, 2014. Blueprint, City, and County staff have been working determine the grand opening event activities, which include an opening ceremony and a family movie night on the 14th and a community day on the 15th. The community day will feature activities around each amenity. Also, staff has been working with Impact Visual Media to produce teaser videos. The third video will be shown in the IA meeting.

Construction Progress
See Attachment 1 for the February 2014 aerial of the Park. The anomaly found in the limestone at the bottom of Boca Chuba Pond has been repaired and the pond is filling with stormwater. The recreated St. Augustine Stream is complete and water will be running in the stream between the Smokey Hollow Pond and Boca Chuba Pond in early February. With Boca Chuba Pond filled, the park’s irrigation system and the Cascades Waterfall Fountain will be in operation. The Amphitheater is 95% complete with all permanent stadium seats in place, sod installed in the upper seating area, house speaker system in place and theater lighting being installed. The Park’s restroom building along the Bloxham Promenade is finished. Our 73 nozzle interactive waterplay area (Imagination Fountain) is complete and has been programmed for a spectacular water, music and light show.

Final landscaping tasks, sidewalk construction and street paving are also on going. Construction of the Smokey Hollow Commemoration and the Discovery Garden are progressing and are scheduled to be complete by Park opening. With assistance from master’s degree students from FSU’s Art Department, The Seven Days of Opening Nights Festival will begin painting their annual mural in February on panels which will be mounted to the east side of the Meridian Point Building. The building is located just north of the Amphitheater.
After the Park opens in March, improvements will continue. Minor modifications will occur as the Park is used and needs are identified. Landscaping and other aesthetic enhancements such as wrapping of the transformer boxes will be made. Large improvements will be constructed such as the restroom near the amphitheater, the pavilion at Smokey Hollow and the Smokey Hollow Barber Shop will be relocated back to Cascades Park.

Sound Study
In the September 16, 2013 meeting, the IA directed Blueprint staff to form a working group that includes representatives from the Myers Park and Woodland Drives neighborhoods and retain Sieben and Associates to conduct a second sound study. Since then, a 27 member working group made up of eight neighborhood representatives, staff, and others has met six times (with two additional subcommittee meetings). The mission of the working group is as follows:

The Cascades Park Work Group (CPWG) provides input and feedback on the operational structure and sound levels in Cascades Park. The CPWG allows representatives from the nearby neighborhoods and key City Departments to create open dialogue resulting in input for the operational direction of Cascades Park. In the future, the CPWG will objectively identify concerns from park users, event attendees, neighboring communities and businesses and event planners in relation to events permitted by the City of Tallahassee and offer solutions.

The second sound test was conducted on Sunday, November 10. Blueprint 2000 hired Seibien and Associates with support from Scott Carswell Presents to conduct the test. See Attachment 2 for photos taken during the sound test.

In preparation of the test, over 2,450 surveys were mailed to all properties located within the boundaries of Magnolia Drive to the south and east, South Gadsden Street to the west and Tennessee Street to the north. Additionally, the survey was emailed to the current electronic project area distribution list (200 contacts) and was available to download from the Blueprint website. A media release announcing the sound test and availability to access and complete the survey electronically was distributed to local media outlets, city and county elected officials, the city executive team and the county communication team via email.

A total of 121 surveys were completed, 25 by U.S. mail and 96 electronically, i.e. by either email or the electronic survey tool. Of the responses received, 76 (62.8%) were from locations within a 3,000’ radius of the amphitheater. See Attachment 3 for graphics illustrating the survey results.

The Seibien Associates Sound Study, completed after the second sound test, was reviewed by the working group on February 13, 2014. The working group will present recommendations to the IA on February 24.

Improved Circulation and Parking
In response to a need for additional Park parking and improved bike and pedestrian connections to the Park, the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department has developed a design for improving the circulation on Bloxham and Gadsden Streets and adding 34 parking spaces. See
Attachment 4 for the location of parking spaces and traffic flow changes to more safely accommodate Park visitors. Final design and cost proposals have not yet been received. The estimated cost for this improvement is $200,000.

The construction plans for Cascades Park call for striping the roads adjacent to the Park with paint. To increase vehicular and pedestrian safety and durability of the road striping, a substitute material for the paint called thermoplastic is requested. Thermoplastic striping material is highly reflective, does not crack or chip, and is impervious to oil and grease. Additionally, the maintenance entities for the roads (City of Tallahassee and Leon County) require thermoplastic striping. Franklin Boulevard has thermoplastic striping and the application of this material to the Cascades Park roads will result in a seamless transition between the two projects. The estimated cost for this improvement is $97,400.

**OPTIONS:**
Option 1: Provide additional funding of $200,000 for the circulation and parking improvements to Bloxham Street and Gadsden Street and $97,400 for the thermoplastic striping from the Blueprint 2000 unallocated funds budget.

Option 2: Provide alternate direction to staff.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Approve Option 1: Provide additional funding of $200,000 for the circulation and parking improvements to Bloxham Street and Gadsden Street and $97,400 for the thermoplastic striping from the Blueprint 2000 unallocated funds budget.

**Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report Consistency:** This request is consistent with project summary for Map 3 Segment 2, Old St. Augustine Branch Redesign Apalachee Parkway to South Monroe.

**Action by the CAC and TCC:** The CAC voted unanimously in favor to approve additional funding of $200,000 from the Blueprint 2000 unallocated funds budget for the circulation and parking improvements to Bloxham Street and Gadsden Street. At the time of the CAC meeting, information regarding the thermoplastic stripping was not available. In addition, the CAC voted unanimously to allocate funding (undetermined amount) to the planning and development of an accessible and inclusive commemoration to Centennial Field in Cascades Park.

The TCC did not review this item.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
Attachment 1: January 2014 Aerial
Attachment 2: Sound Test Photos
Attachment 3: Survey Results from November 10, 2014 Sound Study
Attachment 4: Park Circulation and Parking Improvement Project Graphic
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Citizen’s Advisory Committee Appointment
SUBJECT/TITLE: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment

Date: February 24, 2014
Contact Person: Autumn Calder
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Type of Item: Discussion

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This agenda item advises the IA on the appointment of Jim Stevenson to the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee. Mr. Stevenson will replace Richard Drew as the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC) natural scientist/biologist representative.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Natural scientist/biologist - nominated by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC): This position is currently filled by Richard Drew, who no longer wishes to serve on the CAC. The EECC has nominated Jim Stevenson for the position. The term will be a partial term through November 2015. He is eligible for a second term, which will be a three year period.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve the following nominations:

Representative from the EECC, natural scientist/biologist: Jim Stevenson

Option 2: Provide IA guidance.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the following nominations:

Representative from the EECC, natural scientist/biologist: Jim Stevenson

Blueprint 2000 Project Definitions Report Consistency: Not applicable.

Action by the CAC and TCC: The CAC voted unanimously to approve the nomination of Jim Stevenson. The TCC did not review the item.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Application and brief biography for Jim Stevenson
Nominating Organization: ________________________________

Name: Jim Stevenson

Address: 4797 Lakely Dr. Tallahassee FL 32303

E-mail: florida_springs@comcast.net

Work Phone: 556-3072

Home Phone: ________

Occupation: biologist (retired)

Employer: formerly Dept. of Environmental Protection

Address: ________________________________

Race: x White □ Hispanic □ Asian or Pacific Islander
□ Black □ American Indian or Alaskan Native □ Other

Sex: x Male □ Female

Identify any potential conflicts of interest that might occur were you to be appointed:

________________________________________________

Are you a City resident? □ Yes x No
Are you a Leon County resident? X Yes □ No
Are you a City property owner? □ Yes x No
Are you a Leon County property owner? X Yes □ No
Can you serve a full three-year term? X Yes □ No
Can you regularly attend meetings? x Yes □ No

Conflicts: ____________________________
Please provide biographical information about yourself (attach a resume, if available). Identify previous experience on other boards/committees; charitable/community activities; and skills or services you could contribute to this board/committee:

See attached brief bio; more can be provided if needed.

**Wakulla Springs Alliance board; Florida Springs Initiative board; former Tall Timbers Research Station board of trustees; former Birdsong Nature Center board; former chairman Florida Springs Task Force; former chairman North Florida Prescribed Fire Council; Wakulla Environmental Institute Advisory Committe**

Knowledgeable about water issues, natural lands management and wildlife

Education:

University of South Florida--bachelor degree

(College/University attended)

(Degree received, if applicable)

(Graduate School Attended)

(Degree received, if applicable)

References (at least one):
Nev C. Landrum, Millbranch Rd. Tallahassee 893-4959

(Name/Address) (Phone)

{Name/Address} (Phone)

{Name/Address} (Phone)

All statements and information given in this application are true to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: Jim Stevenson Date: 10-12-13

(1/20/11)
Jim Stevenson retired as senior biologist with the Department of Environmental Protection. Jim began his 38 year career with the Department as a park ranger while attending the University of South Florida. He served as Chief Biologist for the Florida State Park System for 20 years during which he guided the restoration and protection of state park springs.

Jim organized and coordinated spring basin interagency working groups for Wakulla Spring and Ichetucknee Springs for 18 years.

He was Chairman of the Florida Springs Task Force that developed a protection strategy for Florida’s springs and he was Director of the Governor’s Florida Springs Initiative that funded springs protection.

He conducted Florida Springs Conferences in 2000 and 2003 and coordinated the Florida Springs Rally at the Capital in 2010.

In recognition of his dedication to the protection of Florida’s springs, the State of Florida named a large spring on the Suwannee River “Stevenson Spring” in his honor.

And for his longstanding stewardship of Florida’s public lands, the Governor and Cabinet dedicated the “Jim Stevenson Resource Manager of the Year Award” that is given annually by the Governor and Cabinet to the most deserving state lands manager in the Department of Environmental Protection, the Division of Forestry and the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.