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I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

II. CAC CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

III. INFORMATION ITEMS
1. CAC Meeting Minutes (September 6, 2012, October 18, 2012) Shelonda Meeks
2. Manuel Diaz Farms Recognition Gary Phillips
3. Franklin Boulevard Update M. Romanowski

IV. CONSENT
4. IA Meeting Minutes (September 24, 2013) Chair Miller

V. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION
5. FHWA Payment Approval Delegation Charles Hargraves
6. Capital Circle SE, Woodville to Crawfordville Monumentation Charles Hargraves
7. Connector Bridge Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate & Award the Construction Contract Gary Phillips
8. CCT Segments 3A & 3B Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate & Award the Construction Contract Gary Phillips

VI. PUBLIC HEARING – 5:00 PM
9. Cascades Park Update & Request for Additional Funding & Authorization of Amphitheater Enhancements Wayne Tedder

VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD
*Citizens desiring to speak must fill out a Speaker Request Form; the Chair reserves the right to limit the number of speakers or time allotted to each.

VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

X. ADJOURN
#1.

CAC Meeting Minutes

(September 6, 2012 & October 18, 2012)
Christic Henry, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

**Committee Members present:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christic Henry</td>
<td>Kent Wimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Drew</td>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Ennis</td>
<td>Lamar Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Chin</td>
<td>Henree Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Edmonds</td>
<td>Dale Landry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Tedder</td>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder</td>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy</td>
<td>Alicia Wetherell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Tony Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
<td>J. W. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

There were no Agenda Modifications.

**Information Items**

**Item #1: Capital Circle NW/SW: South of US 90 to North of Orange Avenue – Project Update**

This item was informational only.

Tom O’Steen asked about FDOT’s plans for the transition from Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest to Capital Circle Southwest. Jim Shepherd stated that Blueprint sent a letter to FDOT outlining items that were important to Blueprint and should be included in the project. As part of that, one particular item addressed the intersection and, he stated, Blueprint believed that it should be completed separately.

Mr. Shepherd stated that he understood Mr. Tedder’s goal to be to find the money for Blueprint to build through the intersection. The way it was currently designed there was quite a bit of throw-away. Staff wanted to have Lochner design to the full six-lane segment through the intersection. Lochner estimated the cost of that to be $320K; Blueprint had not yet negotiated it. It would be on the agenda for the next update meeting Blueprint held with FDOT District 3.

Mr. Shepherd stated that it would be discussed in greater detail in Item #11 however, in the letters exchanged between Blueprint and FDOT, District 3 committed to continue the 230-foot ROW design, 36-foot median, and several other items that were important to the Blueprint
Item #2: Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief and Roadway – Project Update
This item was informational only.

Lamar Taylor questioned the timing of the project and the requirements of the grant, such as it being completed by July 2012. Marek Romanowski stated that with the expansion of the project the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity agreed to the combining of both projects and to keeping the grant open until Franklin Boulevard was completed. Mr. Taylor requested clarification on the budget given the expansion of the project. Mr. Romanowski stated that the total project budget was $10.5M that included the initial bid plus the amenities. Mr. Tedder stated that during the September 2012 IA meeting, the Board authorized him to reallocate funds from the closed out N1 project to Franklin Boulevard. It was detailed on Attachment 3 of Item 15, footnotes six and seven.

Richard Drew questioned if the Franklin Boulevard project included the modifications at Leon High School. Mr. Tedder noted the presentation to LHS that was attached to the agenda item outlining the schedule and improvements Blueprint was making to Franklin Boulevard, Cascades Park and Segment 3 that would affect LHS. He also underscored that the School Board would still be responsible for raising the parking area to make any further improvement to the flooding issues at LHS. Mr. Drew questioned what would the upstream effects of raising the parking lot be. Mr. Tedder stated that the largest percentage of the flood plain was on LHS property however a small portion of it extended into the adjacent neighborhood. They would work within the boundaries of flood area. When the new field/parking lot was installed it could not flood any more than what was previously flooded in the perimeter. The exception to that would be the residential areas. They would certainly work to protect them.

Item #3: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road – Project Update
This item was informational only.

Item #4: Blueprint 2000 MBE Status Report
This item was informational only.

Consent Items

Item #5: CAC Minutes: June 7, 20121 & August 2, 2012
Lamar Taylor and Christic Henry clarified points made in the August minutes. Corrections were noted. Erin Ennis moved approval as amended; Richard Drew seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Richard Drew commented on his review of the City and County’s spending of the Water Quality dollars. After reviewing he still had questions about some of the projects and how they fit. He understood the revenue base coming in through the Sales Tax versus a user rate charge of utilities, etc. However, it seemed a stretch to label some of the projects as environmental. Such
as a road widening project that was labeled stormwater enhancement. He questioned if there were other sources of information he could review on those projects.

Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint could provide him with any information he requested. However, one person’s opinion of a stormwater management facility, that was part of a project that involved impervious surface, was a green project to another. Understanding what individuals labeled green versus gray would be quite the chore to begin with. Assigning the budget numbers from each individual project would take extensive work by staff, if Mr. Drew wanted the percentage. Mr. Tedder offered to test it on one project. Mr. Drew stated that he could speak to Mr. Tedder about it off-line; also, he was amenable to sorting through the information on his own. Mr. Tedder agreed and suggested Mr. Drew select a project to begin with and the arrangements would be made.

Mr. Drew further stated that in his review of the projects, he was surprised by the number of ball parks that had been proposed. Mr. Tedder stated that they were not funded by Blueprint. The exception to that could be the portion managed by the City or County. Mr. Drew stated that they were listed as recommend projects in the reports. Mr. Tedder stated that he was not familiar with that and would need to review the source. Autumn Calder stated that it was the PowerPoint on the proposed projects that the County presented to the Sales Tax Committee. Tony Park stated that the only one he could recall was the one field proposed for 2019 at the FCI property on the Lafayette Trail proposal. The one on Fred George Road was included in the balance of funds from the property acquisition. Mr. Drew stated that there were five in the presentation however they might not have been funded.

Tom O’Steen questioned if they were requested for Blueprint funds then categorized as environmental projects as opposed to coming from the County’s percentage of the revenue. Mr. Tedder stated that the projects proposed by the County were ones that they considered to be funded by future sales tax dollars, if approved. In order for items to make the list, the Sales Tax Committee had to recommend it up to the County Commission for review. Mr. Drew questioned what the timing of that would be. Mr. Tedder stated it would be at least another year. Mr. O’Steen stated that the meeting dates were scheduled through June 2013. Henree Martin stated that the Committee has not even begun to review projects yet.

Item #6: Proposed 2013 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules
Henree Martin moved approval; Lamar Taylor seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #7: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments
Christic Henry stated that Chris Klena would be replacing Erin Ennis as the Economic Development Council representative. Terrance Hinson would be replacing Windell Page as the Capital City Chamber of Commerce representative. Dale Landry would remain as the representative of the Civil Rights Community. Kent Wimmer would remain as the representative of the Big Bend Environmental Forum. Timothy Edmond was replacing Daniel Parker from the Planning Commission.
Presentations/Discussion

**Item #8: Sensitive Lands Tour**

Autumn Calder stated that Blueprint proposed replacing the October meeting with a tour of Blueprint’s sensitive land properties and outlined the tentative details.

**Item #9: Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Van Buren Pond Design**

Gary Phillips gave a brief update of the specific segments of the project.

Tom O’Steen questioned if all the ponds of Segment 3 provide some capacity for private sector development. Mr. Phillips stated no, only Coal Chute Pond. The Community Redevelopment Agency gave Blueprint seed money, $660K to begin acquisition of right of way; as a trade off the CRA was to provide treatment along Gaines Street. Blueprint was leaving the purchase of capacity up to the CRA. Mr. O’Steen stated that as he recalled the original intent was not to build ponds for private development. It was not necessarily bad however, typically properties purchase capacity from the City; it was a development cost.

Mr. Phillips stated that it was both; the ideas was that the pond would do retrofit treatment for all the water that was not currently being treated. A 52-acre basin would be treated by Blueprint plus opportunities for the private sector to participate. The majority of the capacity however was for Blueprint purposes. It also anticipated the redevelopment at Railroad Square.

The ponds would not be fenced. They would be landscaped with light vegetation initially with additional planting being installed with the Segment 3 construction and landscaping. Amenities would be added at that time as well.

Richard Drew questioned the length of time Adams Street would be closed with the installation of the boxed culvert. Alicia Wetherell with KHA stated that they anticipated it would be approximately 30-days in the spring of 2013.

Henree Martin questioned if anyone had completed a cost analysis on the solar panels over the Connector Bridge. Mr. Tedder stated that it was still under evaluation. Ms. Martin stated that she liked the idea of them but the cost was significantly more than the return she felt it needed to be reconsidered. Mr. Tedder agreed.

Kent Wimmer questioned the safety of the trail crossed the entrance of the City Electric parking lot and the at-grade crossings at the railroad crossings. Mr. Phillips stated that staff reviewed other locations however the ones selected were the best of the choices available. Mr. Drew noted that the bikers would have traversed intersections of major highways. He did not understand them having difficulties at the entrance of a parking lot. Mr. Wimmer was more concerned with younger children or parents with strollers. Mr. Phillips stated that it was not a heavily used parking lot.

Andrew Chin questioned recycled glass surface of the bridge, would it be smooth or textured to reduce speed of skateboarders, etc. Mr. Tedder stated that it would be similar to the other
sidewalks in the project areas.

Tim Edmonds stated that the Orion Motors building, and the bright orange-red color it had been painted was subject of heavy discussion at the recent Planning Commission meeting. He stated that very little attention had been paid to any landscaping or canopies from the building. There was some discussion to the landscaping in Monroe and Adams Streets cross section plans. The owner did not have the resources and was paying no attention to that side wall. It seemed quite significant as it approached the park. He questioned if there was anything the CAC or Blueprint could do to soften that harsh building. He felt it would need something significant to disguise that space. Mr. Phillips stated that he would bring the landscaping plans to the next CAC meeting to show what was planned. He also noted that the electric transmission lines were in that area as well. Mr. Tedder stated that it was all City ROW along there and options were available to Blueprint, such as eliminating the parking and installing heavy landscaping.

Mr. O’Steen questioned if it was redundant and if it would save money to not rebuild the Spanish Steps from the terrace on the east side of the connector bridge. The circuitous universal access was necessary for ADA access however the steps seemed redundant. It seemed to him a better idea was to include additional plantings. It also would allow for additional funds to address the building wall to the south. David Jones agreed and supported Mr. O’Steen’s suggestion. The CAC as a whole was in support as well.

Erin Ennis questioned how to keep the FAMU Way “Art Wall” from becoming a “graffiti mess.” Mr. Phillips stated that it was an ongoing challenge with one option being to paint over it. However, as he understood it from two years of experience wall with art on them were not normally tagged.

Ms. Martin stated that personally she preferred the open fence/landscaped options versus a wall. Furthermore, she did not feel that anyone could guarantee that the wall could be maintained in good condition. She felt the fence was a safer bet.

Autumn Calder offered a point of clarification on the options available. One was the chain-linked fence options that few people found pleasing. The second was to investigate it further to find other design options. It would not necessarily mean a wall that was complete; it could be a combination of vegetation or garden and some concrete. Blueprint staff would like the ability to research that in greater detail, working with FAMU, the City, and the project committee to learn what they would like as well.

Dale Landry stated that he supported a combination of cement wall and open fencing. He suggested giving the maintenance of the art to the Greek organizations at FAMU and referenced a wall near Lee Hall that was maintained by them. He was mostly concerned, however, with the height of the fence being such that people, especially children, could not climb into the pond.

Ms. Martin wondered about the timeframe of the decision. Mr. Phillips stated that staff needed to move forward with the design of the pond because of capacity and timing issues. The wall/fence decision would move more slowly.
Andrew Chin stated that he felt the rendering of the wall seemed offensive because it was a large beige block structure that severely contrasted the green landscape beyond it. Also, it was inconsistent with the red or deep brown brick buildings on campus. The biggest issue he had with the rendering of the fence option was that the majority of the landscaping was to protect the railroad beyond the pond. He did not think that people would be looking at the railroad as much as the fence. He suggested moving a large portion of the landscaping to the street edge of the pond. He also spoke to the sense of ownership on campuses with Art or Greek Walls.

Mr. Tedder stated that the takeaway for him was for Blueprint to take the lead from FAMU. Rather than satisfying the CAC, for staff to aim for satisfying FAMU and move forward with the final design with updates to the CAC. The committee agreed. David Jones supported the open fence and landscaping because it was consistent with the greenway concepts.

**Item #10: Cascades Park Update / Boca Chuba & Building Screen**
Gary Phillips spoke to the slide show of the latest construction photos.

Erin Ennis questioned who would manage the Amphitheater. Wayne Tedder stated that the City would maintain the facilities; the County TDC would manage ticketed event operations. A draft Interlocal Agreement was in the works; he believed the County Commission had approved it at their last meeting. It was to go before the City Commission at their next meeting for approval.

David Jones asked about universal access to the Amphitheater stage. Mr. Phillips stated that it was difficult to see on the slide however, there was a ramp in place and he identified it for him.

Wayne Tedder spoke to the concept design at Smokey Hollow and shared renderings of the proposed design. Dale Landry questioned the inclusion of a restroom. Mr. Tedder stated they were still under design and cost estimates would be forthcoming. Kent Wimmer questioned if the trail crossing at Franklin was signalized. Mr. Phillips stated that it was. Tim Edmond questioned if there were retail kiosks located in the park. He gave examples of parks in Portland, San Francisco, Boston, etc. that leased 5x5 kiosks to vendors who sold kites, snow-cones, etc. It enlivened the park and added a sense of vibrancy, he stated.

Regarding the nut tree and especially the grape arbor plantings, Mr. Landry suggested involving FAMU School of Viticulture. Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint would reach out to them. Mr. Landry stated that he would work with Mr. Tedder or staff to move that along.

Tom O’Steen questioned the funding source for screening the Meridian Point Building. Mr. Phillips state that the TDC had allocated approximately $70K; depending in the screen options it ranged from $30-50K. The interior renovations would be minimal for performer’s dressing room(s) and restroom facilities.

Wayne Tedder stated that he would like feedback from the CAC on the types of screens they would prefer. He would prefer something that could host ticketed events, complimented the main plaza area, and at a low budget. The City hoped to acquire the property in the future, at which time it would be up for redevelopment. That would be at least five years away though. Tom O’Steen stated that given those parameters and without dollar amounts attached to any of
the screening options, moved to spend the least amount possible to dress up the Meridian Point Building with staff bringing it back to the CAC with more details at a future meeting.

Mr. Landry stated that to set the green standard, he recommended using plantings and reiterated partnership with FAMU School of Viticulture as an option. Mr. Jones suggested something that replicated the canopies of the Connector Bridge. Erin Ennis stated that that green was important as was the total cost of ownership; someone would have to maintain the plantings year round.

Regarding the dedication celebration Mr. Drew stated that his only issue was that there were unfunded projects still on the table; it concerned him that money was potentially being diverted. Mr. Tedder stated that the deadline for preliminary cost estimates were due at the end of September however, staff felt it critical to the timing to make the September IA agenda.

Ms. Martin questioned if, given the anticipated opening date of April, the celebration could be tied into Springtime Tallahassee events. Mr. Tedder stated that an off-date would be preferred because of City and County resources. Ms. Martin stated that her only comment was that April was a very busy time with multiple events planned for each weekend. It would be necessary to work around those schedules. Mr. Landry spoke in favor of separating the events because not all groups were involved with Springtime. Furthermore, he suggested including FAMU and FSU in the celebration.

Mr. Tedder stated that while Blueprint had approximately $600K of unallocated funds, he would like the CAC’s approval to use a portion of that for the celebration. However, the overall goal was to have the community sponsor the bulk of the celebration event.

**Tom O’Steen moved that a portion of the unallocated funds be used to offset the cost of the grand opening, with the understanding that approximately 80-90% of the cost would be borne by outside sources. Dale Landry seconded the motion. Lamar Taylor suggested a friendly amendment to include a cap of $50K without returning to the CAC / IA for additional approval.** Mr. O’Steen accepted it and the committee chimed in consent.

Mr. Drew stated that his one outstanding concern was that Blueprint would be diverting monies to a wonderful and important yet singular event but away from a project that would be there for much longer. Smokey Hollow was a prime example. Mr. Tedder stated that $50K would not make any difference to any of the unfunded projects. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Regarding the sculpture in Boca Chuba Pond Tim Edmond asked if there was a preference to local artists. Mr. Tedder stated that the procurement process would however the selection process would not per policy. Many members of the committee spoke in opposition to that. Mr. Tedder stated that if it was the recommendation of the CAC that could be done.

Mr. O’Steen clarified that the budget of $300K was currently allocated for the conceptual drawing however the final cost estimate was unknown because engineering drawings had not been completed. Mr. Tedder confirmed that and that it was necessary to set a cap on the project.

Ms. Martin stated that it concerned her that it would not be completed by April 2013. She hated
to have a grand opening with an incomplete park. The Boca Chuba sculpture was one of the main features of the park, she stated. Mr. Tedder stated that it might be possible to have a model representing what was to come.

Mr. Drew questioned if Blueprint was locked in to having an art piece there. Mr. Tedder stated that without it, it was a large blank canvass. It needed something there; there was also the considerable cost of having set the foundation and having run electric to it.

Ms. Martin stated that visually it appeared that the bridge and the sculpture were the two items one would leave the park remembering. She questioned if Blueprint had contacted Figg for their input toward the design that would match or compliment the bridge. Mr. Tedder stated that for the sculpture to be included in the current project it would have to be through the existing construction contract with Sandco or put it out to bid.

**Tom O’Steen moved the study of alternatives to the existing design with the desire that local artists, engineers, and architects be given preference.** Ms. Martin stated that preference would need to be defined. To Mr. Tedder she stated that she thought he understood what the CAC was trying to accomplish and asked him to explore it in greater depth. While everyone would love to see a local artist get it, she did not want to compromise the scope of what it could be. **Tim Edmond stated that he would support local preference being weighted relative to a point spread.** With the acceptance of the friendly amendment, Mr. Edmond seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

**Item #11: Capital Circle SW: PD&E Study, Design & Construction**

Wayne Tedder summarized the agenda item. Henree Martin stated that her concern was that Blueprint would have to step in and salvage the project, like with Capital Circle Northwest, I-10 to US 90, because FDOT did not want to follow the Blueprint philosophy. Mr. Tedder stated that he hoped to receive a positive response to his letter and would be meeting with the D 3 Secretary in the coming months that was another opportunity to formally address it. They would request a partnership of the Blueprint or the City and County of the amenities that were above the Department’s standards.

Tom O’Steen suggested that Mr. Tedder offer a few observations when he met with Secretary Barfield, first that segment of Leon County had always felt underrepresented when it came to public expenditure of dollars. If the FDOT were not to follow the same guidelines as the other segments of Capital Circle, it would create a problem in public perception. Secondly would be the timing of the project. It was obviously larger than the Blueprint program however Mr. O’Steen would like for the next CAC meeting, a representation of what was going on and why; particularly, if the FDOT was taking the design dollars and asking Blueprint to fund construction. Mr. Tedder assured the committee that he would be active in ensuring that the Blueprint philosophy was carried forward. If he saw that changing, the CAC would be among the first to know.

**Henree Martin moved Option 1: Authorize staff to amend the Blueprint 2000 Capital Budget for Capital Circle Southwest to remove the design, from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road, and the associated funding of $2,708.53.** Tim Edmond seconded the
motion. It passed unanimously.

**Item #12: Leon County Sales Tax Committee**
Due to the length of the meeting and Tom O’Steen stated he would hold his comments however, he requested that time be reserved at a future meeting for updates by members of the Committee.

**Item #13: Property Purchase in Lake Lafayette Basin**
Wayne Tedder briefed the committee on the agenda item. Tim Edmond questioned why Blueprint money was being considered for the acquisition. Mr. Tedder and Tony Park confirmed that there was no other funding source available. Henree Martin stated that furthermore it fit with the original EECC philosophy and what they hoped to accomplish in that area.

Kent Wimmer moved Option 1: Authorize the parcel purchase from funds available in the Lake Lafayette Floodplain line item. Tom O’Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Wimmer requested staff identify public road access to the property. Tony Park stated that the connecting roads were private however as an owner it would be allowed as public access. Mr. Park stated that the County would encourage access via Rutledge to Chevy, however the other direction using Old Dirt Road could be used also. Mr. Wimmer stated that he supported the access in the Alford Arm Greenway and suggested the County build a boardwalk over Alford Arm to increase access. He elaborated on the trail network and potential connects through the east side of the county.

Tom O’Steen stated that he had a philosophical problem in some of the other lands that Blueprint authorized purchase of for environmental sensitivity that would house museum and ball park facilities. Additionally, he would not want to see the CAC authorize the purchase of the Lafayette property for yet to be determined environmental purposes. Also though, to open the possibility for the request to pave public roadways for access to it. The intention was not to create a park, per se. Ms. Martin stated that under Blueprint it would have to be passive.

Furthermore, Mr. O’Steen stated that acquiring the property was not the end of the cost. There would be perpetual maintenance and responsibility costs associated with the land. He was concerned however, that the County did not have maintenance funds. Referring back to Mr. Edmond’s earlier point, if the County could not purchase it, would they be able to maintain it, he asked. Ms. Martin further questioned the cost of $8500-$10,000 per acre depending on if the wetland area was. (Approximately one third was wet, one third hard wood, and one third silviculture.) Autumn Calder stated that the appraisal was completed by Cureton Johnson on behalf of Blueprint. Mr. Tedder stated that it was a mutually agreed upon appraiser with a second appraiser’s review to ensure accuracy. Ms. Martin was quite concerned with the total cost and requested the item be tabled until others could review the appraisals.

Ms. Martin further questioned what would happen to the property if it was not acquired by Blueprint. Mr. Tedder stated that the sellers were anxious to move on it. Mr. O’Steen noted that they were about to receive $1.5M for it. Mr. Tedder concurred and stated that if the CAC recommended not acquiring it, staff would convey that to the IA.
Regarding maintenance Mr. Park stated that in the beginning it would be minimal; he thought fencing was already in place. Mr. O’Steen stated that it was in line with the Blueprint philosophy to purchase environmentally sensitive lands. It was not, however, to purchase them and turn them into active park projects that would have not only capital costs but maintenance and personnel costs as well. Mr. Park stated that the County’s intention was for it to be completely absorbed by the Greenway. Mr. Tedder stated that there would be additional funds in that account; he suggested that those funds could be utilized for additional stormwater improvements or the construction of a boardwalk or other such features.

Richard Drew questioned if there were any waste disposal areas on the site. Mr. Park stated that the County reviewed that in Phase 1 of the Environmental Assessment and it was clean.

Christic Henry called for the vote. It passed 6 to 2.

**Item #7: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments**
Christic Henry requested that Dale Landry confirm the comments of the agenda item. Mr. Landry stated that he had no conflicting meetings and would continue to serve on the CAC. Ms. Henry called for a second to the approval; Tom O’Steen seconded it. It passed unanimously.

**Item #14: Proposed FY 2013 Blueprint Operating Budget**
Mr. O’Steen questioned, as a point of clarification, the status quo of the salary line item and the potential increase listed in the “notes” section. Wayne Tedder stated that City or County raises were carried out per City or County employees. Mr. Tedder further stated that through attrition he retained the funding in the salary line item as if the Finance Manager and Executive Director positions were filled and paid at the rates received by Phil Maher and Jim Davis. Mr. O’Steen requested that it be clarified on the budget.

Wayne Tedder gave a brief update of the agenda item and recap of what was discussed at the special CAC budget workshop.

Tom O’Steen quoted the agenda item, “...using the tax growth rates of the City and County that provided a budget based on 95% of the projected receipts consistent with the County’s approach.” He questioned the remaining 5%. His point was that if it were estimated at 100% Blueprint would see approximately $500K increase in opportunity that would not be allocated to anything in particular. The CAC would then have input as to where those funds would be allocated. Richard Drew questioned if the interest income fell in that group as well. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it did.

David Jones questioned the amenities at Cascades Park. He met with staff to discuss a universal designed accessible ball field at the park and had not heard anything from staff since. He heard from someone at the City that Parks and Recreation would rather not go that route. He questioned what the official outcome was. Mr. Tedder stated that it was a maintenance issue for Parks and Recreation. If it was included at Cascades Park, they would want it fenced like the other Miracle Field. Mr. Tedder was not comfortable cross-fencing Cascades Park. Mr. Jones
agreed that the fence would be undesirable. He stated that what he heard was that the City was concerned about the safety of people playing on the field. He thought that was the purpose of it however; to create an area that increases activity for all people. The concept for the smaller Centennial Field was great and represented the history of that area much more so than a pond or fountain or stage. Regarding maintenance, if it were to be constructed for universal access it would be maintenance free.

Mr. Tedder stated that the concern was skateboarders or others being destructive and terrorizing after hours or whenever. Mr. Jones stated that he had spoken to Dee Crumpler with Parks and Recreation and would pursue it further with him because there was tremendous interest in the disability community to have a piece of Cascades Park that would be usable by people in their community also. Dale Landry stated that he supported Mr. Jones in that movement and would meet with Mr. Crumpler as well. The City through Blueprint and Cascades Park was creating something new; universal access play areas needed to be included in this park for all children to enjoy it.

Mr. O’Steen stated that while he did not understand all the technicalities of why certain surfaces could not accommodate disabled persons but was fine for skateboarders. However, it seemed as if there were many different surface types in the park that ran that same risk of being by used improperly or otherwise not the way it was originally intended. He did not think it was a valid reason to discount (a Miracle Field at) Centennial Field. Henree Martin requested clarification of the surface type and the specific concern of the City. Mr. Jones stated that it was a rubber surface that was very safe and made for kids to play on.

Mr. Tedder stated that City Parks and Recreation stated that they fenced the Miracle Fields to keep people off of them to decrease maintenance of the facility. He stated that he was reporting their major concern; he personally had no experience with it. However if the CAC felt that it was important, have additional money available in the budget for amenities meant that if there were additional costs there was the possibility it could be used for that.

Mr. O’Steen stated that, based on the comments of the day, the Committee was in favor of having something there that met the needs of the disabled community and memorialized Centennial Park. He believed that alternatives to surfaces could do both. If more money was necessary to maintain it; he interrupted himself to question, how the total cost of the park itself. Mr. Tedder stated that it was “upwards of $25M.” Mr. O’Steen emphasized million.

Ms. Martin reminded the committee and stated that the general community might not understand that Cascades Park was a storm water project. That $25M was not for people to have a new park. It was a massive storm water project that would never have been conceived of had it been planned to be a park. The purpose of it was to solve a storm water and water quality issue. The rest, the amenities, were icing on the cake. However, the cake was the storm water component. Mr. O’Steen agreed and noted that the amenities were costly on their own. A universal access play area did not sound like an expensive item to accommodate.

Mr. Jones stated that building a “ball field” was not the intention. The design included a 50-foot by 50-foot diamond play area. If it was constructed out of grass and clay it would be a
maintenance nightmare and people with disabilities could not play on it like others could. The intent was to build it accessible from the beginning, a universal design. He felt that the City’s fear was that they did not want another League going on there. He understood that concern but it was not the intent. Mr. O’Steen stated that would be a programming issue. Ms. Martin noted that would not be possible in a 50x50 area anyway. Mr. Jones believed that was the real concern, not safety.

Mr. Jones further stated that he was involved with the construction of a Miracle League Field at Messer and there was concern of inappropriate use there too. He was familiar with that, the history, and the pros and cons. There had been no inappropriate use by skateboarders or others at that field. In fact, the skateboarders did not want to use the rubber surface because it was undesirable. The sidewalk surfaces were more apt to be used by skateboarders. Ms. Martin supported his comments.

Mr. Landry stated that what he heard as the important point in the conversation was that everything, all of the amenities that were included in Cascades Park were for people without disabilities. Mr. Jones was asking for one small area of the park. Furthermore, Mr. Landry stated that it needed to be only for people with disabilities. Not including it was the dumbest thing he had ever heard. To even have the discussion was problematic given everything else that was being added to that park.

Mr. Tedder stated that he had a clear message from the CAC. Ms. Martin clarified that all areas of the park were ADA accessible. Mr. Jones agreed that Blueprint staff did a fantastic job of designing accessibility into the park. It would be a shame however, not to make it a place for everyone to use from the beginning. Christic Henry noted that it pertained to the allocations of funds that were initially discussed.

Autumn Calder stated that she and Ms. Henry felt it would be prudent to hold a special workshop in the coming months to address a new member orientation and introduction of new staff as well. There was strong support by the Committee for that and a push to make it a barbecue. Ms. Martin suggested also reviewing the original Blueprint (mission/project list) and seeing which projects were moving forward or being discussed to move forward with the new sales tax. Ms. Henry stated that she felt it would increase the confidence of people coming in to the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens To Be Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items From Members Of The Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjourn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:25.
Autumn Calder called the meeting to order with the tour bus departing the Blueprint offices at 3:10 pm.

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christic Henry</th>
<th>Kent Wimmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Drew</td>
<td>David Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles Hargraves</th>
<th>Leigh Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder</td>
<td>Bruce Huffmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy</td>
<td>Steve Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Terrance Hinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Modifications

There were no Agenda Modifications.

Information Items

There were no Information Items.

Consent Items

There were no Consent Items.

Presentations/Discussion

Item #1: Sensitive Lands Tour

As the tour departed Blueprint, Autumn Calder briefly outlined the sites that would be visited and addressed key points from the attachment to the agenda. She also thanked County staff, Leigh Davis and Bruce Huffmaster, as well as Planning staff, Steve Hodges, for their participation in the tour.

Copeland Sink – Bruce Huffmaster stated that the site was planted in long leaf pine and wire grass four years back. The County would begin prescribed burning for maintenance of it in the coming months.

Booth 1 – Mr. Huffmaster spoke at length on the management of the site. To compensate for loss of habitat from clearing of the 9-acre field tract adjacent to the St. Marks tributary prior to acquisition, the County installed fence rows with hedge plantings at three 80-feet intervals and
60-feet in length. Maintenance included a three year rotation of harrowing one of the three 80-feet rows to a depth of six-feet. This disturbed the soil and allowed for new growth between the fence rows and allowed County staff to properly manage all levels of the ecosystem from soil and plantings to insects and up to whitetail deer. Over the course of three years all strips of field were harrowed with County staff returning to the first row in the fourth year.

Mr. Huffmaster stated that County staff used prescribed burns to manage the wetland area around the tributary. Residential development in the vicinity of the Booth properties created some problems for the staff however due to smoke and fire management.

Mr. Huffmaster explained to members that the property was a 755-acre environmental museum. Future mitigation of the site would involve restoring the swamp to natural flow levels along with mulching and the installation of geo-web material to help with soil stabilization and retention. In addition to that it would provide for people and fire equipment to access the area in the event of an emergency and help prevent sediment pollution downstream from foot and horse traffic in the upstream area.

Kent Wimmer expressed his desire for trails that penetrated the land versus mainly on the perimeter. Mr. Huffmaster agreed that it would be better however the behavior of the public was the most difficult challenge with such trails.

Terrance Hinson questioned how the County advertised access to the public the value of the resource. Mr. Huffmaster stated that it was mainly through educating residents and visitors of hidden gems. Leigh Davis stated that the County also coordinated Greenways Days in November, to promote all such properties and the activities available. Also it was largely word-of-mouth through various trail associations. However the County had purposely kept quiet about the Booth properties because of funding constraints in the management of land. David Jones spoke about funding that allowed for instant gratification to the public versus funding the provided for the bigger picture. He suggested limited access to the area so that people could begin to see the value of such acquisitions and funding the maintenance of them as well as the big picture for the long term community and environmental benefits. Mr. Huffmaster agreed noting that the benefit of the work County staff was investing in the property was truly for future generations; great, great grandchildren.

Steve Hodges stated that it was a balance of preservation and access and reminded members that the Agencies were awarded points in the grant applications for recreational facilities. Mr. Huffmaster stated that currently the County planned to continue using existing avenues for trails to keep from further fragmenting the region.

Fred George - Mr. Huffmaster stated that the County was partnered with Wildwood Preservation Society for the development and management of the Fred George site. Their priority would be securing the property. There were two home sites plus other structures on the property; one of the home sites would be converted into a museum and educational facility that would be managed by the Wildwood Education Center.

David Jones questioned the purpose of the museum. In a collaborative response Leigh Davis and
Autumn Calder stated that it would be similar to the Tall Timbers facility and that there could be a connection made to the Lake Jackson Mounds site as well.

Broadmore – Jim Shepherd distributed site plans for the site (included in the file) and spoke about the acquisition of the property and the mitigation efforts by Blueprint. As well as coordination with the City on final ownership and easement access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens To Be Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items From Members Of The Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjourn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The meeting adjourned with the return to Blueprint offices at 6:00 pm.
#2

Manuel Diaz Farms Recognition
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Manuel Diaz Farms Recognition

Date: February 25, 2013
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

Blueprint 2000 would like to publicly thank Manuel Diaz Farms for their generous contribution of palms to the Franklin Boulevard project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

On October 23, 2012 24 palms were delivered to the Franklin Boulevard project. The palms were donated by Manuel Diaz Farms, a tree farm based in Homestead, FL. The total donation included:

- 10 Washington Palms,
- 4 Chinese Fan Palms, and
- 10 Pindo Palms.

The donation also included a reduced delivery fee. The total donation is estimated to be a value of $30,000.00.

OPTIONS:
No action required.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required; for information only.

ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
No action taken by the CAC, presented for information only. This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None
#3

Franklin Boulevard Update
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Board on the status of the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief and Roadway Project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The construction contract with M of Tallahassee, Inc. was executed on December 16, 2011. Due to HUD Grant time limitations, the contract was based on the original, and previously completed design for a four-lane project. The roadway project was designed by the Genesis Group. On May 31, 2012, the design for the IA-approved two-lane roadway with a sidewalk and a mixed-use trail was completed.

Installation of the box culvert in the median of Franklin Boulevard began on February 22, 2012, and was complete on November 19, 2012. The “Closure Pour Ceremony” was held on that day. The street lighting design has been completed by the COT Electric and was used by M. Inc. for installation of underground conduits and pull boxes. Installation of wiring, lighting poles etc., will be done by COT Electric. Substantial completion of the roadway reconstruction is expected in March 2013.

On September 26, 2012 Blueprint and City staff met with Leon County School Board representatives and discussed flooding issues in the Leon High School student parking lots and Blueprint’s mitigation schedule. Per FEMA permit conditions, a restrictive plate has been installed at the inlet to the existing Concrete Box Culvert at Leon County School property. The purpose of this flow restriction is not to exceed the current 100-year flood elevation permitted by FEMA. The restrictive plate will have to remain in place until the downstream storage capacity is available to satisfy FEMA requirements.
Project Funding:
At an Intergovernmental Agency meeting held on June 25, 2012, the Board approved total project funding in the amount of $10,590,000. It is expected that, barring some unforeseen developments, this amount should be sufficient to complete the project.

OPTIONS:
No action required.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action required; for information only.

ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
No action taken by the CAC, presented for information only. This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENTS:
None; photographs of construction progress will be shown at the meeting.
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IA Meeting Minutes
(September 24, 2013)
MEMBERS PRESENT

County City
Commissioner Akin Akinyemi Commissioner Andrew Gillum
Commissioner John Dailey Commissioner Nancy Miller, Vice Chair
Commissioner Bryan Desloge, Chair Commissioner Mark Mustian
Commissioner Kristin Dozier Commissioner Ziffer
Commissioner Nick Maddox Commissioner Bill Proctor
Commissioner Jane Sauls

CITY/COUNTY STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Staff</th>
<th>City/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Calder, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Tony Park, Leon County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Diemer, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Harry Reed, CRTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Edwards, COT Parks &amp; Rec</td>
<td>Debra Schiro, Blueprint 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hargraves, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Wayne Tedder, Blueprint 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Ivy, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Anita Favors Thompson, City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelonda Meeks, Blueprint 2000</td>
<td>Jay Townsend, City Manager’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Menendez, COT Public Works</td>
<td>Patrick Twyman, COT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHERS PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others Present</th>
<th>City/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Figg, Figg*</td>
<td>Marek Romanowski, The LPA Group*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
<td>Mandy Sauer, Tallahassee Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gibby</td>
<td>Jim Shepherd, Jacobs Engineering*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Grey</td>
<td>Dave Snyder, The LPA Group*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christic Henry, CAC</td>
<td>Jeff Walters, Figg*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel Nicholson-Choice, Greenberg Traurig*</td>
<td>Tamera Waters, Tallahassee Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Phillips, The LPA Group*</td>
<td>Alisha Wetherell, Kimley- Horne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman, The LPA Group*</td>
<td>Ray Youmans, THC*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

None
II. CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Ms. Christic Henry, Chair of the CAC, stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee discussed several issues as follows:

- CAC budget meeting
- Support of the Cascades Park Dedication Celebration
- Local preference should be given to the Boca Chuba Pond statue
- Support of the universal design of Centennial Field
- Capital Circle Southwest PD&E study

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. CAC Meeting Minutes (June 7, 2012 and August 2, 2012)
   This item was presented as informational only.

2. CCNW/SW: South of US 90 to Orange Ave Update
   This item was presented as informational only.

3. Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief and Roadway Update
   This item was presented as informational only.

4. CCSE: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Rd Update
   This item was presented as informational only.

5. Blueprint 2000 MBE Status Report
   This item was presented as informational only.

IV. CONSENT ITEMS

6. IA Meeting Minutes: (May 21, 2012 and June 25, 2012)

   RECOMMENDED ACTION:
   Approve minutes as provided.

7. Proposed 2013 IA, TCC and CAC Meeting Schedules
8. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the following nominations:

Representative from the Economic Development Council: Chris Klena
Representative from the Civil Rights Community: Dale Landry
Representative from the Capital City Chamber of Commerce: Terence Hinson
Representative from the Planning Commission: Timothy Edmond
Representative from the Big Bend Environmental Forum: Kent Wimmer

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

9. Property Purchase in Lake Lafayette Basin

Wayne Tedder stated that Blueprint and County staff were contacted regarding the subject parcel. Staff had determined that the parcel was consistent with Blueprint principles as outlined in the original EEC document. This parcel is 174 acres. After initial and review appraisal of the subject properties, a conditional offer was extended to the owners. There were several opportunities that could be created through the acquisition of the property. The property was contiguous to the existing Lake Alford Greenway. It also provided access to the open water of Lake Lafayette. Staff recommendation was to approve the purchase from the Lake Lafayette Floodplain line item in the amount of $1,467,424. Mr. Tedder made mention that should improvements be necessary, funding was available in the line item.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize the parcel purchase from funds available in the Lake Lafayette Floodplain line item.

Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation, Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study, Design & Construction
Mr. Tedder stated that FDOT allocated $2.7 million to complete the design for Capital Circle Southwest, which is from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. He was contacted by FDOT who stated that they wanted more control of state road projects and that they were rescinding the LAP Agreement funding the design. The project budget needed to be amended to reflect the loss of the $2.7 million. It did not mean the money is going away however FDOT would manage the design of the roadway. In meeting with FDOT Mr. Tedder stated his concerns for maintaining the Blueprint philosophy for the road design. FDOT verbally agreed that they would maintain the design consistent with that philosophy. He further stated that FDOT anticipated that the project would be put out for bid by the end of 2012, but that had not yet been confirmed.

In order to complete the PD&E study Blueprint would need to indicate that funding was allocated for design in the five-year plan. The allocation was shown as $2.1 million. Furthermore, the intersection of Orange Avenue and Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest had yet to be designed.

Commissioner Gillum inquired as to how much of a precedent this policy change was for FDOT; that they withdrew the design from the local authority. Mr. Tedder stated that he felt that it was a relatively new trend. Commissioner Gillum expressed concern over how political road construction had become. The Commissioner requested that FDOT be made aware of the local municipalities goals of creating a certain kind of vision for their projects. He felt that if local money was invested in the project the locality should have input. Mr. Tedder stated that he had written FDOT expressing some of his concerns however a response has not been received. Mr. Tedder’s understanding of the policy shift was that FDOT had issues on other roadway projects in Florida and that an effort was being made to exert more control.

Commissioner Akinyemi strongly supported Commissioner Gillum’s concerns. Commissioner Akinyemi asked if there was still time to raise objection to the decision. Mr. Tedder stated that there was. Commissioner Dozier stated that her primary concerns were with the design issues and felt that raising an objection would not be productive. She requested to amend the staff recommendation to include that FDOT put in writing their commitment to using Blueprint design standards.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Authorize staff to amend the Blueprint 2000 Capital Budget for Capital Circle Southwest to remove the design, from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road, and the associated funding of $2,708,503.
Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation, Commissioner Ziffer seconded the motion.

Commissioner Nick Maddox supported Commissioner Gillum’s concerns and expressed his own that FDOT would not adhere to the design standards or philosophy. Commissioner Ziffer, however, supported Commissioner Dozier’s line of reasoning.

There was one public speaker. Mr. John Gibby felt that Blueprint 2000 was fired for doing nothing; FDOT took the money from them due to Section 8 from the letter. He raised concerns about how future money would be spent and requested that an audit be conducted.

Commissioner Miller requested that counsel respond to Mr. Gibby’s claims. Ms. Maribel Nicholson-Choice said that as of several months ago, she was aware of Mr. Gibby’s claims. Ms. Nicholson-Choice had not seen anything from FDOT to connect the two claims.

Mr. Tedder reiterated the source of the funding and that FDOT would be responsible for applying them to the project. Commissioner Dozier supported Commissioner Gillum’s request for FDOT to decide on the design standards.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he did not think the Board should take any action at that point because all that occurred was that they were informed of the LAP termination. He spoke to the history of positive relationship between Blueprint staff and FDOT personnel and because of that, was surprised by the way the information was communicated. He stated that he would like clarity on why the change occurred.

Mr. Tedder stated that through his meetings with FDOT staff he understood that FDOT would use comparable design guidelines. However, local financial support would need to be utilized for options that went above and beyond the design standards. Mr. Tedder stated that he had no issue with sending FDOT a letter based on the preceding conversation. Commissioner Miller then recapped the motion.

Commissioner Proctor asked if the action by FDOT “killed the project.” Mr. Tedder denied that; it was still available however it would be with a different agency to fund and manage the project; FDOT instead of Blueprint. Commissioner Miller asked if it would require changes to any of the contractors on the project. Mr. Tedder clarified that the project has not gone out to bid, therefore there were no contractors at that point.

Commissioner Proctor inquired as to whether or not the MBE requirements would be different because of the change. It was pointed out that the funding was for roadway design only;
construction funding had not been designated. However, FDOT had emphasized their desire to complete the design. Commissioner Dozier stated that because state funding would be used for the design Blueprint would be required to use FDOT standards regardless of Blueprint policy. Commissioners Proctor and Gillum recapped their thoughts on the community and the termination of the LAP agreement. Commissioner Gillum reiterated that he wanted to know why it happened and that he is not happy about it. Therefore, he would not be voting for the motion.

The motion carried 9-2 with Commissioners Gillum and Maddox casting the dissenting votes.

14. Adoption of the FY 2013 Blueprint Operating Budget and Resolution No. 2012-08

Mr. Tedder stated that the budget was essentially the same as the previous year and through the continued reorganization. It would be reduced once the final numbers of employees were in place. Mr. Tedder noted for clarification that there was a misstatement in the agenda item. The September 6, 2012 meeting was a publicly noticed meeting. Blueprint was not required to hold a public hearing. Staff recommended approval of the operating budget as presented.

There was one public speaker. Mr. John Gibby wished to point out the discrepancy in the public hearings stated in the agenda item. He supported the newspaper budget announcement.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2013 Blueprint Operating Budget as presented and approve the FY 2013 Operating Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2012-08).

Commissioner Dailey moved Option 1. Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.


There was one public speaker. Mr. John Gibby merely duplicated his previous comments. He also stated that he would like more time to review the information and that two weeks were required for publication.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2013-FY 2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2013 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt Resolution No. 2012-09.
Commissioner moved Option 1. Commissioner seconded. The motion carried 11-0.
Commissioner Dailey concurred that the more time citizens had to read the agenda items the better.

5. Blueprint 2000 MBE Status Report

Commissioner Miller revisited Item 5 due to Commissioner Proctor’s arrival. Commissioner Proctor stated that he had reviewed the information compiled by staff and in his opinion, the numbers had been fulfilled. He inquired as to where the MBE percentage requirements originated from. Mr. Tedder stated that the numbers were maintained by Blueprint and reviewed by the City’s Equity and Workforce Development Agency. The percentages were goals created by Blueprint that were based on the requirements of the City and County. Furthermore, the goal set by Blueprint was higher than either the City or County. Commissioner Proctor then requested a higher percentage of MBE for Blueprint.

11. Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 Update

Gary Phillips stated that the purpose of the item was to inform the Board of the progress of Capital Cascades Segment 3 as outlined in the agenda item and to seek approval of the preliminary Van Buren Pond design. Mr. Tedder interjected that he wanted to ensure that the board was aware that excess funding from the Coal Chute Pond construction would be applied to the excess cost of segment 3A.

Mr. Phillips stated that the CAC requested staff evaluate the removal of the stairway on the north side of the Connector Bridge and the parking lot adjacent to the development; and requested screening options instead. The screening options have the opportunity to be included in the in the construction contract. Mr. Tedder stated that it would provide the opportunity to move the parking away from the front of the building and to the side consistent with land development regulations. These changes would also serve to enhance redevelopment along the trail.

Commissioner Dailey if there was sufficient parking to allow for public access to the park if the aforementioned parking were removed. Staff confirmed that there was. Commissioner Dailey questioned the width of the path leading to the bridge. Staff stated it was 12-feet wide; the same as the bridge width. Commissioner Miller questioned why the parking would not be used by the adjacent business. Mr. Tedder responded that it was a possibility.

Commissioner Akinyemi stated that at street level people could potentially just walk across Monroe Street. Mr. Tedder stated that staff was reviewing possible solutions to that.
Linda Figg presented various Connector Bridge Perspectives. Commissioner Dozier inquired as to whether or not the bridge contained anti-graffiti stain. Ms. Figg stated that it could be applied to the bridge. Mr. Tedder restated the CAC request that something be done to hide the orange motorsports building. Commissioner Ziffer asked if murals had been proposed for the area. Mr. Tedder stated that he was not away of any proposals. Commissioner Proctor questioned how much it would cost to purchase and demolish the building. Mr. Tedder stated that the site was designated by the EPA as a superfund site and would require remediation; therefore it would be quite costly to consider.

Mr. Phillips recapped the design of the Van Buren Pond and its site requirements. He stated that FAMU School of Architecture had been contacted to come up with possible visioning analyses for the trail and pond. The concepts would be taken to FAMU Administration for final approval. Commissioner Dailey expressed support for the Plan and was happy see that FAMU was being consulted. He requested that effort be made so that it would not look like a walled off retention pond.

Commissioner Gillum asked if there was vision for how the pond would look. Mr. Phillips replied that there was a general idea however the FAMU students were instructed to be creative as possible. Commissioner Gillum enquired as to the possibility for underground storage rather than a 20-foot deep stormwater pond that would be dry at most times. Mr. Phillips stated that it was looked at early on and was eliminated because it was an incredibly expensive option.

Commissioner Proctor asked about FAMU’s involvement with the holding pond design. They have been involved through the FAMU Way extension project and Blueprint organized meetings. Commissioner Proctor spoke on the roundabout planned for FAMU Way.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Approve the Preliminary Van Buren Pond Design

Commissioner Ziffer moved Option 1; the motion was seconded and passed. 8-3. Commissioners Proctor, Gillum, and Nick Maddox dissented.

Debate on FAMU’s awareness of the stormwater pond design continued. Mr. Phillips described the purpose and location of the stilling pond. Commissioner Ziffer requested a price for underground stormwater storage for informational purposes.

12. Capital Cascades Trail – Segment 3 (Stilling Pond): Right-of-Way Acquisition and Authorizing Resolutions
The item sought approval of Resolutions NO. 2012-06 and -07 in order to construct the stilling pond.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Approve the Resolutions allowing the acquisition of the two (2) privately owned parcels, which are required for the construction of the Stilling Pond stormwater facility.

Commissioner Dozier moved Option 1. Commissioner Dailey seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

13. Cascades Park Update

*Cascades Park Dedication Celebration*

Ms. Calder provided an overview for the Cascades Park Dedication Celebration. The date of the opening was yet to be determined. Information included planned events and funding proposals.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Support the utilization of Blueprint 2000 unallocated funds for the Dedication Celebration expenses which go beyond the dollars collected through donations and sponsorships.

Commissioner Ziffer moved item and it was seconded. Commissioner Dozier pointed out the need to have parking agreements with the state in place prior to the opening; noting that Fridays would be the most difficult days to coordinate parking. Mr. Tedder stated that the City’s Real Estate Division was drafting an agreement with the State. Commissioner Miller requested a representative from City Properties be present at the next IA Meeting to give an update on the status. The motion passed unanimously.

Alternatives to the Boca Chuba Sculpture

Staff sought approval of the Request for Proposals and allocation of a budget. Commissioner Dozier expressed support. Mr. Tedder clarified the process and the possible cost savings.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve the proposed selection process and allocated budget for the sculpture in Boca Chuba Pond.
Commissioner Gillum moved item. Commissioner Dozier seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

*Smokey Hollow Commemoration*
Ms. Calder provided an update on the Smokey Hollow Commemoration including the Commemoration design.

There was one public speaker. Wendy Gray suggested that ongoing maintenance and operations need to be a point of focus.

*Possible Sink Hole at Cascades Park*

Mr. Tedder stated that after a recent rain event there was evidence of sink hole in Boca Chuba Pond. A consultant was currently investigating the issue. The extent of it was as of yet undetermined; the results would be brought back to the Board in the future. Mr. Tedder requested in increase in funding by $500,000.00 to address the issue. The funding would come from the Landbank for contingency.

Commissioner Dozier moved the motion.

**VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

None

**VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

None

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Miller adjourned the meeting at 7:35.

APPROVED:  
________________________  ATTEST:  
Nancy Miller  
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA  
Shelonda Meeks  
Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
#5

FHWA Payment Approval Delegation
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: FHWA Payment Approval Delegation

Date: February 25, 2013
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Charles Hargraves
Type of Item: Presentation

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

This agenda item requests authority for the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve additional costs that FHWA has reviewed and agreed to pay for.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

A. Additional FDOT Funding
On December 6, 2012, the FHWA announced that it will pay for all fuel, bitumen, and quality adjustments for the Capital Circle NW/SW project.

Current Blueprint policy states that all project change orders must be approved by the IMC which would include adjusting the budget to allow the FHWA to pay for the fuel, bitumen, and quality adjustments referenced above.

For projects utilizing FHWA funds, such as the Capital Circle NW/SW project, all project change orders are required to have FHWA approval prior to review and approval by the IMC. Given that the FHWA is the only agency authorized to approve funding changes, staff’s recommendation to authorize the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve the additional costs is intended to streamline the approval process by removing the unnecessary step of IMC approval.

OPTIONS:

1: Authorize the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve additional costs that FHWA has reviewed and agreed to pay for.

2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDATION:

Option 1: Authorize the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve additional costs that FHWA has reviewed and agreed to pay for.

ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
The CAC voted 8-0 in favor of Option 1, to authorize the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve additional costs that FHWA has reviewed and agreed to pay for.

This item was not presented to the TCC.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
None
#6

Capital Circle SE,
Woodville to
Crawfordville
Monumentation
**SUBJECT/TITLE:** Capital Circle Southeast (E3) from East of Crawfordville Road to West of Woodville Highway Monumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: February 25, 2013</th>
<th>Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Charles Hargraves</td>
<td>Type of Item: Presentation/Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**

The purpose of this agenda item is to request Board approval for additional funds required to produce the Capital Circle Southeast (CCSE E3) monumentation map.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**

The CCSE E3 project limits include Parcel 800 of the US Forrest Service property and a portion of Parcel 119 at the east end of the project. The majority of the CCSE E3 project is located within the road easement on Parcel 800. During procurement of the project, Blueprint concluded that the most cost effective way of completing the monumentation would be through the survey team of Construction Engineering & Inspection (CEI). To this end, Blueprint requested a cost proposal from the CEI for field work and preparation of the monumentation map. The CEI submitted a proposal to Blueprint for all survey field work including monumentation. After negotiations with the CEI, Blueprint selected to reduce the scope and cost of the survey to only the required project’s field work.

As a result of the negotiations, preparation of the monumentation map was not included in the accepted proposal. In order to satisfy the FDOT requirement to provide the monumentation map, Blueprint obtained an independent surveying consultant cost proposal from a local company. Blueprint is requesting a budget of $15,000.00 to cover the costs associated with the monumentation.

**Project Funding:**

The Design-Build project with C.W. Roberts, Inc. is funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Program in the amount of $7,393,598.00 in which no sales tax funds were utilized for this roadway improvement. In addition, some underground utility work for COT Water/Sewer Utility was included in the contract for $1,591,027 and the CEI cost amounted to $1,334,162.32 (COT portion in this amount is $107,017.89).

Additional CRTPA funds in the amount of $387,216.20 were made available for construction of additional median openings, irrigation, access improvements and pavement markings.
The ARRA funds did not included any contingencies for extra work. All funds allocated to this project have been spent. Therefore, an additional $15,000.00, from FY 2012 unallocated funds, must be allocated to the project to complete the required monumentation map.

**OPTIONS:**

1. Allocate $15,000.00 for preparation of the monumentation map. The funding source is unallocated funds from FY 2012.

2. Board Guidance

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1: Allocate $15,000.00 for preparation of the monumentation map. The funding source is unallocated funds from FY 2012.

**ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:**
The CAC voted 8-0 in favor of Option 1, to allocate $15,000 for preparation of the monumentation map from unallocated funds from FY 2012.

This item was not presented to the TCC.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
None
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Connector Bridge Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate & Award the Construction Contract
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascades Connector Bridge - Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate and Award the Construction and CEI Contracts

Date: February 25, 2013
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips
Type of Item: Information

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Board on the status of Capital Cascades Connector Bridge design and to request authorization from the IA to advertise, negotiate and award a contract to construct the project.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

1. Project Design: The project redesign and permitting will be complete and ready to be advertised for construction by May 2013. The trail redesign was requested through coordination with the IA, TCC and CAC during meetings held in 2012. The final design plans will include structural plans such as substructure and superstructure, tie-beam details, post tensioning layout, erection sequencing, canopy details and civil and electrical plans such as grading and drainage, hardscape and landscape, irrigation and lighting.

2. Project Permitting:
   • Agencies requiring permits are City of Tallahassee, Florida Department of Transportation and the Division of Historic Resources.
   • The Natural Features Inventory (NFI) has been approved. The Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) and Environmental Management Permit (EMP) will be submitted concurrently upon redesign completion.
   • The FDOT Air Rights Agreement and Local Agency Program Agreement will be completed by Staff.

3. Project Schedule: The design and permitting are scheduled to be completed by April 2013 followed by Invitation for Construction Bids. Construction Notice-to-Proceed is anticipated in August 2013 (See the Attached Project Schedule).

4. Estimated Project Cost: The Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Cost (EOPC) which includes contingency, post design services and CEI is $4,500,000.00
5. **Project Funding:** Currently, Blueprint has $2,600,000.00 remaining in sales tax funds in the Connector Bridge budget. Blueprint has secured $1,400,000.00 in Grants for this project: $850,000.00 is anticipated in 2014 Federal Transportation Enhancement Funds (FTEF) (the LAP Agreement is being processed) and $550,000.00 is anticipated from CRTPA. Collectively, the total existing project funding is $4,000,000.00. To account for the project shortfall, Blueprint recommends transferring $500,000.00 from the Land Bank. Any remaining funds at project completion will be transferred to the CCT-Segment 3 project.

6. **CEI Services:** In order to be eligible for the FTEF funds, Blueprint will re-advertise the CEI services.

**OPTIONS:**

**Option 1:**

A. Allocate the $850,000.00 Federal Transportation Enhancement Funds and the $550,000.00 CRTPA funds to project #1000612- Capital Cascades Trail Connector Bridge.

B. Transfer $500,000.00 from project #03758 – Land Bank to project #1000612 – Capital Cascades Trail Connector Bridge. Any remaining funds at project completion will be transferred to the CCT-Segment 3 project.

C. Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services and CEI Services at a total cost not to exceed $4,500,000.00. The budget includes construction contingency and negotiated post design services with the design firm.

D. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction and CEI firms, and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.

**Option 2:** Board Guidance.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:**

A. Allocate the $850,000.00 Federal Transportation Enhancement Funds and the $550,000.00 CRTPA funds to project #1000612- Capital Cascades Trail Connector Bridge.

B. Transfer $500,000.00 from project #03758 – Land Bank to project #1000612 – Capital Cascades Trail Connector Bridge. Any remaining funds at project completion will be transferred to the CCT-Segment 3 project.

C. Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services and CEI Services at a total cost not to exceed $4,500,000.00. The budget includes construction contingency and negotiated post design services with the design firm.

D. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction and CEI firms, and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
The CAC voted 8-0 in favor of authorizing the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascades Connector Bridge Project at a cost not to exceed the FY2013-2017 Capital Improvement Plan allocation for the project which includes CEI services, post design services and project contingency.

This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Bridge and Trail Plan View
2. Project Schedule
### Proposed Schedule

**JANUARY 16, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice To Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management &amp; Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGGO Team Kick-Off Meeting w/Subconsultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-Off Meeting w/ Blueprint 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Charette Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Charette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Charette Summary Report &amp; Bridge Concept Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House to Present Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical - Final Drawings &amp; Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Design &amp; Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Park &amp; Trail Design &amp; Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Lighting Design for Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Concept Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Design &amp; Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall Design &amp; Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Agreement No. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Design (East Side) &amp; MKP Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CCT Segments 3A & 3B Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate & Award the Construction Contract
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Cascades Trail (CCT) - Segment 3 Update and Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate and Award the Construction Contract for CCT - Segments 3B and 3C

Date: February 25, 2013
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Gary Phillips
Type of Item: Discussion/Presentation

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Board on the status of Capital Cascades Trail (CCT) - Segment 3 projects and to request authorization from the IA to advertise, negotiate and award a contract to construct CCT - Segments 3B and 3C.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Segment 3A - Box Culvert Installation from South Monroe Street to west of South Adams Street: The project Notice-to-Proceed was issued December 7, 2012 with 180-day construction duration. The Contractor has begun installing the double 12’ x 9’ box culvert from the western terminus of the project to South Monroe Street, a total distance of approximately 620 feet. To date, the Contractor has installed 420 feet of the double concrete box culvert and is across South Adams Street. The sanitary sewer and water lines were replaced and South Adams Street was rebuilt with sidewalks on both sides of the travel lanes. South Adams Street was reopened to traffic after 24 days of closure on February 6, 2012.

CCT – Segment 3B and Segment 3C: CCT-Segment 3B and 3C which extends from west of South Adams Street to West of Cleveland Street, a distance of approximately 4,000 feet is being requested from the IA to advertise, negotiate and award a construction contract together with the FAMU Way Extension Project. The two projects have been designed and permitted concurrently with the understanding that the projects would be combined (design plans, specifications, quantities) and advertised together as one construction contract. By combining the two (2) project designs into one (1) construction project, the phasing and sequencing of the box culvert installation, roundabout and roadway construction, utility work, maintenance of traffic and other critical project components are substantially enhanced and will ultimately decrease project costs and lessen impacts to the traveling public. The project’s landscaping and hardscape is currently being developed by Wood and Partners (see summary below) and will be advertised under a separate construction contract in summer of 2013. (See Attachment 1 – Plan View of CCT-Segment 3B and 3C and FAMU Way Improvement Projects)
CCT – Segment 3B – Van Buren Pond: This in-line, 5-acre pond will reduce flooding and replace lost floodplain storage created by placing the St. Augustine Branch Ditch inside a double box culvert. The pond is located north of FAMU Way and south of the CSX Railroad between M.L. King Jr. Boulevard and the Bronough Street overpass. Right-of-way acquisitions for all required properties have been completed. Staff and the design team are working with the City and the FAMU community to identify design features that will incorporate the vision and overall themes including elements of water, history and heritage, color, vibrancy and playfulness. (See Attachment 2 – Advanced Schematic Design)

CCT – Segment 3 Landscaping and Hardscape: Wood and Partners Inc. (WPI) have been tasked to develop advanced schematic designs for the CCT-Segment 3 and FAMU Way Improvement Projects from South Monroe Street to Lake Bradford Road. Building upon prior work collected through stakeholder input, preferred concepts generated by Florida A&M University, School of Architecture students, as well as Kimley-Horn and Staff prepared design drawings. WPI, along with the City and Blueprint Management, will develop and present Advanced Schematic Designs to several key community groups, FAMU Board of Trustees, FAMU Way CAC, Blueprint CAC and TCC, as well as conduct a community meeting, before completing construction documents for bids. The project’s landscaping and hardscape will be advertised under a separate contract in summer of 2013.

Coal Chute Pond Construction: The project Notice to Proceed was issued on September 4, 2012. This 4-acre regional stormwater facility is located west of Railroad Square, and situated on 10 parcels acquired by Blueprint, using, in part, funds provided by the Community Redevelopment Agency. Construction funds are from Blueprint and the City of Tallahassee. Construction Engineering Inspection is being conducted by Parsons-Brinkerhoff. Additional stormwater outfall improvements from Gaines Street to the Pond will be constructed concurrently; funded by the City. Project time extensions have been granted by the City to accommodate project change orders and permitting delays associated with the jack and bore underneath the CSX Railroad and utility conflicts. Depending on the sanitary sewer conflict resolution at the pond outfall, the pond is scheduled to be completed April 30, 2013.

Capital Cascades Connector Bridge: Revised plans for the Capital Cascades Connector Bridge and connecting access trails to Gadsden Street and Adams Street are being prepared by FIGG Engineering and Kimley-Horn and Associates. Agenda Item #7 is requesting authority to advertise, negotiate and award a construction contract for the Connector Bridge project.

Relocation at Stearns Street: Blueprint experienced some unusual relocation circumstances on a 10 unit apartment complex on Stearns Street as part of our CCT Segment 3 Project. These issues were not covered in our current Relocation Policy. Based on our policy, the tenants in this complex only qualified for moving expenses. Unfortunately, several of these tenants were in severe financial and credit situations and could not afford to pay first and last month’s rent and deposits which are normally required with low income and poor credit applicants. Several of the tenants have small children and are living in a 430 SF apartment with 1 bath and 1 bedroom.
Although our Policy does not address this type situation, the Director of PLACE felt it appropriate to assist these tenants and approved budgeting additional monies to assist them in securing other living arrangements. Blueprint believes that this approach is consistent with the previous direction of the IA regarding tenant displacement. All tenants have now been successfully relocated and the additional funds needed totaled $1,800.00. All of the additional funding for rents and deposits were paid directly to the new landlords.

**Project Funding and Process**– Currently, Blueprint has a balance of $12,137,370.00 allocated to Segment 3, and $6,106,021.96 in sales tax funds will be available FY 2014. Due to the need to combine the City’s FAMU Way project with the Blueprint Cascades Trail project, staff is recommending that the City administer the procurement and CEI services.

**OPTIONS:**

**Option 1:** Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 3B and 3C Project at a cost not to exceed $17,000,000.00 which includes post design service and project contingency consistent with the project implementation described below:

1. The CCT-Segment 3B and 3C project will be combined (plans, specifications, quantities) with the FAMU Way Extension Project and advertised together as one construction contract.
2. City of Tallahassee Public Works will advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
3. City of Tallahassee Public Works, in coordination with Blueprint 2000, will administer the Construction Contract and CEI Services for the project
4. Blueprint 2000 and the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department will enter into a Joint Project Funding Agreement

**Option 2:** Board Guidance.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 3B and 3C Project at a cost not to exceed $17,000,000.00 which includes post design services and project contingency consistent with the project implementation described below:

1. The CCT-Segment 3B and 3C project will be combined (plans, specifications, quantities) with the FAMU Way Extension Project and advertised together as one construction contract.
2. City of Tallahassee Public Works will advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.
3. City of Tallahassee Public Works, in coordination with Blueprint 2000, will administer the Construction Contract and CEI Services for the project
4. Blueprint 2000 and the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department will enter into a Joint Project Funding Agreement

ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
The CAC voted 8-0 in favor of Option 1, to authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 3B and 3C at a cost not to exceed (amount to be provided) which includes CEI services, post design services and project contingency.

1. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.

This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: CCT-Segment 3B and 3C/FAMU Way Improvement Projects Design Plan View
CCT-Segment 3B and 3C/FAMU Way Improvement Project
Cascades Park Update & Request for Additional Funding & Authorization of Amphitheater Enhancements
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

As expected with any similar project, the addition of work items and the extension of time that is required by the contractor to complete the work increases the cost of the project. The purpose of this agenda item is to request Board approval for additional project funding and authorization to proceed with Amphitheater seating and electrical improvements.

AMENITY UPDATE

Discovery at Cascades: Final Construction Plans were completed on January 11, 2013. Staff is working with KCCI to develop a project implementation and coordination schedule for each of the major components including site grading, utility and landscape plans and detailed hardscape plans for each feature: infiltration garden and sand beach flume; pump basin flume and diverter box; outdoor classroom; embankment slide and access deck; elevated foot bridge; steep head slide and log scramble steps; cypress slide and log jump. A community planting will be scheduled in the late spring, early summer. The Discovery at Cascades Site Plan is included as Attachment 1.

Smokey Hollow Commemoration: Staff has worked with the Smokey Hollow Working Group to refine the design of the Smokey Hollow Commemoration. This working group includes several members of the former community. The landscape plan and the site plan are complete and the cost estimating is underway. Architects Lewis + Whitlock are providing an in-kind donation of their design services and Genesis Group is providing an in-kind donation for the site design. The Smokey Hollow Commemoration Site Plan is included as Attachment 2.

Amphitheater Noise Study: Acoustics By Design, Inc. was retained to complete a Community Noise Study at the proposed amphitheater location at Cascades Park. The study team measured the current community background noise levels over a 24 hour period beginning August 24, 2012 near the residential property lines near Cascades Park. In addition to the measurements, they also predicted and analyzed the potential future noise impact of the Amphitheater on the Myers Park neighborhood to the south of the park.
The noise measurements at the nearby residential property lines over the 24-hour period were daytime hourly L10 in the 47-56 dBA range, and the nighttime hourly L10 to be in the 43-54 dBA range.

The predicted exterior noise level produced by the amphitheater house speaker system at the “worst case” property line location was found to be 73 dBA which is 25 dBA above the measured nighttime noise level and 16-24 dBA above the average measured daytime noise levels. The predicted exterior noise level produced by the Amphitheater touring speaker system at the “worst case” property line location was found to be 82 dBA which is 34 dBA above the measured nighttime noise level and 25-33 dBA above the average measured daytime noise levels. Note: the literature states that sound levels within a residence of typical wood frame construction will be 10 dBA lower than exterior levels if the windows are open, and 20 to 25 dBA lower than the exterior levels if the windows are closed. For example, at the nearest residence with the touring system, the sound levels inside the residence are calculated to be approximately 57-62 dBA with the windows closed.

Based on their findings, the study team recommended investigating noise mitigation options. To that end, they predicted and analyzed the potential future noise impact of the Amphitheater using the house speaker system and the touring speaker system on the community to the south of the park with a 10 foot, 20 foot, and 30 foot wall on the south side of Cascade Park Lane. The wall used in the study was approximately 745 feet long and placed just west of Gadsden St and ended approximately 300 feet from E. Gaines St. The sound level at the mix location with the house system would be approximately 95 dBA, and 105 dBA with the touring system. For the house system, only adjacent locations showed a reduction in sound level with the 20 foot wall and there is no reduction at any of the locations with the 10 foot wall. However, with the 30 foot wall, depending on the measurement location, there is a 5-12 dBA reduction in sound level. With the touring system, again, there is no reduction with the 10 foot wall, a 5-10 dBA reduction with the 20-foot wall and a 7-15 dBA reduction in sound level with the 30-foot wall. City, County and Blueprint staff are continuing to meet with the adjacent neighborhoods to identify options to mitigate concerns.

Parking Agreement with Department of Management Services: The City of Tallahassee is currently drafting an agreement with the Florida Department of Management Services for use of State parking lots. The purpose of this agreement is to accommodate parking needs during Special Events as Cascades Park. Additional parking agreements with FDOT and other entities will also be developed. A surface and parking garage ownership map is included in Attachment 3. The current agreement allows access to 3,769 spaces. The City will also seek similar agreements for additional parking spaces with other State agencies not a part of the current agreement.

Donation Policy and Procedure: The objective of the Donation Policy and Procedure document is to establish policy and procedure for collecting donations and instituting donor recognition in Capital Cascades Park and the greater Cascades Trail greenway. The Park Donation Program will be flexible and responsive to the needs of our community’s donors. The development of an official donating policy will establish consistent procedural guidelines and
avoid ambiguity in the expectations of our donors. Cascades Trail will be constructed in segments; this document will serve as continuity for future donations to all segments of Cascades Trail. The Donation Policy and Procedure is included in Attachment 4.

**ADDITIONAL FUNDING INFORMATION:**

As previously stated, the increased project scope and the need for the contractor to extend the contract time amount, has increased the cost of the project. Other unforeseen issues have also increased the cost of the project. The following Major Change Orders and Supplemental Agreement have been executed since the September 24, 2012 Intergovernmental Agency Meeting:

1. **Supplemental Agreement #2 - $604,000.00** – Contract adjustment to include reasonable and fair profit & overhead associated with the addition of extra work and extension of contract time (completion date), sets substantial completion for 7/31/13.
2. **Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) Extension – $84,000.00** – Extends MOT from original contract completion date to current contract substantial completion date of 7/31/13.
3. **Roadway Reconstruction - $65,226.81** – Expanded scope of work - plans called for milling and resurfacing but existing conditions required reconstruction.
4. **Restroom Modification - $31,439.81** – Enhancements to Kiosk, Restroom and Changing area including decking, added rebar for concrete benches, added metal fascia, structural bond and interior architectural elements.
5. **Boat Ramp Installation – $27,136.41** – Expanded scope of work to add boat ramps to both upper and lower ponds for access to alum injection system.
6. **Slope Filter Drain System for Upper Pond – $151,814.60** – undesirable ground water conditions jeopardized the slope stability of the west-bank which required the installation of slope filter drain system to facilitate construction and ensure long term maintenance.
7. **Convert Concrete Capstone – $174,305.76** – Adjust contract quantity to address overrun of item and modify from Pre-Cast to Cast-in-Place to improve quality of the final product.
8. **Shade Structure Coordination – $94,952.55** – Addition of Contractor coordination and facilitation of extra work installed by others (Agency hired Contractor, not General Contractor) for the Amphitheater Stage Canopy.
9. **Post Design Services – $132,000.00** – Extension of post design services to support design additions to the park that have extended beyond the original scope of work and overall project completion duration.
10. Construction Engineering and Inspection – $100,000.00 – Extension of time for two (2) full time City Employees – Project Engineer and Inspector.


12. Subsurface Investigation and Analysis of Sheet Pile Retaining Wall – $58,032.00 – assess the movement and stability of the sheet pile retaining wall in the lower pond (Boca Chuba).


14. Remediation Support – $25,000.00 – Extension of remediation services associated with monitoring wells, monthly status reports to USEPA and environmental permitting.

15. Furnish and Install Grout for Shade Structure Foundations – $27,136.41 – Additional grout imbeds and miscellaneous hardware associated with the addition of the amphitheater structure.

16. Power Distribution Stations (PDS) – $204,377.29 – modify design and construction of nine (9) Power Distribution Stations which will serve as the outdoor electric room for the park amenities and convert COT electric power to usable power for the various features such as the lights, sound, pumps, fountains, irrigation, alum injection and the code blue emergency systems.

17. Structural Survey and Miscellaneous Investigation – $4,235.00 – Survey at sheet pile wall and independent structural services to assist BP2K in evaluating movement of the sheet pile wall and other misc. structural items.

**Total Costs = $1,931,743.29**

Based on the Change Orders and Supplemental Agreement listed above, as of the date of this meeting, Blueprint has less than $250,000.00 remaining in unobligated contingency funding.

**AMPHITHEATER OPTIONS:**

Upon direction from the IA at the June 25, 2012 meeting, staff began the necessary design work to modify components of the amphitheater to accommodate ticketed events. The designs were completed in late November 2012. Staff has worked with the contractor to finalize the cost ($2,378,676.08). In order to complete the IA’s direction, additional funding is required. Funding is available from unallocated funds that remain from FY12. Staff has evaluated three options for consideration. It should be noted that $650,000.00 of TDC funds will need to be paid back if the facility reverts to local events only. Blueprint is seeking replenishment of these funds.
for completion of amenities such as the Smokey Hollow Commemoration and to address the potential karst feature in the lower pond. Blueprint recommends utilizing current unallocated funds that remain from FY12. The following three (3) cost proposal packages associated with Amphitheater Seating and Electrical Enhancements are summarized below:

**Option A – Electrical Infrastructure Only (Local Events)**
**Option B – Electrical and Seating Infrastructure Only (Ticketed Events with Seating)**
**Option C – Amphitheater as Designed with Specialty and Theatrical Lighting (Ticketed Events with Seating/Lighting)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option A – Local Events</th>
<th>Option B – Ticketed Events with Seating</th>
<th>Option C – Ticketed Events with Seating/Lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork, drainage, Utilities</td>
<td>$203,518.00</td>
<td>$203,518.00</td>
<td>$203,518.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Infrastructure</td>
<td>$351,665.81</td>
<td>$351,665.81</td>
<td>$519,614.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Lights, Sound, Grounding</td>
<td>$37,915.27</td>
<td>$37,915.27</td>
<td>$859,417.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating with Grandstand</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$515,064.42</td>
<td>$515,064.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Work</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$298,197.60</td>
<td>$298,197.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Engineering plus landscape Credit</td>
<td>$(66,561.78)</td>
<td>$(66,561.78)</td>
<td>$(66,561.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handrails</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$25,875.00</td>
<td>$25,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$593,099.08</td>
<td>$1,365,674.32</td>
<td>$2,355,124.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond (1%)</td>
<td>$593.99</td>
<td>$13,656.74</td>
<td>$23,551.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$599,030.07</td>
<td>$1,379,331.06</td>
<td>$2,378,676.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC Repayment</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,249,030.07</td>
<td>$1,379,331.06</td>
<td>$2,378,676.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total current construction contract amount is $26,597,126.04.

**OPTIONS:**

**Option 1:** Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

1. Project Funding and Contingency = $2,500,000.00
2. Option C (Complete Amphitheater Package) = $2,378,676.09
   **TOTAL** = $4,878,676.09

**Option 2:** Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

1. Project Funding and Contingency = $2,500,000.00
2. Option B (Ticketed Events with Seating) = $1,379,331.06
   **TOTAL** = $3,879,331.06
Option 3: Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

3. Project Funding and Contingency = $2,500,000.00
4. Option A (Local Events) = $ 599,030.07
   TOTAL = $3,099,030.07

Option 4: Board Guidance.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

1. Project Funding and Contingency = $2,500,000.00
2. Option C (Ticketed Events with Seating/Lighting) = $2,378,676.09
   TOTAL = $4,878,676.09

ACTION BY THE CAC AND TCC:
The CAC had a lengthy discussion regarding the amphitheater’s impact on the surrounding neighborhood and the community as a whole. The committee requested more information from Blueprint 2000 regarding crowd sound and light pollution. The CAC voted 7-1 in favor of Option 1, to amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

1. Project Funding and Contingency = $2,500,000.00
2. Option C (Complete Amphitheater Package) = $2,378,676.09
   TOTAL = $4,878,676.09

This item was not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Discovery at Cascades Site Plan
2. Smokey Hollow Commemoration Site Plan
3. Surface and Garage Parking Ownership Map
4. Donation Policy and Procedure
5. Contractor’s Amphitheater Cost Proposal
6. FY 2013 Budget Resolution No. 2013-01
The Cascade Waterfall

This waterfall celebrates the location of the Florida State Capitol in October 1823 by Dr. William H. Simmons of St. Augustine and John Lee Williams of Pensacola. These men were commissioned by Governor William P. Duval to find a compromise location for the capital between St. Augustine and Pensacola. The area around the Apalachicola village of Tallahassee ("old fields") was selected. John Lee Williams eloquently described the area as follows:

"The area around the Apalachicola village of Tallahassee ("old fields") was selected. John Lee Williams eloquently described the area as follows:

"The cascade and sink have long since vanished but the stream, the St. Augustine Branch, remains. The 1824 map shows the original plan for Tallahassee and includes the course of the St. Augustine Branch.

What is a rood? A rood is an old English unit of length equal to 5.5 yards (16.5 feet).

The Cascade Waterfall was made possible by a donation from..."
I. GOAL

The creation of Capital Cascades Park and Trail is a historic move by the City of Tallahassee and its citizens to enhance our community on several fronts. The goal of the project is to develop a holistic approach to stormwater management while jointly recognizing local history and providing a citywide amenity that promotes a sense of community and supports a healthy lifestyle. Funding for this expansive project has largely been from local sales tax. In addition to the engineered site plan, landscape and hardscape features are necessary to establish the Park and Trail as a social commodity. To ensure all amenities that meet this end are funded, supplemental donations are being sought from the community.

II. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this document is to establish policy and procedure for collecting donations and instituting donor recognition in Capital Cascades Park and the greater Cascades Trail greenway. The Park Donation Program will be flexible and responsive to the needs of our community’s donors. The development of an official donating policy will establish consistent procedural guidelines and avoid ambiguity in the expectations of our donors. Cascades Trail will be constructed in segments; this document will serve as continuity for future donations to all segments of Cascades Trail.

III. DEFINITIONS

Administrator – Entity that is presently managing donations, either Blueprint 2000 or City of Tallahassee Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Affairs

Authority – The entity that is in ownership of the Park, depends on pre- or post- construction status

City – City of Tallahassee

Donation – Includes any contribution to Capital Cascades Trail, including monetary and in-kind service

Donors – Individuals, Businesses, Community Organizations, etc.

Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks Foundation, Inc. – a group of citizens who provide assistance to the City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation Department in acquiring additional sources of funding for programs and facilities. The primary purpose of the non-profit, tax-exempt foundation is to acquire properties and accept gifts for use in the City’s park system. The Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)(3).
Greenway – Trail that is dedicated to preservation/conservation and serves the community as a functional corridor

Hardscape Feature – Hardscape is the non-living elements of a landscape

Landscape Feature – Components of the overall landscape differentiated by vegetative, geologic, hydrologic, and structural elements, which may occur at various scales

Multi-use trail – Trail that serves multiple functions such as running & biking

Park – Cascades Park

PR&NA – City of Tallahassee Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Affairs

Panel – Recognition element for prominent elements in the Park/Trail

Plaque – Recognition element that is smaller than a panel

Prominent Park/Trail Amenities – Designed public facilities which are a useful or attractive feature in the Park/Trail that are deemed significant to the overall master plan.

Public Works – City of Tallahassee Public Works Department

Recognition Element – Panels, Plaques, Bricks

Trail – Cascades Trail, all segments

IV. POLICY

A. Authority: The City of Tallahassee is the owner of Cascades Trail; Blueprint 2000 is the agency responsible for acquisition and construction. Blueprint 2000 is the authority charged with allocating funding sources, including both the appropriation of sales tax revenue and community donations. Blueprint 2000, in coordination with City of Tallahassee Parks, Recreation & Neighborhood Affairs (PR&NA), is responsible for administering the donation program, including a review process for approving and installing donation elements prior to segment completion. Prior to the sunset of Blueprint 2000, the agency will seek to construct all amenities in the Cascades Trail Master Plan. The City, PR&NA or Public Works will assume authority for segments of Cascades Trail that have since opened to the public and will be responsible for maintenance. Post-construction, it is at the discretion of the City to continue or institute new donation programs.

B. Donation Administrator: Donations will be submitted to Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks Foundation, Inc. through the entity managing donations, referred to as the Administrator. Prior to opening to the public, the Administrator for the Trail segment will be Blueprint 2000; thereafter the Administrator will be PR&NA. Donations will be accepted from public
and private sources for the purposes of funding all Park/Trail amenities in the Master Plan. Constructed amenities are the property of the City.

C. Donation Coverage: Coverage is determined according to amenity and will be outlined in section H. Donation Criteria. Donations are intended to cover the amenities to the greatest extent possible to ensure they are built and the Park/Trail serves the community as intended.

D. Donor Recognition: Donor recognition will vary depending on amenity of interest, location, and monetary contribution. Donor will have a varying level of discretion regarding recognition content based on amenity funded. Where possible, site furnishing plaques will be placed directly on items. Recognition elements for Prominent Park/Trail Amenities will be located adjacent to amenity on a raised panel. Engraved bricks and the Pillars of the Community stand as the amenity itself. The engraved bricks will have a limited number of characters and the Pillars of the Community will only contain names of individuals, families, or organizations. Recognition will be addressed in greater detail after engaging the Administrator to begin the donation process.

E. Damages: The City will make every effort to repair damaged amenities and recognition elements. However, the City is not responsible for replacing items due to natural ‘wear & tear,’ excessive damage or loss. Cases should be brought to the attention of PR&NA. If the responsible party is identified, they shall bear the expense. PR&NA will make an effort to contact the donor to inform them of the loss and the option to replace the item and / or recognition element at their expense.

F. Donation Sunset: Donor recognition elements are not in perpetuity and will expire at the end of the design life of the amenity or recognition element itself for a period determined by the City. If the City elects to replace/repair the element in question, the standing donor will be notified with the option to donate prior to releasing the element for community wide donation. At the discretion of the City, the element may change and the standing donor will not have claim.

G. Naming Rights:

   General Criteria:

   1. Elements within the Park/Trail will not be named on behalf of individuals or organizations unless predetermined by the City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation Advisory Board or approved by the City (refer to 2. Advisory Board for criteria for naming exceptions). Recognition will be proffered through phrases such as “made possible by.”

   2. Advisory Board: City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation Advisory Board does not recommend naming sections within a facility after individuals and organizations. Names may be recommended by the public to the Board through contest, public notice, or public hearings conducted by the Board. The City Commission has
override authority following review by the board. Evaluation will take into consideration monetary contribution as well as dedication and service to the City.

3. Exclusivity: Regarding Prominent Park/Trail Amenities, the level of recognition is contingent upon coverage of costs associated with the amenity. Initial determination will be based on the engineering cost estimate, with the final decision based on the construction cost. Exclusive recognition is contingent upon 75 percent coverage of the construction cost. The donor will be the sole contributor identified on the recognition element. For donations under 75 percent but over 50 percent, the designation of “primary” donor will be given. Under this designation “top billing” to one individual/organization will be recognized with statements such as “amenity sponsored by,” and additional donors will be listed as “additional support provided by.” A donor’s logo, if provided, will be displayed for both the primary and exclusive donation levels. Between 50 percent and 25 percent, donors will be recognized on location. No more than four donors can be recognized on one Prominent Park/Trail Amenity. Below 25 percent, donors can still specify the amenity they wish to fund however recognition will be off-site and listed as a general donor at the “Pillars of the Community” (refer to section H. Donation Criteria). The Administrator reserves the right to alter the recognition convention with weight given to the monetary significance of the contribution. A “letter of agreement” will be the mechanism to document contributions for Prominent Park/Trail Amenities.

- 75% - 100% Exclusive Donor
- 50% - 74% Primary Donor
- 25% - 49% Donor (on-location)
- 5% - 25% Donor (off-site)

Specific Criteria:

1. Amphitheater: It is permissible for this prominent park element to bear the name of an individual or organization contingent upon the review process outlined in General Criteria.

2. Meridian Plaza: It is permissible for this prominent park element to bear the name of an individual or organization contingent upon the review process outlined in General Criteria.

H. Donation Criteria: proposed donations may be incorporated into the landscape and facilities of the Park and Trail according to the following criteria:

General Criteria:

1. Donations must be compatible with and meet a specific park facility or amenity need identified in the approved Cascades Trail Master Plan.
2. In areas not covered by the Master Plan, compatibility with existing facilities and local conditions shall be considered as long as the donation meets a specific park need.

3. Anticipated maintenance requirements regarding the donation will be evaluated.

4. If the Park/Trail has no need for additional amenities, donations will be accepted and allocated to a general maintenance fund for Cascades Trail.

5. Park Furnishings & Park Amenities Shopping List: This list identifies the site furnishings available for donation and included as Attachment 1. It is also available online for viewing. The list will depict the furnishing and the associated cost, however the image may not be an exact representation. The Administrator reserves the right to alter the make and model of furnishings.

Specific Criteria:

1. In-Kind Services: Organizations and individuals interested in providing in-kind services are required to contact the Administrator for approval and coordination. Services can be provided pre- or post-construction of the Park/Trail. Services will be considered a donation and the degree of recognition is contingent upon estimated value of such services. Prior to opening, eligible donors will be identified on the ‘Pillars of the Community’ according to the recognition criteria outlined in section H. Donation Criteria. Post-construction, recognition of services will be at the discretion of PR&NA.

2. Cash Donations: Unspecified cash donations may be used to construct, repair, or upgrade new or existing facilities. During construction the use of the donation will be at Blueprint 2000’s discretion and post construction will be at PR&NA’s discretion.

3. Prominent Park/Trail Amenities: These elements are the focal point of the Park/Trail system and donations involve coordination with the Administrator. A formal agreement with the Administrator will be necessary to carry out the process. A minimum donation must cover five percent of the selected amenity. Construction of the amenity is contingent on whether it is fully funded. Donors will be reimbursed if the amenity is not fully funded within an established timeframe. Contingent on the funded amenity, the donor recognition element will either be on the Pillars of the Community, or an interpretive panel. Below is a list of the prominent Park and Trail amenities.

- Cascades Fountain
- Boca Chuba and Smokey Hollow Pond
- Smokey Hollow Commemoration
- Centennial Field
- Gateway Entrances
- Meridian Plaza & Stage
- Interactive Water Fountain
- Amphitheater Shade Structure
- History Fence
- Discovery at Cascades Park

Example of Interpretive Donor Panel

**Capital Cascade Park Graphic Panels**

**Donor Panel 30" x 18"**

---

**The Cascade Waterfall**

This waterfall celebrates the location of the Florida State Capitol in October 1823 by Dr. William H. Simons of St. Augustine and John Lee Williams of Pensacola. These men were commissioned by Governor William P. Duval to find a compromise location for the capital between St. Augustine and Pensacola. The area around the Apalache village of Tallahassee (“old fields”) was selected. John Lee Williams eloquently described the site as follows:

> The location selected possesses a site for the Capitol with a great advantage. It is situated in the center of the State, not far from the sea and a seasonable climate. The people are industrious and the country fertile, are the conditions that have been considered in the selection of the site. The site selected, as you know, is near the banks of the St. John’s River, and near the site of the old fort which has become of national importance, as it is now the site of the city of Tallahassee.

The cascade and steps have long since vanished but the stream, the St. Augustine Branch, remains. The 1824 map shows the original plan for Tallahassee and includes the course of the St. Augustine Branch.

---

*What is a cad?* A unit of length equal to 6.4497 square miles.

*What is a mile?* A unit of length equal to 6.4497 square miles.

---

*The Cascade Waterfall* was named in honor of its donor donor donor.
Donor Panel 30" × 18"

GRAPHIC PANELS
CAPITAL CASCADE PARK
TALLAHASSEE, FL
4. **Pillars of the Community:** The Pillars of the Community is a proposed recognition element that will acknowledge all donors within one location in the Park. Post construction of Cascades Park, it is at the discretion of the Administrator to utilize this recognition element for donor contributions allocated for additional Cascades Trail segments. The Administrator reserves the right to terminate this program if it is determined that collected donations to-date do not justify the cost of the recognition element itself; in which case donors who made general cash donations will be afforded the option to be reimbursed. The Administrator also holds the right to discontinue this program at any time.

5. **Site Furnishings and Trees:** Site furnishings and trees are the most prevalent and functional amenities that have a modest cost with a lasting recognition element. Donation amounts are established with the intent of covering the furnishing or tree plus the recognition element, and may include a discretionary administrative fee for coordination and installation. The recognition element will be a plaque affixed or in close proximity to the donated furnishing or tree. The Administrator will offer donors a “shopping list” of pre-approved furnishings and trees and associated costs that they may select (this list is included in Attachment 1). General aesthetic standards established for furnishings in the Park/Trail will be maintained. The list shall include but not be limited to the following items and may be amended at the discretion of the Administrator.

- Benches, example shown below, actual plaque size 2” x 4”
- Receptacles, plaque similar to brass bench plaque
- Drinking Fountains, example shown below, actual size 5” x 7”
- Bike Racks, plaque similar to brass bench plaque
- Trees, donor plaque example shown below, actual size 4” x 5”

**Example of Brass Donor Plaque**

![Example of Brass Donor Plaque](image)

**Example of Bench**

![Example of Bench](image)
Example of Aluminum Drinking Fountain Plaque

Example of Tree Donor Plaque

Other Furnishings: Furnishing and landscape suggestions and donations outside the pre-approved list will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

6. Plant Donations: Acceptance by the Administrator is based upon whether the plant material furthers the design theme established in the Park and a need exists for additional plants. Only plant materials that can be planted at the time of acceptance are allowed. Use of donated plants is at the sole discretion of the Administrator.

7. Engraved Bricks: The brick program is intended to raise money for unfunded amenities in Cascades Trail. Cost will cover fabrication and installation and generate additional funds to be used at the discretion of the City. For continuity, Blueprint 2000 will be the administrator of the brick program for the duration of the Cascades Trail project or until the program is discontinued. Blueprint 2000 will be responsible for construction and allocation of funds. It is at the discretion of PR&NA to assume administrative authority of a brick program upon completion of Cascades Trail.
Donors may purchase engraved bricks for Cascades Trail by completing an order form to reserve a brick. The form will provide details and serve as the medium for collecting the donor’s content. Individuals may purchase multiple bricks under the condition that content changes. A sample brick will be available for prospective donors to view the product. For bricks purchased at least three months prior to the completion of Cascades Park, Blueprint 2000 will ensure installation of bricks within the Park before the segment is open to the public. Bricks purchased after the Park completion will be installed contingent upon the quantity of reserved bricks with the guarantee that it will be in place within a year of purchase.

Engraved bricks will be placed along the horizontal and vertical axes of the Meridian Plaza beginning at the granite map of Florida and moving outward as shown in the example graphic. Donors will be informed if the brick program transitions from the Park to other segments in Cascades Trail.

Example of Brick Location for 4” x 8” and 8” x 8”

8. Artwork: Donations of art, or cash donations to purchase or commission art must be pre-approved by the Administrator. Donor may suggest a location but final authority lies with the Administrator. Artwork from local artists is preferred.
V. PROCEDURE

A. General: Cascades Park and Trail will be a highly utilized public green space that will serve the community in perpetuity. The addition of amenities made possible by Tallahassee citizens fosters the vital relationship needed to ensure the success of the greenway. Park and Trail elements available for donation will be limited. The following procedure is designed to outline the process that donors must undergo to directly fund Tallahassee’s future.

B. Administrator: The administrator for donations is dependent upon the Authority in control of the Cascades Trail segment. Prior to segment completion, donors should access Blueprint 2000’s website or contact their office directly. Post-construction, donors should contact City of Tallahassee Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Affairs to make donations through Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks Foundation, Inc.

Prior to Opening:
850.219.1060
Cascades Park Donations: http://www.cascadepark.org/intro.cfm

After Opening:
Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks Foundation, Inc. 850.891.3866
Attachment 1

Park Furnishings & Park Amenities Shopping List
Park Furnishings & Park Amenities

Payment Information:
Your contribution to Cascades Park (via Friends of Our Parks) is fully tax deductible as allowed by law. Friends of Our Parks is a 501(c)(3) organization. To order complete order form and mail to Friends of Our Parks, 912 Myers Park Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32301.
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PARK DESIGN ELEMENTS

1. SMOKEY HOLLOW COMMEMORATION
2. CAPITAL CASCADES TRAIL
3. HISTORY FENCE WITH PANELS
4. FDOT PARKING
5. UPPER POND OVERLOOK
6. SMOKEY HOLLOW POND
7. OLD GAINES STREET PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE
8. KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL (EXISTING TO REMAIN)
9. ST. AUGUSTINE BRANCH STREAM RESTORATION
10. FDOT PARKING
11. MERIDIAN MONUMENT PLAZA AND STAGE AND STAGE CANOPY
12. MERIDIAN PLAZA SIGNATURE BRIDGES
13. BLOXHAM STREET PLAZA & RESTROOMS/INTERACTIVE WATERPLAY/
    CASCADES FOUNTAIN
14. HISTORIC ELECTRIC BUILDING
    (EXISTING TO REMAIN/RESTORATION BY OTHERS)
15. CASCADES PARK LANE
16. OLD GADSDEN STREET PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE
17. CENTENNIAL FIELD COMMEMORATION
18. WEST BLOXHAM STREET GATEWAY
19. MONROE STREET GATEWAY
20. BOCA CHUBA POND SCULPTURE
21. BOCA CHUBA POND SCULPTURE
22. HISTORIC WALL RECONSTRUCTION
23. DISCOVERY AT CASCADES
HELP FURNISH THE PARK!

Although the infrastructure portion of the park is funded, many furnishings are not. Donors can contribute in a variety ways to help complete the park. Along with our Brick Campaign (go to cascadespark.org to buy a brick), you can sponsor drinking fountains, park benches, trash and recycling receptacles, bike racks, picnic tables or pet waste dispensers.

Donor recognition will vary depending on amenity of interest, location, and monetary contribution. Site furnishing plaques will be placed directly on items.

PARK BENCH - BACKLESS

Recycled Steel
Quantity Needed: 30

Color: Black

$1,750 Each

INVERTED U BIKE RACK

Recycled Steel
Quantity Needed: 7

Color: Black

$300 Each

PARK BENCH WITH BACK CENTER ARMREST & CAST ENDS

Recycled Steel
Quantity Needed: 30

Color: Black

$1,600 Each

CAROUSEL PICNIC TABLE

Recycled Steel
Quantity Needed: 14

Color: Black

$3,000 Each
Park Furnishings

**STANDARD DRINKING FOUNTAIN**
- **Recycled Steel**
  - Color: Black (not shown)
  - Quantity Needed: 3
  - $4,700 Each

**DRINKING FOUNTAIN WITH MISTING TOWER**
- **Recycled Steel**
  - Color: Black
  - Quantity Needed: 1
  - $5,350 Each

**BIG BELLY SOLAR COMPACTOR**
- **Color: Black**
  - Quantity Needed: 1
  - $7,500 Each

**RECYCLE DISPOSAL**
- **Dura Coat Finish**
  - Color: Black (not shown)
  - Quantity Needed: 13
  - $2,000 Each

**NON-RECYCLE DISPOSAL**
- **Dura Coat Finish**
  - Color: Black (not shown)
  - Quantity Needed: 13
  - $2,000 Each
Park Furnishings

**DRINKING FOUNTAIN WITH PET BOWL**

- Recycled Steel
- Color: Black (not shown)
- FULLY FUNDED

**PET WASTE DISPENSERS**

- Color: Black (not shown)
- FULLY FUNDED

If you are interested in sponsoring a furnishings, please complete the form on page nine.

---

**Help Pave The Way To**

**BUY A BRICK**

It’s simple! Just go to [www.cascadespark.org](http://www.cascadespark.org)
Cascades Park will become a beautiful gateway into downtown Tallahassee. It will provide open space and will be an anchor for our community. Though the cost of this project is significant, a number of donors and public agencies have already made substantial contributions toward funding park amenities. To date over $6.1 million in outside funding has been obtained for the park from donations and grants.

The Tallahassee Community can be a part of the park by coming together and raising the funds necessary to complete this important project.

---

**CENTENNIAL FIELD**
*TBD - PARTIALLY FUNDED*

---

**SHADE STRUCTURE FOR MERIDIAN PLAZA STAGE - FULLY FUNDED**

---

*Meridian Plaza, Cascade Park - Fabric Structure*
Amenities

SMOKEY HOLLOW COMMEMORATION
TBD - PARTIALLY FUNDED

HISTORY FENCE WITH PANELS
$520,000

INTERACTIVE WATERPLAY/DANCING FOUNTAIN - FULLY FUNDED

BOCA CHUBA POND SCULPTURE
TBD - DESIGN UNDERWAY

If you are interested in sponsoring a park amenity, please contact Autumn Calder at 850-219-1060 or autumn.calder@blueprint2000.org
Donor Pledge Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Furnishings</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Bench - Backless</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Bench with Back</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted U Bike Rack</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carousel Picnic Table</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Belly Solar Compactor</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle Disposal</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Recycle Disposal</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain with Misting Tower</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain with Pet Bowl (Fully Funded)</td>
<td>$6,270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Waste Dispensers (Fully Funded)</td>
<td>$ 354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to make a monetary contribution in the amount of $___________________

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________

_________________________________________  __________________________________________
City                        State                         Zip Code

Country: ______________________________________________________________

Phone Number: __________________________________________________________

e-mail: ________________________________________________________________

PAYMENT INFORMATION
Make Check Payable to: FRIENDS OF OUR PARKS
Your contribution to Cascades Park (via Friends of Our Parks) is fully tax deductible as allowed by law. Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) organization. To order complete form and mail to Tallahassee Friends of Our Parks, Inc., 912 Myers Park Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32301.
Attachment 2

Tree Donation Program
Donate a Tree to Cascades Park
Donating a tree to Cascades Park is a great way to commemorate or memorialize a loved one or event.

Tax Deductible
Your tax deductible donation gives you the opportunity to dedicate one or more of the various trees planted throughout Cascades Park.

Keep Tallahassee Beautiful
Your donation of a memorial or commemorative tree will contribute to the development and beauty of Cascades Park for many years to come.

Choose Your Tree
You can meet Blueprint staff and view landscape plans to choose a your tree for dedication. Specific tree species are dependent upon availability and location.

Commemorative Plaques
A commemorative plaque will be placed at your tree site containing an inscription of your choice.

How to Donate a Tree
Please contact:
Autumn Calder or Gary Phillips
850-219-1060
Autumn.Calder@blueprint2000.org
Gary.Phillips@blueprint2000.org

Tree Selection and Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Saucer Magnolia</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Birch</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palatka Holly</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahoon Holly</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaupon Holly</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetbay Magnolia</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Gum</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longleaf Pine</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Tree</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Grapefruit</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskogee Crape Myrtle</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellie R Stevens Holly</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabal Palm</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Flowering Cherry</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumard Oak</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allee Elm</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There is a limited availability of certain tree species and locations.

Cascades Park is a project developed by Blueprint 2000, Leon County and the City of Tallahassee.
For more information visit www.cascadespark.org.
### Option 1 - Amphitheater Summary - Infrastructure Basics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHWORK, DRAINAGE, UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandco - EXHIBIT 1 (cost following 01/08 Review)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$193,761.00</td>
<td>$193,761.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXHIBIT 2 - NOT USED (no Landscaping/Irrigation Repair)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRICAL - ELECTRICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ONLY</strong> (cost following 01/08 Review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3.1 - Ingram Infrastructure ESI 7, ESI 9, PDS5, etc.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$296,898.36</td>
<td>$296,898.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,534.75</td>
<td>$44,534.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3.2 - Ingram Specialty Lights, Sound, Grounding, etc.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$32,857.30</td>
<td>$32,857.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,928.60</td>
<td>$4,928.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALTY SEATING AND GRANDSTAND STRUCTURE - EXHIBIT 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.1 - Original design by American Seating with grandstand</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$447,882.10</td>
<td>$447,882.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating only (includes tax and bond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$211,976.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SturdiSteel grandstand (includes tax and bond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$235,905.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,182.32</td>
<td>$67,182.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibit 4.2 - CONCRETE WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original design assuming metal grandstand (not concrete)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$259,302.26</td>
<td>$259,302.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,895.34</td>
<td>$38,895.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANDCO VALUE ENGINEERING OPTION (Exhibit 4.2a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise original design with metal grandstand to concrete:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(50,000.00)</td>
<td>$(50,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional engineering services for concrete grandstand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional center aisle handrails (value +/- $7,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METAL FABRICATION - HANDRAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Fabrication &amp; Sales - EXHIBIT 5</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPING, Deductive Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBIT 6 (quantities to be billed in SOV)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(16,561.78)</td>
<td>$(16,561.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** permit fees not included. Permit fees to be paid by Others.

**SUB-TOTAL:** $1,345,555.24

**Bond @ 1%:** $13,455.55

**TOTAL:** $1,359,010.80
## Option 2 - Amphitheater Summary - Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHWORK, DRAINAGE, UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandco - EXHIBIT 1 (cost following 01/08 Review)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$193,761.00</td>
<td>$193,761.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXHIBIT 2 - NOT USED (no Landscaping/Irrigation Repair)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRICAL - PROVISIONAL N.T.E. COSTS INCLUDES ALLOWANCES</strong> (cost following 01/08 Review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3.1 - Ingram Infrastructure ESI 7, ESI 9, PDS5, etc.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$458,838.61</td>
<td>$458,838.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$68,825.79</td>
<td>$68,825.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3.2 - Ingram Specialty Lights, Sound, Grounding, etc</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$456,765.30</td>
<td>$456,765.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$68,514.80</td>
<td>$68,514.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALTY SEATING AND GRANDSTAND STRUCTURE - EXHIBIT 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.1 - Original design by American Seating with grandstand</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$447,882.10</td>
<td>$447,882.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating only (includes tax and bond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$211,976.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SturdiSteel grandstand (includes tax and bond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$235,905.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,182.32</td>
<td>$67,182.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 4.2 - CONCRETE WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original design assuming metal grandstand (not concrete)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$259,302.26</td>
<td>$259,302.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,895.34</td>
<td>$38,895.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANDCO VALUE ENGINEERING OPTION (Exhibit 4.2a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise original design with metal grandstand to concrete:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional engineering services for concrete grandstand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional center aisle handrails (value +/- $7,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METAL FABRICATION - HANDRAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Fabrication &amp; Sales - EXHIBIT 5</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Markup at 15%</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPING, Deductive Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBIT 6 (quantities to be billed in SOV)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(16,561.78)</td>
<td>$(16,561.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> permit fees <em>not</em> included. Permit fees to be paid by Others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,019,280.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond @ 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,192.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL =</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,039,473.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PCO 115 Amphitheater Sitework and Utilities (SANDCO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIBITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey (prorated over 120 days of field requirement)</td>
<td>DY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing (Concrete and Soil)</td>
<td>DY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm/Potable water Asbuilts (Not To Exceed)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Damaged Landscape areas (already planted)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION/CLEAR AND GRUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Trash/Waste Hauloff - Dumpster Disposal</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,488.00</td>
<td>1,488.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo RW 14 (previously removed per B2K directive)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauloff Concrete/Dispose of RW 14 (load)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of RW14 concrete @ Pit</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHWORK/EMBANKMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining wall embankment</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Retaining wall excavation (4 ea@ 67 CY) (54R-55L)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Select Fill Including 35% shrinkage - RW 54R-56 (5 EA)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including backfill under stairs/ steps b/w walls- Access and production inhibitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall Underdrain/weephole behind walls</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>8,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW 55L(30LF), 55R (30LF), 56 (245 LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Seating - Mass Earthwork Prepatation for Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Seating - excavation/hauloff (2 FT below FFE of slab)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Seating - Select Embankment (2 FT )</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Grade Seating Area in conj. with staged Conc pours</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Grade/Final prep- Post Utility/Electric Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between RW 56 and RW 16 (Sound Booth)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut&amp;Prep Upper and Lower Grade Beam bulkheads</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IN ACCORDANCE WITH BARKLEY -BCEI TYP SECTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade lower deck 6&quot; flatwork</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Balance &amp; Re- Grade upper for 6&quot; flatwork</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(already graded previously for 4 inch sidewalk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 440120 CREDIT type II Underdrain</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>-6,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II underdrain (P-967-973)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanout assembly (S-965-- 971)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15” MES</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15” RCP (P959-961)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>4,368.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Drain (Standard Cast Iron Grating per RFI 234)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>22,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8” Trench Drain Connection Piping</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C Box (Pay Item #2795 less than 10’)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,325.00</td>
<td>2,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDPE inline Drain (S-950,951,955,956)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDPE Drain Basin (S-952,953,954, 961, 962, 963, 964)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>8,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm drain (8 inch to 12 inch)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Existing Riser (S-608)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| POTABLE WATER                                                              |      |          |            |         |
| Connect to Existing                                                        | EA   | 2        | 750.00     | 1,500.00 |
| 1.5 inch water service (pay item #1050-11-221)                             | LF   | 270      | 4.00       | 1,080.00 |
| Hose Bibb Event Connection                                                 | EA   | 2        | 500.00     | 1,000.00 |
| Hose Bibb Box                                                              | EA   | 2        | 600.00     | 1,200.00 |

| SIGNAGE AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS                                              |      |          |            |         |
| Handicap Space (paint)                                                     | EA   | 16       | 200.00     | 3,200.00 |

| CLEANUP                                                                    |      |          |            |         |
| Clean up debris/trash post construction                                    | DY   | 5        | 500.00     | 2,500.00 |
| Clean Decking                                                              | DY   | 5        | 500.00     | 2,500.00 |

|                                      |      |          |            |         |
|                                      |      |          |            | TOTAL   |
|                                      |      |          |            | 193,761.00 |

apply bond to total price proposal amount
## Capital Cascade Trail - Segment 2
### AMPHITHEATER - PCO 115

#### Electrical - Ingram Signalization, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 3.1 - ESI #7, 9 and 13</th>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS 5.1</td>
<td>$ 88,811.16</td>
<td>$ 88,811.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS 5.0</td>
<td>$ 51,318.40</td>
<td>$ 51,318.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backstage</td>
<td>$ 66,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit and Wire Between PDS 5.0 and 5.1</td>
<td>$ 75,096.50</td>
<td>$ 75,096.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit and Conductor PDS 5.1 to Front of Stage, etc.</td>
<td>$ 66,387.75</td>
<td>$ 10,428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Lights</td>
<td>$ 34,398.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Handholes to Stage Panel Wiring</td>
<td>$ 5,507.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type H Lights Stage Right</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Platform #1</td>
<td>$ 75.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Additional Duct Work (with deduct / credit) | $ 62,244.30 | $ 62,244.30 |

| Exhibit 4 Sub-Total = | $ 458,838.61 | $ 296,898.36 |

#### Exhibit 3.2 - Specialty Lights and Sound, Grounding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Lighting Controls on Sidewalk Lights</td>
<td>$ 40,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverter for Emergency Lights</td>
<td>$ 9,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Wall Lighting</td>
<td>$ 37,840.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical Lighting by Ingram</td>
<td>$ 35,397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergrater Part of Theatrical Lighting (per Genesis letter*)</td>
<td>$ 255,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Sound (ESTIMATED ALLOWANCES)</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounding Loop (ASSUMES CONCRETE GRANDSTAND)</td>
<td>$ 17,778.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Exhibit 5 Sub-Total = | $ 456,765.30 | $ 32,857.30 |

* Letter dated January 16, 2013 from Pinnacle / Frank Lovelace to Joe Sisk
WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency’s Budget Policy 102, Section 06, subsection B(2), requires the Intergovernmental Agency to adopt a Capital Budget and appropriate funding for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency has acknowledged the receipt of bond proceeds and sales tax revenue to fund expenses for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2012, and ending September 30, 2013,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, hereby approves and adopts the budget for Fiscal Year 2013 as reflected below, and that all incomplete project balances, requisitions, and encumbrances from prior years will automatically be re-appropriated.

**Blueprint 2000**  
**Fiscal Year 2013 Capital Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #0100306</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascades (Segment 2)- Project Funding &amp; Contingency</td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option C (Complete Amphitheater)</td>
<td>$2,378,676.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,878,676.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Blueprint 2000**  
**Fiscal Year 2013 Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Taxes</td>
<td><strong>$4,878,676.09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,878,676.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted this ____ day of February, 2013.

Tallahassee/Leon County, Florida  

Attest:

By: ______________________________  By: _________________________
Nancy Miller, Chair  
Jim O. Cooke, Treasurer-Clerk
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency  
City of Tallahassee

Approved as to Form:

By: ______________________________
Maribel Nicholson-Choice  
Blueprint 2000 General Counsel