INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY MEETING
September 19, 2011
5:00 pm to 7:00 pm
City Commission Chambers

Chairman: Bryan Desloge

Agenda

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

II. CAC CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. CAC Meeting Minutes (June 2, 2011, and July 21, 2011 (Special Meeting))
2. Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 1 and 3: Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) Services
3. Capital Circle NW/SW Update: US 90 to Orange Avenue

IV. CONSENT

4. IA Meeting Minutes: June 20, 2011
5. Proposed 2012 IA, TCC and CAC Meeting Schedules
6. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study and CCSW Design From Orange Avenue to Springhill Road
7. Smokey Hollow Design Committee
8. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

V. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSION

9. Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project Update and Funding Authorization Modification
10. Approval of Resolution No. 2011-13 Authorizing Issuance of Not to Exceed $40,000,000 Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Refunding Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2011
11. Cascades Park Update

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: 5:30 pm

12. Adoption of the FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget And Resolution No. 2011-11
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

IX. ADJOURN
#1.

CAC Meeting Minutes
(June 2, 2011, and July 21, 2011 (Special Meeting))
Lamar Taylor, Chair, called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:36 pm.

**Committee Members present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamar Taylor</th>
<th>Kevin McGorty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burt Davy</td>
<td>Kent Wimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Drew</td>
<td>Christic Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Steen</td>
<td>David Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Pease</td>
<td>Windell Paige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wayne Tedder</th>
<th>Gary Phillips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
<td>Debra Schiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
<td>Linda Figg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Dick Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
<td>Jeff Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latesa Turner</td>
<td>Alisha Wetherell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelonda Meeks</td>
<td>Bruce Ritchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Modifications**

Dave Bright noted that there was an additional Agenda Item handout for the Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Construction Options that would be discussed with the Capital Budget agenda item.

Dave Bright also noted that Agenda Item #10 relating to the Cascade Connector Bridge would be presented first by the design consultant; and that Agenda Item #9, Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment, was pulled from the Agenda. He noted that the Education Community Representative CAC position rotated between TCC, FSU, FAMU, and the Leon County School Board. For this appointment, it was up to FAMU to submit a nomination. Despite staff’s due diligence since January no nomination had been received. Dave Bright noted that there would be four CAC positions requiring appointment in the fall. Item #12 would be discussed after Consent Items.

**Presentations/Discussion**

**Item #10: Cascade Connector Bridge Design and Design Contingency Budget**

Linda Figg presented the design options for the connector bridge from the May 14, 2011, Community Design Charrette. The summary of the presentation was included in the agenda packet. The community-preferred concept included sail-like canopies for a shaded environment with adjustable, soft-color aesthetic lighting and native limestone abutments.
Richard Drew suggested signs be included to have bike-riders dismount and walk across the bridge rather than riding for the safety of both pedestrians and riders, too. Additionally, regarding the abutments, he questioned if the community hands-concept could be combined with the native stone. Ms. Figg stated they were exploring using that feature else-where on the bridge; in an area where it would be more easily seen, near the rail, a texture on the hardscape pathway, etc.

Kevin McGorty complimented the firm on the connectivity with other amenities, the sail canopies at the bridge with the sail canopy, although unfunded, over the Meridian Plaza area; as well as the limestone which replicates the Centennial Field wall.

Tom O’Steen questioned if there had been a budget analysis of the four concepts. Ms. Figg stated all concepts were based on the knowledge that the budget was $1.5M.

Christic Henry asked for more detail on the solar panels. Ms. Figg stated that they were integrated into a woven fabric that was often used in remote military operations, such as in the Middle East.

Kent Wimmer stated that he was concerned that 12-foot would be awfully narrow for cyclists, pedestrians, and people gathered simply to enjoy the bridge. Ms. Figg stated the bridge could be any width however 12-foot was the prescribed width. Also, it would be a short bridge, 160-feet. Mr. Wimmer suggested a “bump out” for gathering. Ms. Figg noted that it was all a function of cost.

Burt Davy questioned what material they were considering for the walkway. Ms. Figg stated that details had not been completely fleshed out but generally it would be textured or scored concrete. Mr. Davy suggested including pavers as well. She agreed that the design would include continuity with the Park trails on either side. There was also the potential of using self-cleaning concrete.

Kevin McGorty moved Option 1: Concur with the bridge concept recommended by the public at the May 14, 2011, design charrette. Kent Wimmer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Burt Davy moved Option 2: Authorize a design contingency budget of $50,000. Funds would come from the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4 Master Plan line item. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Consent Items**

**Item #7: CAC Minutes: February 10, 2011**
**Item #8: Transfer of $450,000 in Remaining Funds From Capital Circle Southeast (Tram Road to Woodville Highway) to Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2**

Option 1: Approve the transfer of $450,000 in remaining funds from CCSE to Capital Cascade
Trail Segment 2.

_Burt Davy moved approval of the consent agenda. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion; it passed unanimously._

**Presentations/Discussion**

**Item #12: Name that Park: Cascade Park or Cascades Park?**

Following a brief history of the issue by Dave Bright, Kevin McGorty stated that it could go either way because he did not see a right or wrong. Kevin noted that Jonathan Lammers, a former state historic preservation planner, authored the most extensive study of the site, a 38-page paper on the subject, and even he had no particular side. Mr. Lammers felt however that the plural use was a 20th century invention based on a 1912 postcard entitled “The Cascades.”

Mr. McGorty stated that the original owner of his house also owned the Cascade sinkhole. In a 1890 survey of that land it uses the term “Cascade” singular. However, in local references it has been used in both singular and plural form. The 1971 National Register Nomination lists it as Cascades, plural, recognizing that there were multiple streams that fed into the cascade. That the cascading water was described as “cascades.” While there may have been one uniform waterfall the historians who made that nomination felt secure in the nomination of the 30-ish acres as “Cascades” Park.

Mr. McGorty felt that the vernacular was important. However, what was on deeds or maps would not hold weight to the common vernacular. “Cascades,” he agreed, did roll off the tongue well and added eloquence to a linear park system. Still, he admitted, he could go either way.

Burt Davy stated he supported the plural form because of the common usage and ease with which it rolled off the tongue. He likened it to the Junior Museum always being the “Junior Museum” and the hospital remained “Tallahassee Memorial” despite numerous name changes. Colloquial usages, correct or not, rolled and fit better.

Lamar Taylor noted that he agreed with Mr. Davy, but noted that Blueprint material used the singular form. Dave Bright noted that Blueprint’s usage was a decision made early by Jim Davis. He pointed out however that the EECC report used both singular and plural forms and questioned if that was intentional. Tom O’Steen stated that they were not so purposeful.

With no strong opinions for the singular form _Burt Davy moved Option 2: The Park should be named Cascades Park. The entire greenway should be named the Capital Cascades Trail. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. It passed unanimously._

Kevin McGorty commended the efforts of the History Fence Working Group. He would also like to share information with them regarding the location of the fall itself. He felt it would be paramount to the final product. Dave Bright stated Blueprint had tentatively approached EGS about potentially doing electro-resistivity testing of the site. With Mr. McGorty’s information they might gear that up again.
Public Hearing

Item #15: Proposed FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget

There were no speakers for the advertised Public Hearing.

Wayne Tedder, Interim Executive Director, stated that there had been no significant changes to the Operating Budget from the current year into FY 2012. There was a substantial jump in the Telephone line item however. He stated that Blueprint had to change service providers with the move to the SunTrust Building which escalated the cost. He noted that while Blueprint could piggy-back onto a state contract they were locked into a contract with CenturyLink. Blueprint’s legal counsel was reviewing it to see if the contract could be broken to save Blueprint money.

There were no comments from members of the CAC.

Item #16: Revised Master Plan and Proposed FY 2012-2016 Blueprint Capital Budget

There were no speakers for the advertised Public Hearing.

Wayne Tedder stated that Attachment 1 showed what funding was available and projected available dollars in the future years, once all expenses were deducted from sales tax received. He worked with both the City and County Budget Departments and met with the Blueprint Finance Committee, and they recommended Blueprint use the same projection rates, with regard to expected revenue streams and percentage of increase, as both local governments.

He noted the significant drop in available revenue in the out years. The benefit of that was that it was pretty conservative as it did not include any interest earnings. Blueprint earned approximately $1M in interest over the past year due to Jim Davis and Phil Maher keeping bond money in house and leveraging projects with grants, etc. Mr. Tedder stated he would maintain that approach to apply the interest earnings to real projects.

Kent Wimmer questioned the why the projections indicated a drop in revenue. He did not think the Governor would fire that many state employees. Lamar Taylor assumed it was the projected sales tax projections over the next so many years. The EDR (Office of Economic and Demographic Research), an arm of the state Legislature who produced sales tax collection numbers and forecasts, have shown since 2007 a flat-line of revenue. In part it was the reduced expectation in spending but also the leveling off of population growth in the county. There had been a steady 4% growth rate for several years before that; 2007 was a significant paradigm shift. With debt-services that had to be paid from sales tax revenues, and that being the source of revenue there was much more of a propensity to be conservative rather than glom onto assumed 4% increases. It seemed reasonable to assume a flat-line or 1% increase projection.

Richard Drew questioned if any analysis had been completed regarding sales tax impacts of internet purchases or the potential of a trickle down to the counties from reimbursements.
harnessed by the state from internet purchases. Mr. Taylor stated that there had been studies to that effect. The EDR had detailed information on that. He clarified that Blueprint’s tax revenue was from a 1-cent surcharge. For example, it only applied to the first $5K on a car purchase, not the whole purchase amount.

Mr. Tedder stated that projects highlighted in green on Attachment 2 were expected to be closed out this year, and may have funds remaining. The CAC had opportunity to provide direction as to where they wanted to see the remaining money transferred. However, as the final budget would be brought back in September, many of the answers would not be available until then.

The red line, CCNW/SW (N-2), indicated that Blueprint did not have sufficient funds to cover the entire project. Would the CAC consider moving “green” funds to that “red” line item or to another project?

Mr. Tedder noted that for N-2, Blueprint had estimated the construction cost for the segment between US 90 and Highway 20 at $43M (as indicated in the Master Plan). The dollars programmed in the Master Plan only encompassed the Segment from US 90 to SR 20, while the full project went to Orange Avenue. In FY 2012, there would be $9.2M additional available from the state to get thru the SR 20 intersection; there would be more information confirming that following the scheduled meeting with FDOT District 3 on June 6, 2011. It was included in the 5-year Work Program. Even with that, it was thought that left them $5-6M short to construct all the way to Orange Avenue.

The unknown variable was current competition for construction bids. With the economy and companies hungry for work, however, the bids could come in lower than the estimated costs. The thought process was to send the project out to bid this summer and have the real number by the September IA meeting. It was possible that bids could come in at a price that matched the amount of funds available. That would give a clearer picture: surplus of funds, need additional funds, or reduce the scale of the project to work within the funds available within the Master Plan for the project.

Kevin McGorty stated that a precedent had been set during other lean budget years, with environmental projects programmed in the out years, that if funding became available it would be a high priority not to rob those projects to do gray infrastructure. Mr. Tedder stated that Mr. Bright had been working to catch him up on that. Mr. Bright stated that he had pulled four sets of minutes and found evidence to support Kevin’s statement, almost verbatim in one motion. Mr. Taylor also stated that that view had also been presented to the IA.

Mr. Tedder explained that on Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4, a total cost of the project had not been determined at that point; hence the “TBD” listing. With the design of Segment 3 and FAMU Way underway (at the 60% stage in October 2011), it would give us a better idea of the costs of Segment 3 later this year. The line item would be updated to include that information and how funds would be allocated for it. Any remaining funds or additional revenues would go to Segment 4.

Moving to Attachment 3, Mr. Tedder stated that items highlighted in yellow were the estimated
net sales tax funds that would be available. They were programmed throughout the remaining years of Blueprint. Furthermore, he was working with the City Accounting Department to achieve more transparency and clarity in the budgeting process. They had made some adjustment suggestions, as did the TCC, such as breaking out segments of projects. For example, Franklin Boulevard / Segment 1 Flood Relief would be separate from Capital Cascade Trail Segment 1.

Mr. Drew questioned if the web-site was up to date regarding project details. Mr. Bright stated that it has project content and descriptions but not financial details by project. Mr. McGorty interjected that Agenda Item #4 regarding the Sales Tax Extension contained the best information regarding the original intent of Blueprint, what had been accomplished to date, and what remained.

Mr. O’Steen stated that August would be an appropriate time frame for a presentation to update the CAC on each projects’ status, and it could even be beneficial for Mr. Tedder to learn more about it. Even for those who had been around, it would not hurt to review the original Blueprint Report information. For example, if the N-2 PD&E was 50% complete; it could be that with such analysis they might decide to halt a study and put funds toward another project. Maybe not, but it was worth a project by project “dust off.”

Mr. Tedder stated that the Monthly Project Reports were an excellent source of information. However, the combination of the two sides would help Blueprint manage the projects better it would also be quite valuable in general. There were extensive details attached to each project, Mr. O’Steen noted. It would be beneficial to have it in one presentation rather than searching through meeting minutes. He again suggested doing it at the August meeting as it was worthy of an out-loud presentation and conversation. Projects might even be re-prioritized; they might not; but it would be an excellent exercise that everyone could learn from. Mr. McGorty agreed and requested that information regarding the Sales Tax Extension (Item #4) be included as well.

Mr. Wimmer agreed and included that a tour would be helpful for new members. Mr. Bright stated that a tour for new members was typical, the tour delay had been because of not having a new Executive Director as of yet. Once that was sorted it would be scheduled.

Mr. Taylor stated that the CAC’s position would be to take it under advisement; see what developed over the next two months with a follow up presentation in August with more detail as to the projects, bids, costs, etc.

Presentations/Discussion

**Item #11: Cascade Park Update**

Gary Phillips briefed the committee on the status of construction at Cascade Park. Recent project photos were included in the briefing. Construction had moved into the upper park and within another month, the pond in the lower park would be graded, irrigation systems installed, and the sod and trail would be in. Seventy-eight additional days had been granted to the
contractor due to change orders and weather delays. That pushed the anticipated opening to October 2012.

Richard Drew questioned where parking would be for major events at the Park. Mr. Phillips stated that FDOT had offered the use of their parking lot; however, there was not an official agreement in place. Staff was in discussions with FDMS about using the parking garages as well. All were amenable to joint-use as long as it was outside of regular work hours. Mr. Bright noted that Blueprint would not be programming the park’s activities, that would be through City Parks and Recreation, but Mr. Drew was correct, someone would need to arrange the Park events.

**Item #13: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 and 4 Update**

Gary Phillips briefed the committee on Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4. Updated project photos were included in the briefing.

Richard Drew questioned with the redevelopment of the Gaines Street warehouse area, would there be any funding associated with the redevelopment to support the regional ponds. Mr. Phillips stated that funding for the Coal Chute Pond ROW acquisition came from the CRA in anticipation of that. The CRA and Blueprint will have a formal agreement of some sort that would reimburse the CRA when credits were sold to developers. Also, because the City needed the pond for Gaines Street and FAMU Way, they were paying $1M of the $2.6M it will cost to construct.

Dave Snyder stated that the design of FAMU Way and Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 would be at 60% complete in October 2011. Blueprint would begin purchasing ROW in earnest at that point. The final design would be completed 15-months from then; construction could be advertised in January 2013 with a two year construction schedule.

Christic Henry questioned if the Real Estate Policy would be available for review prior to the June 20, 2011 IA meeting. Dave Bright stated that typically the CAC did not get into that level of policy review; however, he would send it to the committee when it was complete. Debra Schiro stated that Blueprint’s Real Estate Policy was available on the website. The agenda item was to amend the section on relocations. Blueprint complied with the Federal relocation guidelines when purchasing ROW on federally funded projects, but there was not a policy for locally funded projects. The agenda item would address that.

Wayne Tedder stated that during the outreach for the FAMU Way project, the City Commission indicated that they would like to look into a relocation policy. Blueprint was developing one for their review at the IA. He stated that once it was finalized, staff would forward it to the CAC for review.

Ron Pease questioned if the design had progressed to level to show rest areas with benches, etc. along the length of the trail. He wanted to make sure the benches were spaced appropriately for the elderly. Alisha Wetherell stated that Kimley-Horn had not gotten that far in the design. Mr. Phillips stated that there were 32 benches in Cascade Park; that was the only part of the trail that
had progressed to that level of detail. Mrs. Wetherell stated that there was not a requirement by ADA but there would definitely be benches included.

Kent Wimmer inquired as to shade; Mr. Phillips confirmed there would be shade and water fountains as well. Emergency call boxes, a lightning detector system for the interactive fountain area, cameras, etc were also included in the park.

**Item #14: Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project**

Marek Romanowski briefed the committee on the progress made on the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief project. The design would be complete by October 2011, with the project going to construction at the beginning of 2012. Due to restrictions on funding construction on the project needed to be complete in mid-2012.

Kevin McGorty questioned if there had been discussion about the City moving utility lines underground. Mr. Romanowski confirmed that it had been discussed, however, it came down to cost and for such a small project it was a challenge.

Kent Wimmer questioned the inclusion of sidewalks, etc. Mr. Bright explained that this it was a flood relief project, and was only phase 1 of the ultimate build out. Wayne Tedder stated that the money was on a time constraint and Blueprint would lose it if it was not spent by a certain date. However, discussions were underway to see if something could be done in regard to sidewalks.

**Information Items**

**Item #1: Cascade Park History Fence Working Group Recognition and Draft History Panel Narratives**  
This item was informational only.

**Item #2: Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road – Design/Build Project**  
This item was informational only.

**Item #3: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update**  
This item was informational only.

**Item #4: Sales Tax Extension**  
This item was informational only.

**Item #5: Cascade Park and Amenities Fundraising Update**  
This item was informational only.

**Item #6: FAMU Way House Acquisition and Surplus**  
This item was informational only.
Citizens To Be Heard
There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee
There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:45 pm.
Blueprint 2000 SPECIALCAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 21, 2011
Blueprint 2000 Office
2727 Apalachee Parkway, First Floor Conference Room

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

Committee Members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tom O'Steen</th>
<th>Windell Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Taylor</td>
<td>Christic Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Davy</td>
<td>Dale Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Pease</td>
<td>Erin Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wayne Tedder</th>
<th>George Reynolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bright</td>
<td>Latesa Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Snyder</td>
<td>Margie Quillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shepherd</td>
<td>Jim Davis (telephonically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Paco de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Romanowski</td>
<td>Scott Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Youmans</td>
<td>Beckye Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Richardson</td>
<td>Christina Parades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlana Hoffman</td>
<td>Rashaunda Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelonda Meeks</td>
<td></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.
Item #2: Blueprint 2000 Management Review

Item #1: Blueprint 2000 and Planning Department Restructuring

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

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

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

Also in terms of scaling back, with the compartmentalization of projects, Mr. Taylor questioned if projects could be divided in a way that would be fairly seamless? His main concern was that Blueprint had accomplished a tremendous amount of work in a very short period of time. Not withstanding the fact that all of the funded projects were in the works, they still needed to be completed. Particularly to the extent that, by dispersing portions to the City or County, projects could become bogged down in bureaucratic process. Mr. Taylor was concerned that it would reflect negatively on the organization itself and assuredly on the renewal or extension of the sales tax.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Taylor suggested that another approach could be to renegotiate the terms of the contract, keep it outsourced, and downsize County and City staff. If there was capacity … it was another option. Mr. Ross stated that the County had looked at privatizing, they downsized staff, and the engineers still say they could be more involved in the process. Just to say downsize County staff...they had looked at privatization with the consultants to help Blueprint 2000 complete their mandate. They had accomplished a lot of projects but it had also cost a lot of money. With overhead charges, bonuses, and built in escalators for pay, those were things that would not ordinarily be seen in government structure. The benefits were being paid … you’ve been around seven-years and the contract was extended to 2015; that was 15-years. That was an ingrained bureaucracy. Mr. Taylor stated that he understood… Mr. Ross interrupted saying that was why they looked at it. They did not go through each Letter of Agreement (LOA). Some might need more consultant help than others, but there might be other ones… That was why they requested, they (IA) approved that Mr. Tedder review each issue on an objective basis to see what could be paired down for cost savings.
Mr. Taylor wholeheartedly endorsed that proposal, but again the structure for the accountability had always been in place. If the issue was “is Blueprint and the City and County and the citizens getting the benefit of the contract” that was an oversight responsibility of the IMC. To the extent they have not then the contract needed to be renegotiated. The accountability was an issue in terms of keeping the contractor in line with what they were supposed to do in terms of deliverables. It was not necessarily an issue of saying it was inherent improvement in accountability, because you overlay a bureaucracy on it. To compare apples to apples on accountability, another issue for accountability, was holding the contractor to the terms of the contract or renegotiating the terms.

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

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

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

Mr. O’Steen stated that while he was not a numbers guy and thanked Mr. Taylor for taking that on, the same questions were raised. What was the budget of the City of Tallahassee Public Works Department? How did it match up with the construction projects that had been completed over the same period of time? What were those construction projects? Did they follow the same tenets? Did they have the same appearance, aesthetics, and character as Blueprint projects?
Then, if at the end of the day the numbers between Blueprint and the City Public Works Department were significantly skewed, then there were discussions to be had about budgets and pricing issues, etc. Which was Mr. Taylor’s point, no one voted for the sales tax extension with the express understanding that the projects would cost five times what they normally would otherwise; the support would not have been there. The projects had generalized budgets attached to them with identified sources of the budgets which came from the City, County and independent consultant staff estimating projected costs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He understood the need for audit given the timing and. The standard answer to it would always be, ‘there’s a way to do it more efficiently.’ Mr. Tedder’s charge was to review
that and do something given that the Executive Director and Finance Manager were no longer with Blueprint.

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

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

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

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

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

Ron Pease stated that he might not be able to speak with the same amount of emotion and sensitivity as Mr. O’Steen. He explained that he was a newer member of the CAC but he
also felt emotion and sensitivity to what had transpired. It seemed that Blueprint was paying the price for the uniqueness of its structure and origin of effort. It was as thought the uniqueness had caught up with them. Perhaps, because of the time they were living in and the concerns over the economy or employment. It seemed to him that they were where they were due to a degree of lack of oversight by the IMC that should have been keeping tabs if there were concerns about the operation and costs of projects. That horse was out of the barn some time ago, he stated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Having the dedicated funding source paired off and flowing directly to Blueprint was something Mr. Taylor stated he would be concerned about. He would hate to see even a well intended leveraging of sales tax dollars to deal with, uplift, or backfill funding for
projects that should have been funded by ad valorem tax dollars. That would have an impact on the perceived effectiveness of the Agency in the community when they tried for a sales tax extension. Overall, they were optics and good management to wall off the revenue sources, however, all of that had been proposed from the standpoint of leveling some criticism. With a “hey, let’s shine a light on this problem, an overfunding of outside consultants.” As Mr. Pease pointed out however, that did not happen yesterday. The fact that there might have been some bureaucracy or agency capture, he stated he understood the difficulties of working with people day to day to get in their face and say “you need to write this down.” That was the role of the IMC to exercise avenues of accountability.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Landry asked Mr. Tedder to clarify the purpose of the Planning Department. Mr. Tedder stated that they managed the comprehensive plan for the City and County. They oversaw the Canopy Road CAC, the Planning Commission, and were members of the Water Resource Board, and did contracts to some degree, although not nearly to the extent that Blueprint did. Mr. Landry questioned what their MBE participation numbers were. Mr. Tedder stated that the Planning Department contracted under the City’s procurement policies; however Blueprint would remain the same. Mr. Paige stated that the City’s overall MBE participation number was in the 7% range. Blueprint was closer to 15-17%.
Mr. Landry again asked why it was necessary to go the route chosen. The CAC had asked its questions, however, as a representative of the NAACP he would have to follow up on that individually. Mr. Landry questioned when the Planning Department had last been audited. Mr. Tedder stated it had been approximately eight years ago. Mr. Ross stated the list of MBEs that were used by Blueprint 2000 was specified by the City and County. They had to receive approval for the use of other vendors.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Landry stated that he hoped Mr. Tedder understood, that was why they requested the special meeting and were asking the questions of him and the Management Review
Committee. They meant no disrespect, truly. His concern was that they had to read about it in the paper. He was angry that the process did not include the CAC; that changes were made without their knowledge or input.

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

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

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

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

As a member of the CAC, the Planning Commission, and other bodies, stated Mr. Davy, he was part of government. It was a direct reflection on him as part of government. That was not the way to do business; government was supposed to operate in the sunshine. Granted, no laws were violated; no sunshine laws were violated, he was certain.
However, to see that Mr. Long stated that public input was not wanted … he quoted, “they did not want everyone in the world reacting to the report prior to the Board getting the document to review.” Yes, stated Mr. Davy, everyone would react to the report. The Democrat had an editorial about it. Gerald Ensley wrote a column about it. As a member of government, that was…icky.

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

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

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

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

Shelonda Meeks stated that she wanted to make clear that regarding Mr. Ross’ comments on Blueprint’s record keeping practices, at the time of the review Blueprint was in the midst of physically relocating the offices. They were packing boxes and moving from a larger space in Koger to the current, much smaller SunTrust location. Their records were in multiple locations due to constraints in storage. Some older records were moved to the church building for storage. Furthermore, when Blueprint was originally organized decisions were made regarding who would handle various portions of the program. The financial needs of Blueprint were handled by the City because all procurement and invoice payments were with them. Therefore all financial records had to be with them. The IA also decided, so that there would be shared services, the County Clerk of Court would be the Clerk for Blueprint. Consequently some records are stored with the City,
some with the County for those reasons. Mr. Ross stated that they understood those reasons but thought it needed to be changed; that all records should be maintained by the City. Mr. Landry stated that Mr. Davis’ explained to him on his CAC orientation tour that Blueprint used the church for storage because of space restrictions at the office. He felt it was a wise use of space owned by Blueprint rather than paying for storage elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Windell Page stated he would be more specific regarding the overall look of the projects. It might not be the politically correct way to say it, however, the supply diversity also remains on the table as related to the completion of the projects. Christic Henry requested to add that they were concerned about not only fiscal efficiencies but the overall maintenance of efficiencies with the projects that were on going. That was
crucial, especially important to have neighborhood buy-in to the project. Mr. Taylor stated that Franklin Boulevard came to mind with that statement and of course, the completion of Cascades Park as well as Segment 3 of Capital Cascades Trail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:38 pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#2.

Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 1 & 3: Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) Services
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item advises the Board of the firm selected to conduct Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) Services for Capital Cascades Trail, Segments 1 and 3.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
CE&I procurement for the Cascades Trail Segment 1 and Segment 3 projects was authorized by the Board in June, the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) was released on July 24, and consultant responses were received on August 18. Two firms responded to the RFQ:
- Atkins North America, Inc.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff

Review of the Statement of Qualifications occurred on August 31 and Consultant Oral Presentations are scheduled for September 15. The Board will be advised of the selected firm at the September 19 meeting.

The CE&I services will be utilized on the following projects (anticipated construction dates and funding sources are noted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement*</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monroe St. to Adams St. Box Culvert</td>
<td>Dec. 2011 to May 2012</td>
<td>Agency**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coal Chute Pond</td>
<td>Dec. 2011 to June 2012</td>
<td>COT &amp; Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capital Cascades Connector Bridge</td>
<td>June 2012 to June 2013</td>
<td>FDOT &amp; Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Blueprint 2000 reserves the right to add or delete improvements (interim or ultimate) for Cascades Trail within the boundaries of Segments 1 and 3 as part of this project.
** HUD funding will possibly become available.

The objective of the Construction, Engineering and Inspection Services Contract will be to administer and monitor the work of the Contractors constructing the projects.
OPTIONS:
For information only.

TCC and CAC Actions:
Both Committees were advised of the project schedules and that CE&I procurement was ongoing.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested, for information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None
#3.

Capital Circle NW/SW Update: US 90 to Orange Avenue
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Committees and IA as to the status of the Capital Circle NW/SW project from north of Orange Avenue to south of West Tennessee Street.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Project Funding: The Board was advised at their June 20, 2011, meeting that the project construction limits would be based on total available construction funding, current right-of-way constraints, and the need to encumber previously allocated federal funds. The total funding currently available for construction, CE&I, and contingency is $52,280,000 as noted below:

- $ 34,790,909 Blueprint 2000
- $ 8,189,091 SAFETEA-LU Federal Earmark
- $ 9,200,000 Additional FDOT Funding - Specifically to construct the SR 20 intersection
- $ 100,000 COT Share of Pump Station 77 Demolition and Sewer Construction
- $ 52,280,000 Total

Project Limits: The construction project limits will extend from south of US 90 to approximately 1,300 feet north of Orange Avenue. All wetland impacts and associated mitigation for the entire project will be completed during the initial phase of construction in conformance with local, state and federal permits.

Final Plans: The Final Plans and Specifications were submitted to FDOT for approval and FHWA Funding authorization which is expected by the end of the federal fiscal year (September 30, 2011).

Permits: All permits have been applied for and have either been issued or are in process as follows:
- FDEP Regulation of Stormwater Discharge Permit – Issued on 10/18/07
- FDEP Wetland Resource Permit – Issued on 7/15/11
- USACOE Wetland Resource/Dredge and Fill Permit – Issued on 8/5/11
- Leon County Environmental Management Permit – Issuance Pending
**Request for Bids:** At its June 20, 2011, meeting, the Board approved the following:

**Option 1:** Authorize Staff to initiate a low-bid procurement process to construct from US 90 (Tennessee Street) to north of SR 371 (Orange Avenue).

1. If the low bid is **less than $52.3 million****, authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to award a contract to the low-bid Contractor.
2. If the low bid is **more than $52.3 million****, then authorize staff to bring this item back to the IA for guidance.

** Including Pump Station 77 Demolition and Sewer Construction costs but excluding COT water/sewer utility work

Blueprint staff is currently preparing the Invitation for Bid document for this project. The project is anticipated to be advertised for construction in October 2011.

**Local Preference:** A question was asked at the June IA meeting as to whether local preference will be used in the construction procurement. Staff has asked FHWA for clarification on local preference and MBE being included in procurement and received the following response from FDOT/FHWA (Per e-mail from Derek Fusco (FHWA) to Keith Shores (FDOT)):

“For procurement, local preference is allowed up to 10 percent of the total evaluation criteria. However, the total of all allowable non-qualification based evaluation criterion (local and DBE) must not exceed ten percent of the total criteria.”

**Under competitive negotiation/qualifications based selection (Brooks Act) procurement procedures, may a local office presence be an evaluation criterion during the advertisement and selection phase? (Posted 7-20-11)**

Yes, a local office presence may be utilized as a nominal evaluation criterion where appropriate in assessing the qualifications of firms to perform the solicited services.

Although a locality factor is not directly a qualification factor, a small locality criterion of no more than ten (10) percent of the total evaluation criterion may be used. This criterion cannot be based on political boundaries and should be used on a project-by-project basis for projects where a need has been established for a consultant to provide a local presence. Further, if a firm currently outside the locality area indicates as part of its proposal that it will satisfy that criteria in some manner, such as establishing a local project office, that commitment should be considered to have satisfied the local presence criterion. The intent is to only apply this evaluation criterion on projects where a local presence will add value to the quality and efficiency of the project provided that application of this criterion leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, available to compete for the services.

To maintain the integrity of a competitive negotiation/qualification based selection procurement, total of all allowable non-qualifications based evaluation criterion (local presence and/or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation) should not exceed ten (10) percent of the total evaluation criteria.
OPTIONS:
For information only.

TCC and CAC Action: The Item was presented to both committees in June and both committees were advised that this Item may need to be readdressed at the August committee meetings, and the September IA meeting, in relation to the adoption of the FY 2012 Capital Budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None.
#4.

IA Meeting Minutes:
June 20, 2011
Commissioner Bryan Desloge called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm and asked that the Citizen Advisory Committee Chairman’s report first.
II. CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Mr. Lamar Taylor, Chairman of the CAC, stated that the committee was presented with the information from the Capital Cascade Connector Bridge Charrette results and recommendations. He stated that the CAC supported the bridge design, abutment and lighting concepts recommended by the charrette participants, but several CAC members suggested the bridge deck be wider than the proposed 12-foot width to accommodate those standing, walking, and bicycling across the bridge. Mr. Taylor stated that there was discussion on the naming of the park and that the CAC recommended that the park be named Capital Cascades Park. He further mentioned that there was a public hearing on the Capital Budget and that the committee was made aware that there may be funds that could be reallocated from the projects that were nearly completed. He stated that staff would provide updated details at the August CAC meeting. Mr. Taylor stated that in 2010, when the capital budget was reviewed and cuts were made to projects because of the reduction in revenues due to the economy, that the CAC as well as the Intergovernmental Agency agreed that when funds became available the projects previously cut would be refunded.

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Tedder stated that there were two agenda modifications delivered to the Board via e-mail on Friday, June 17, 2011: (A) Blueprint 2000 Management Review, and (B) Blueprint 2000 and Planning Department Restructuring. He further stated that Item #4. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update and Item #15. Revisions to Blueprint Real Estate Policy (No. 107) to Include a Relocation Policy for Locally Funded Projects needed to be pulled for discussion.

Agenda Modification A: Blueprint 2000 Management Review

Scott Ross, Leon County Office of Management Budget (OMB), stated that in October 2010, the City Manager and County Administrator directed City and County staff to conduct a joint management review of the Blueprint 2000 Agency.

Commissioner Miller pointed out that she preferred Mr. Ross provide the Board with a detailed report because she had not seen the report until she walked into the meeting and that she was uncomfortable voting on an item and making a decision when she hadn’t reviewed the information. Commissioner Desloge stated that he felt the same.

Mr. Ross provided the names of those who assisted in compiling and creating the report from both city and county staff. He stated that interviews were conducted with key staff at Blueprint 2000. He further stated that the report contains the following sections as outlined in the report:

A. Methodology
B. Background
C. Organizational Overview
D. Blueprint 2000 Policies
E. General Engineering Consultant Contract
Mr. Ross stated that when the Executive Director of BP2000 resigned and the Capital Project Finance Manager retired, the management review team suggested that this would be an opportunity to restructure the organization and make it more efficient. He stated that it was their idea to place Blueprint under the auspices of the Planning Department and not hire a new director. Mr. Ross stated that the Planning Department was involved in Blueprint and that the director reports to the City Manager and County Administrator, similar to the structure of Blueprint 2000. He stated that most Blueprint 2000 projects are well under way and a lot of them have been constructed. He mentioned that there isn’t enough money to complete the projects before the sales tax extension runs out and that the Planning Department would play an integral role in the sales tax extension. He reiterated that it was a great opportunity to place Blueprint 2000 under the Planning Department.

Mr. Ross stated that the team studied Blueprint 2000 methodology, engineering consulting contracts, adherence to City and County policy and Blueprint 2000’s policies, reviewed their reporting and record keeping, and interviewed various staff and consultants. He reviewed Blueprint 2000’s current organizational structure (as shown below, which is on page 6 of the Management Review report); the yellow boxes indicate Blueprint 2000 staff, green boxes indicate the General Engineering Contract (GEC) and the blue boxes indicate the GEC staff.

Mr. Ross reviewed the governing structure of Blueprint 2000 (as shown below, which is on page 3 of the Management Review report).
Mr. Ross stated that generally Blueprint follows many of the City’s policies due to the fact that Blueprint 2000 uses the City’s personnel and financial systems in order to keep track of all day-to-day finances. He stated that the team could not find any deficiencies in the way that the policies were applied.

Mr. Ross stated that there was a difference in the real estate policies between Blueprint 2000, the City of Tallahassee, and Leon County. He referenced Table #1 (as shown below, which is on page 8 of the Management Review report), which highlights the thresholds for independent appraisals of each entity. Mr. Ross stated that Blueprint obtained one independent appraiser for properties valued $0-$750,000 and that FDOT review appraisals were used as the second appraisal for properties valued $750,001 and higher. He stated that the team recommended that Blueprint 2000 update its Real Estate policy to reflect the current practices.
Mr. Ross stated that there was a large difference in the amount of approval authority between the three entities as well. He referenced Table #2 (as shown below, which is on page 8 of the Management Review report).

**Table #2: City of Tallahassee, County, and BP2000 Real Estate Approval Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary Thresholds</th>
<th>City of Tallahassee Real Estate Policy: Final Approval Thresholds</th>
<th>Leon County Real Estate Policy: Final Approval Thresholds</th>
<th>BP2000 Real Estate Policy: Final Approval Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $25,000</td>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $250,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 - $500,000</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,001 - $500,000</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001 and Higher</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $750,000</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>BP2000 Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750,001 and Higher</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>IMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He stated that the Blueprint 2000 Director had more autonomy to purchase property than the individuals who supervise him. He stated that the team recommended that the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) approve real estate acquisitions up to $500,000 dollars, and for purchases above $500,000 to go before the Intergovernmental Agency to bring more accountability.
Mr. Ross stated that Blueprint 2000 is a unique entity that will not be found anywhere else in Florida. There is a small support staff and large consultant firm working through a GEC. He stated that the GEC performs all types of services and tasks relating to the day-to-day operations of the offices such as basic surveying, basic engineering, and developing policies and procedures. He stated that there is an overall contract for GEC services and that all of the tasks are done through annual Letters of Authorization (LOA), which outline the job tasks. He referenced Table #5 (as shown below, which is on page 17 of the Management Review report). Mr. Ross stated that this table illustrates the Program Management and Support cost for the last 7 years.

Table #5: Summarization of the Yearly Program Management and Support Costs for LOA #1 and BP2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>LOA #1</th>
<th>BP2000</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004(1)</td>
<td>$412,470</td>
<td>$828,809</td>
<td>$1,241,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$801,456</td>
<td>$839,756</td>
<td>$1,641,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$996,469</td>
<td>$827,223</td>
<td>$1,823,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$714,630</td>
<td>$988,408</td>
<td>$1,703,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$822,571</td>
<td>$1,042,394</td>
<td>$1,864,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$702,117</td>
<td>$1,086,901</td>
<td>$1,789,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010(2)</td>
<td>$802,180</td>
<td>$1,150,832</td>
<td>$1,953,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011(3)</td>
<td>$193,107</td>
<td>$1,166,506</td>
<td>$1,359,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,445,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,930,829</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,375,829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) FY 2004 costs are partial year payments, due to the contract commencing mid-year FY 2004.
(2) FY 2010 BP2000 costs are budgeted, not actual costs.
(3) FY 2011 LOA #1 costs represent payments for the first quarter of the fiscal year. Annualized costs for FY 2011 are estimated at $772,428, bringing the total compensation for LOA #1 to approximately $6.02 by the end of the FY. FY 2011 BP2000 costs are budgeted, not actual costs. The total costs associated with Program Management will reach $14 million by the end of FY 2011.

He stated that the interesting thing was that there are built-in costs such as 5% increases and overhead charges. He further stated that there are two rates of overhead: an office rate, which pays for work being done in the GEC main office; and a non-office rate, which pays for work the staff does out of the Blueprint 2000 offices. He mentioned that Blueprint pays for the office space, computers and support. Mr. Ross stated that the team recommended that since government has the built in overhead to be able to absorb some of the cost, the LOAs should be reviewed and renegotiated so that Blueprint utilizes City and County staff to realize potential cost savings. He further stated that it would reduce the amount of work being done by the GEC and therefore be a cost savings.

Commissioner Akinyemi stated that the GEC was doing in-house program management and not engineering work. He stated that their job was to manage projects and move the projects along. Mr. Ross stated that Commissioner Akinyemi was correct but that the GEC was being paid engineering overhead rates that have been approved by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). He stated that the overhead rate ranged from 113% to 135% for internal Blueprint offices and a rate of 162% to 170% for the LPA home office. He further stated that with government, the overhead rates were lower because of the economy of scale and systems already being in place. Mr. Ross stated that there were also line items, performance bonuses, and profits which were not seen in government contracts.
Commissioner Miller asked if it was the bonuses that were not usually built into government contracts. Mr. Ross stated that in government there would be one bonus for an engineer who brought a project in on time. Commissioner Miller asked how the bonuses got into the contract. Mr. Ross stated that they were in the original contract when it was negotiated and that it was the industry standard.

He stated that when Blueprint 2000 was started, it needed to hit the ground running and that some great work has been done. He further stated that now that some projects had been completed and there wasn’t enough money to finish the other projects, Blueprint should take advantage of the economies of scale and use the public works departments and the government’s engineers to do some of the work. Mr. Ross stated that essentially the IA created a third public works department.

Commissioner Akinyemi asked how long the LPA contract was for and if the contract was indefinite. Mr. Ross stated that the current contract was a five-year contract that was renewed in 2009 for an additional five years under the same terms and that it could be renewed (annually 2014-2019) until Blueprint 2000 was done. Commissioner Akinyemi asked if that was standard. Mr. Ross stated that Blueprint 2000 wasn’t realizing savings because the projects have been ongoing and that they can’t stop in the middle of a project such as Capital Cascades; therefore, the GEC staff wasn’t being reduced since the projects are continuing.

Commissioner Dozier asked if the annual LOAs spell out the specific details of the scope of work that the GEC is to perform and if the nature of the contract could be altered in the LOA. Mr. Ross stated that she was correct.

Commissioner Gillum asked if there was a minimum amount of work that the LPA Group was expected to perform. Mr. Ross stated that the annual LOAs spelled out the specific tasks that the GEC was to perform. He referred the Board to Table #8 (as shown below, which is on page 22 of the Management Review report), which showed all the projects and LOAs that were associated with each. He stated that Blueprint 2000 staff annually reviewed the LOAs and the tasks that were needed, and wrote the LOAs to carry the tasks to fruition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters of Authorization</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOA #2</td>
<td>Capital Cascade</td>
<td>$7,070,466</td>
<td>$458,481</td>
<td>$17,035,717</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,564,664</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #3(2)</td>
<td>Capital Circle NW</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>45,586,051</td>
<td>22,605,000</td>
<td>4,285,996</td>
<td>72,477,047</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #4(2)</td>
<td>Connie to Tram</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3,317,268</td>
<td>32,269,488</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>35,586,756</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #5</td>
<td>Capital Circle NW/SW</td>
<td>5,447,326</td>
<td>41,481,037</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,540,000</td>
<td>48,468,363</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #6(3)</td>
<td>Sensitive Lands</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6,691,632</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6,691,632</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #7(2)</td>
<td>Tram to Woodville</td>
<td>1,210,108</td>
<td>13,174,000</td>
<td>18,314,128</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>32,698,236</td>
<td>14.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #8</td>
<td>Woodville to Crawfordville</td>
<td>996,151</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>996,151</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commissioner Dozier asked: if the Board deemed that staff could be assigned tasks, would the LOAs be different based upon the tasks assigned, or would this violate the contract? Mr. Ross stated that the contract could be renegotiated as needed. He stated that the tendency was not to use city or county staff to complete tasks but to use the consultants.

Commissioner Gillum restated his question regarding whether there was a minimum amount of work or payment that the GEC was to be provided. He further asked if the LOAs could be zeroed out. Mr. Ross stated that the LOAs were open ended and could be negotiated as needed and that LOAs could be zeroed out for the projects that have been completed.

Anita Favors Thompson asked if Commissioner Gillum’s concern was whether there was enough work to be done. Commissioner Gillum stated that his concern was whether there was a minimum amount that the GEC was to be paid even if work was moved to city and county departments to take advantage of the economies of scale.

Vince Long stated that upon approval of the report, the next step would be to review each LOA and renegotiate them and determine if there was a minimum amount that the GEC was to be paid.

Maribel Nicholson-Choice stated that she understood Commissioner Gillum’s question to be a legal question. She stated that the contract had not been reviewed by legal counsel as far as she knew.

Mr. Ross stated that the team’s recommendation was for the Planning Director to review the LOAs to see what services could be moved to City or County staff to take advantage of existing staff resources and to lower the costs of the GEC contract. He further stated that the Management Review team didn’t have the expertise to review the individual LOAs and that the manager who was running the program should be the one to go through the LOAs.

Commissioner Gillum asked if there were LOAs that went beyond 2011. Mr. Ross stated that he didn’t think so and that they would be coming up for renegotiation in September of this year. There were nine LOAs and that they were modified for the upcoming year.

Commissioner Akinyemi reiterated that Table #8 showed that the LOAs were associated with specific projects.

Commissioner Miller referred to Table #7 (as shown below, which is on page 21 of the Management Review report) and asked what the Other Sub-Consultant column represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA #9</th>
<th>Capital Circle SW</th>
<th>2,354,312</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>2,354,312</th>
<th>1.05%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$17,078,363</td>
<td>$110,708,469</td>
<td>$90,224,333</td>
<td>$5,825,996</td>
<td>$223,837,161</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>49.46%</td>
<td>40.31%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Source Blueprint 2000 Master Plan Schedule as of September 31, 2010 - Does not include program management costs as outlined in LOA #1 - #9
(2) Completed Projects
(3) Includes land purchases only, does not include payments to the County or City for water quality projects, Lidar imagery or program management costs
Mr. Ross stated that the GEC hired sub-consultants to do work, i.e. biologists, hydrologists, or whatever expertise was needed and that column represented the payments to them.

Commissioner Gillum asked if the team observed any sub-consultants to the sub-consultants. Mr. Ross stated that the team did observe cases where there were three layers of consultants. He stated that in government there would be a project manager and then there would be consultants. He further stated that he wasn’t sure if work could be hired out to another sub-consultant. Commissioner Gillum asked if there were any restrictions around how this would work. Mr. Ross stated that there were restrictions and that they were to get certifications from Blueprint 2000 to use consultants who were not on the approved sub-consultant list.

Mr. Ross mentioned that the total amount of payments to the GEC and sub consultants was $21,640,572 for all of the LOAs.

Mr. Ross referred the Board back to Table #8 (as shown above, which is on page 22 of the Management Review report) and stated that it was a condensed version of the Master Plan that Jim Davis produced annually on the capital project budget. He stated that as of October 1, 2010, Blueprint had spent $223,837,161 on the projects and that almost 50% of the expenditures went to right of way acquisition. The second-highest expenditure was for construction of the projects at 40%. He mentioned that the most expensive project to date was Capital Circle Northwest in which Blueprint simply paid Florida Department of Transportation to purchase right of way and construct the project.

Mr. Ross referred the Board back to Table #9 (as shown below, which is on page 24 of the Management Review report) and stated that it was a case study to compare the project management costs between Blueprint 2000, City of Tallahassee, and Leon County projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA #</th>
<th>LPA</th>
<th>Other Sub consultants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOA #1</td>
<td>$2,779,913</td>
<td>$2,665,087</td>
<td>$5,445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #2</td>
<td>$2,396,248</td>
<td>$1,042,534</td>
<td>$3,438,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #3</td>
<td>$230,131</td>
<td>$685,931</td>
<td>$916,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #4</td>
<td>$1,100,212</td>
<td>$1,978,427</td>
<td>$3,078,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #5</td>
<td>$300,177</td>
<td>$4,212,087</td>
<td>$4,512,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #6</td>
<td>$39,431</td>
<td>$329,690</td>
<td>$369,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #7</td>
<td>$1,051,171</td>
<td>$1,423,695</td>
<td>$2,474,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #8</td>
<td>$276,026</td>
<td>$487,567</td>
<td>$763,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA #9</td>
<td>$138,787</td>
<td>$503,459</td>
<td>$642,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,312,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,328,476</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,640,572</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Payments included here are based on financial records obtained through January 2011.
Table #9: Comparison of Project Management Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>BP2000</th>
<th>City of Tallahassee</th>
<th>Leon County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Circle:</td>
<td>Orange Ave Extension:</td>
<td>Orange Ave:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie to Tram</td>
<td>Blairstone to Capital Circle</td>
<td>South Monroe to Blairstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Costs</td>
<td>$3,088,559 7.74%</td>
<td>$398,961 3.26%</td>
<td>$422,267 1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$39,894,048 100%</td>
<td>$11,862,346 100%</td>
<td>$38,931,392 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He stated the construction cost were hard to normalize due to cost of right of way, stormwater facility requirements in each area, and various other issues. The project management costs for the projects were the only portion that was compared.

Mr. Ross stated that, in a nutshell, the team’s conclusion and staff recommendation was the continued transition of Blueprint 2000 to the Planning Department. He stated that the workload of Blueprint 2000 was going down and that there wasn’t funding for all of the projects. He stated that the Intergovernmental Agency structure would stay the same until all of the bond debt has been paid off, and that only the management of Blueprint 2000 should be changing. Mr. Ross recommended that Blueprint 2000 utilize city and county staff to the greatest extent possible given the current economic times. He mentioned that currently there were two inspectors from the City of Tallahassee working for Blueprint on Capital Cascades Park which was saving approximately $200,000 in CEI costs, rather than paying the market rate for consultants to do that work. He stated that with two key vacancies in the organization that there was the opportunity to reorganize without interrupting staff resources as it was. He further stated that the Planning Department would be integral in the planning for the sales tax extension in the future and that the change would streamline both departments so that there was one direct report instead of two.

Below is the summary of findings and conclusion from the Management Review report (Pages 25 to 29)

G. Summary of Findings:

Finding #1: Through interviews it was determined that the IMC quarterly meetings were often canceled.

Finding #2: While the CAC is an integral part of the BP2000 Agency, some members of the CAC appear to be serving beyond the term limits set forth in the bylaws and are in violation of the CAC “conflict of interest” clause.

Finding #3: Once the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) was changed to an advisory committee, technical decisions tended to be made prior to TCC meetings by BP2000 staff/consultants and the advice of the committee was not always considered when presenting the final recommendations to the IA.

Finding #4: The BP2000 organization resembles a ‘third’ Public Works department that completes a specific list of projects decided by the City and County Commissions as the Intergovernmental Agency. This structure allowed BP2000 to focus on implementing the specific project list faster than may have otherwise been possible through the minimal staffing and the hiring of consultants through the general engineering contract.
Finding #5: The BP2000 February 2004 Performance Auditing Services Final Report, submitted by MGT of America, described the overall structure of the BP2000 as ‘complex,’ ‘unwieldy,’ and ‘awkward’ from a traditional management perspective. The report does take into account the difficulty of balancing the interests of both public agencies in areas of control, effectiveness, cost and convenience.

Finding #6: The BP2000 Real Estate Policy requires the Agency to procure two independent state-certified real estate appraisals for acquisitions, sales or dispositions of real property in which the estimated value exceeds $750,000. The current process uses only one appraisal with a review by the Department of Transportation. Based on the interviews with BP2000 staff, and given that many of the appraisals are for land purchased for future transmittal to the Department of Transportation, the process is prudent and efficient.

Finding #7: There is a disparity in the approval thresholds for the City Manager and the County Administrator in their respective roles with the City and County, and the BP2000 Executive Director, supervised by these same individuals. The current arrangement provides too much autonomy and it is counter intuitive to have an agency director that reports to the City Manager and the County Administrator having more authority.

Finding #8: The BP2000 Procurement Policy was last revised on June 17, 2002. The policy should be reviewed for sufficiency and submitted to the IA for approval. If there is no longer a desire to require that the policy be reviewed every five years, then Section 101.08 Sunset Review should be removed.

Finding #9: Neither Section 101.7, 8 of the BP2000 Procedures Policy nor the City Procurement Policy, nor implementing Procedures Manual, address post contract grievances. Rather, these policies address bidder/vendor grievances concerning awarding of bids. The City Procedures Manual also addresses contract non-compliance procedures although this portion of the Procedures Manual has not yet been incorporated into the BP2000 Policy. As a result, the grievance process followed by BP2000, although appropriate, was not supported by Policy language.

Finding #10: As an agency subject to the provision of the Florida Sunshine Law, BP2000 has an obligation to maintain records so they are reasonably accessible to the public as well as for internal business reasons. Although all records are obtainable as currently stored, it would be more efficient to maintain a central location for storage of all records.

Finding #11: In earlier years, evaluations were conducted using an objective analysis which utilized statistical data derived from surveys that focused on evaluating the goals and objectives of BP2000. The past two year reviews have progressed into a satisfaction survey that does not correlate to the goals and objectives of BP2000.

Finding #12: Since 2004, LPA and its sub consultants have been compensated $5.45 million for Program Management and Support services provided under LOA #1. These costs are expected to total approximately $6.02 million by the end of FY 2011. BP2000 operating costs are approximately $7.9 million. The total cost associated with the Program Management element of BP2000 is $13.4 million and estimated to reach $14 million by the end of FY 2011. Based on the
scope of services for LOA #1, the actual costs should have decreased from year-to-year, due to the fact that initial program set-up is complete. However, as shown in Table #5, throughout the duration of the contract there is no downward trend of actual costs.

Finding #13: While the biannual reports provide detailed information on the status of all BP2000 projects, it does not necessarily provide accurate information regarding cost savings. In addition, the client satisfaction section should be reviewed in terms of content and information that is provided and list the composition of the review committee. Furthermore, BP2000 should limit the use of non-objective measures, focus on reporting the progress of projects and eliminate the promotion from this document or eliminate the document entirely.

Finding #14: The GEC has continued to meet or exceed the 15.5% Minority Business Enterprise goal provided in the GEC Contract. The GEC is also involved in the MBE Coordination for all BP2000 projects. BP2000 currently uses the City’s MBE policy and the County’s Local Preference policy.

Finding #15: Since 2004, Public Involvement costs have totaled approximately $2.38 million under the GEC contract, which includes LOA #1 thru LOA #9. Of this, $1.9 million is for personnel related expenses for two employees and $516,000 for an Advertising/Marketing sub consultant. These costs are expected to reach $2.69 million by the end of FY 2011. Services provided are in-line with those provided by the City’s Communications and the County’s Public Information departments. The significant difference is that City and County Communication and Public Information departments provide services on an organizational-wide level, while the GEC team provides services for one department. As mentioned earlier, the GEC Public Involvement staff works closely with City and County Communications and Public Information staff to provide information on BP2000 projects.

Finding #16: CEI services have been provided on BP2000 projects by two City employees for construction inspections, in lieu of contracting with sub-consultants for these same services at a cost of $480,000. This conflicts with the premise of using the current GEC structure where long-term cost savings are achievable through the use of temporary employees instead of permanent employees. In this particular instance the savings for using the existing City staff is $199,190. Long-term costs of hiring sub-consultants for CEI services may in fact be achievable, but the shortterm impacts that these costs more than double those employee salaries should be taken into account.

Finding #17: Since 2004, LPA has been compensated $21.6 million dollars for services provided under the GEC contract. Of this, $8.3 million is for payments made directly to LPA and $13.3 million for sub consultant services. While the GEC team has been efficient in the set-up and management of the BP2000 program thus far, there may be a more efficient way to provide these services going forward.

Finding #18: A review of projects costs for BP2000 projects, with specific attention to LOA #4 (Connie to Tram) indicated that the Program Management Matrix costs did not completely match expenditures as documented in the City of Tallahassee’s financial system.
Finding #19: BP2000 project management currently uses multiple layers of consultants to manage projects.

H. Conclusion:
Based on the report entitled “Blueprint 2000 and Beyond: A Community Based Guide for Economic Development and Natural Resources Management”, City and County Commissions selected high priority projects to be funded from the FY 2004 sales tax extension. A number of these projects were very visible state roadway improvements and other large multi-jurisdictional projects. The Blueprint 2000 report also incorporated a more holistic approach for construction of these projects inclusive of aesthetic stormwater facilities and enhanced bike and pedestrian amenities. In order to effectively manage these projects and get the projects done in an expeditious manner, an intergovernmental agency operating as an independent governing body was established by interlocal agreement between the City and County. The new agency, although similar to both City and County Public Works Departments, was given greater administrative flexibility and approval authority for accomplishing the designated projects such as the high approval thresholds for the Executive Director and IMC for real estate acquisitions. This structure, which is highly dependent on outside consulting resources, accomplished the initial goals of both the City and County and allowed these large high dollar projects to get started and finished quickly.

At this time, a majority of the funded BP2000 projects are either complete or near completion. In addition, limited funding resources are available for new projects. One of the purported benefits for structuring the agency with contracted program management was the capability to rapidly reduce program costs consistent with reduced workloads rather than having to lay off permanent full-time government employees. However, as outlined in the General Engineering Consultant Contract section of the report, even though BP2000 projects were being completed, or were under contract, the project management costs have remained fairly consistent since inception. Also, it is further argued that this form of contract management justifies paying higher overhead costs for private sector contracting than the economies of scale provided in government overhead. This, however, does not appear to be the case since program management costs have stayed consistent throughout BP2000’s existence.

In addition to the limited number of projects remaining, a number of other factors impact the continued viability of the IA as currently structured. Since inception of the Agency, a number of financial constraints have been placed on both City and County governments due to property tax reform, a decline in property valuations, and slow sales tax growth. Given these circumstances, it might be financially prudent for City and County management to consider downsizing the current BP2000 structure or bringing the BP2000 function under the oversight of an existing department such as City/County Planning. The Planning Department is in a better position to coordinate with the City and County Public Works Directors of the apparent capacity of the existing engineering and project management expertise.

By utilizing existing staff resources, there is the opportunity to reduce recurring overhead charges and performance bonuses that are paid to contracted consultants. Based on information gathered in the management review, staff estimates cost savings will also be realized through downsizing the Public Involvement portion of project management with existing resources of
Planning, and City and County Communication and Public Information staff. This option will immediately reduce recurring overhead costs for these program management areas, in addition to operating margins/profits that are not typically levied by local governments.

In order to accomplish this type of consolidation, a detailed analysis of each Letter of Authorization associated with project management and general engineering must be done to see which functions can be distributed among existing City and County staff. Also, it is likely that some specific consulting resources may need to be maintained to preserve the continuity of active construction projects such as Cascade Park and the segment of Capital Circle Southwest between Crawfordville Road and Woodville Highway (LOA #2 and #8, respectively).

Since the start of this review, the BP2000 Executive Director has resigned and Capital Program and Finance Manager retired from their positions in December 2010 and March 2011, respectively. (The Capital Program and Finance Manager served as Interim Executive Director from January 2011 – March 2011.) The turnover of the Executive Director and Capital Project and Finance Manager positions provides a unique opportunity to reorganize the structure of BP2000 utilizing the existing resources of both local governments, as described above, to achieve the goals of the BP2000 Interlocal Agreement.

As a result, the management review team met with Senior Executive Staff (Assistant County Administrator, and the City Director of Management and Administration Services) to review the scope of work and preliminary findings. At this meeting it was suggested by the team that the City and County may want to delay or reconsider the hiring of the BP2000 Director due to the possibility that the management of BP2000 could be streamlined by more effectively integrating the City and County Public Works Departments into the BP2000 structure, and realigning the reporting of the Executive Director to the Planning Director. The Planning Department is currently jointly funded and managed by the City and County and would offer similar oversight and reporting as the current BP2000 structure.

The continuation of this transition is recommended for the following reasons:

- The workload of the BP2000 agency is greatly diminished due to successful completion of projects and lack of additional funding for projects.
- The interlocal agreement requires that the Intergovernmental Agency stay intact until all bonds have been repaid. There are no restrictions on the operational structure of the agency.
- The Planning Department is jointly funded and managed by the City and County with a reporting structure similar to the BP2000 agency.
- Utilization of existing City and County personnel resources in lieu of outside consultants will be more cost effective and possibly contribute to maintenance of these resources given the current economic conditions.
- Two key staff members are currently vacant providing an opportunity to restructure with little disruption to current staffing.
- If an extension of the sales tax is pursued beyond FY19, it is likely that the Planning Department will be integral in this effort.
**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Approve Option #1 - Accept the Joint City-County Management Review of the Blueprint 2000 organization.

Ms. Favors Thompson stated that the Intergovernmental Management Committee (IMC) had been discussing the issue since the first of the year. She stated the reorganization that was being proposed had been taken to the original Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC) membership, with the exception of Commissioner Mustian, to explain why they were looking at a new organizational structure. She stated that the program is at a different place and point than when it was started more than ten years ago. She further stated that most of the projects were completed and that most of the available funding had been spent, although they still intended to leverage funding wherever they could to finish projects that were still on the listing. Mrs. Favors Thompson stated that it was no longer necessary to do some of the things that were done in the past such as the use of the consultants. She stated that she and Mr. Parwez Alam were very aware of the costs of the consultants, but that the EECC’s concern was that there was a Blueprint 2000 philosophy. She mentioned that the philosophy was to expedite projects, expanding projects beyond the norm and those aspects of the design and implementation that would go beyond anything that government would typically do.

Ms. Favors Thompson stated then the Board look at the document that compared the acquisition processes and the dollars spent by Blueprint 2000 versus the City and the County and the consultants that were used. She stated that she believed that the product was what both commissions believed was appropriate.

She stated that the IMC was recommending a new structure because Blueprint, being an Intergovernmental Agency, was already similarly designed to the joint Leon County/City of Tallahassee Planning Department. She stated that there was some expertise and talent in both agencies that fit in very well where they were and where they need to be going in the future. She mentioned that there could be some cost savings by utilizing the resources of both City and County and would do more toward the implementation of the last few projects.

Ms. Favors Thompson stated that the EECC members were very concerned about independence, which was expressed at the recent meetings. She stated that they felt that Blueprint 2000 should not be another public works department on the city or the county side, and they wanted the Blueprint philosophy maintained as the program moved forward. She stated that they liked the idea of Wayne Tedder being in the position as director of the program due to having worked with him on a variety of projects. She stated that there were some efficiencies to be gained by utilizing some of the staff on both sides and that some changes could be made to minimize costs for the future.

Mr. Long stated that he wanted to speak to the Management Review timing of the release of the report and the short period of time in the members receiving the report. He stated that the IMC anticipated that the timing would be a double-edged sword because the report was done and was a public document. Given the amount of time between IA meetings, they didn’t want everyone in the world reacting to the report prior to the Board getting the document to review. He further stated that it would be entirely acceptable for the Board to accept the presentation and take action
at a later time. Ms. Favors Thompson mentioned that the next meeting wouldn’t be until September.

There was discussion on whether to continue discussion of this agenda item or to move to the next agenda modification having to do with the management restructuring.

Commissioner Dozier stated that there were items in the Management Review report that she would like to review; however, she would like to take more time to digest the report.

**Commissioner Desloge stated that his suggestion was to accept the report, however, they didn’t agree with everything in it. The Chairman’s recommendation was moved by Commissioner Dailey. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Maddox.**

Commissioner Miller stated that she would like the item placed on the agenda for the September IA meeting for a thorough discussion.

Mrs. Nicholson-Choice stated for clarification the way the recommendations were written regarding the acceptance of the report meant that the Board voted to accept the 19 findings and the recommendations of the report at that time. Commissioner Desloge stated that the Board should add an option #3 to receive the report for review.

Commissioner Gillum stated that many of the recommendations where intended to improve the processes of Blueprint and that he would hate for the improvements to be delayed.

Commissioner Mustian stated that he wanted to congratulate the staff for the job that they did on the report. He stated that he agreed with the EECC intention, to move numerous projects in a short period of time that would have overwhelmed City and County staff. He mentioned that he assumed that the report would go through the CAC before it comes back to the IA in September. Commissioner Mustian stated that he would be in favor of the changes to the consultant contract.

Commissioner Dailey asked again for clarification regarding the acceptance of the report and the comments that were made by Commissioner Gillum and Commissioner Mustian. He stated that if the other members felt that they would like more time to review the report, he understood and suggested that the Board just receive the report for review.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she wouldn’t support option #1 at this time because she would like to dig into the findings a little more. However, she agreed that there were items that they should look at more closely, in particular the consultant issue. She suggested the possibility of the Board meeting again, prior to the September meeting, to specifically review the report. She asked if the Board could move forward with the reorganization and give the organization under Wayne Tedder’s leadership the opportunity to dig into the findings. She mentioned that they were in the middle of the year and of the LOAs for this fiscal year. It might not be that harmful to wait a couple of months under the current system even though there was consensus to change the structure of the consultants.
Ms. Favors Thompson stated that most of the recommendations involved initiating a process that would give the Board more information. Commissioner Dozier was correct that the process could be started via Mr. Tedder. Ms. Favors Thompson stated that since both commissions would be on break for the summer, it would be a great time for Mr. Tedder to start the process.

Commissioner Dozier asked if the Board could receive the report but request that staff move forward with investigating the findings so that the Board has more information at the September meeting. If the Board agrees with the recommendations, they can be implemented immediately.

Commissioner Gillum suggested that the Board accept the recommendations and allow staff to move forward with implementation so that the Board members can flag items of concern to be revisited in September.

Commissioner Miller stated that a course correction was due. However, how it would be correlated with what the citizens voted on, which was an independent agency that would work on specific projects with the money only being spent on those projects. She stated that there was confusion on where the money for the last penny sales tax went and that people were very clear this time where the money has been spent. She mentioned that as far back as 2004, Wendy Grey and she were concerned with the use of the consultants and sub-consultants, and that with the matrix that was described, she is more concerned.

Commissioner Desloge stated that it was a citizen-driven initiative that would be arm’s length away from government. Jim Davis did a spectacular job. Also, the Board couldn’t ask for a better person than Wayne Tedder to make the shift. He stated that he needed procedural clarification because most of the Board members had not had the opportunity to review the material in enough detail to say move forward with the recommendations. **Commissioner Desloge suggested that the Board accept the report in concept and move forward to the Department restructuring item and take the next few months to digest the report and revisit it at the next meeting. Commissioner Dailey agreed with the suggestion of Commissioner Desloge for the motion. There being no further discussion the motion passed 9-0.**

**Agenda Modification B: Blueprint 2000 and Planning Department Restructuring**

Mr. Long stated that Mr. Tedder had been working as the Interim Director since Mr. Davis retired and that he hadn’t missed a beat and had done a tremendous job. He stated that as a part of the Management Review, an evaluation was made on whether “form follows function” was a key efficiency principal. He further stated that design was wrapping up on most of the projects and also much of the right of way acquisition had been done. He stated that the structure that was being proposed as (shown below) allowed for better county-wide planning, construction and maintenance of the program and coordination with City and County Public Works Departments. Mr. Long stated that the structure achieved the efficiencies discussed in the Management Review Report and also positioned them for the planning of the future sales tax extension.
He stated that he wanted to point out the bullets on page 4 of the agenda item (shown below), which were effectuated through the Memorandum of Understanding which vests the responsibilities of the Director of Blueprint 2000 and the Planning Director in the new Director of the Tallahassee-Leon County Department of Planning, Land Management and Community Enhancement (PLACE).

- **The Term of the agreement shall end on December 31, 2019 (the end of the current one cent sales tax collection) unless otherwise modified by the City and County.**
- **Creates a new Department that encompasses both Blueprint 2000 and The Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department. The proposed department name is the Tallahassee-Leon County Department of Planning, Land Management and Community Enhancement in an effort to more closely describe the functions of the Planning Department in Blueprint 2000. The Department will oversee functions of both the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department and Blueprint 2000. The Director of the Department will report to the City Manager and County Administrator or their designee.**
- **The director position will be funded as follows: 50 percent by Sales Tax revenue and the remaining balance shall be paid by the City and County consistent with the allocation prescribed in the Interlocal Agreement between Leon County, Florida and the City of Tallahassee for The Joint City/County Planning and Zoning Department Planning dated September 23, 2009.**
- **The duties and responsibilities of the director shall be those duties as stated for the Director in the Interlocal Agreement Between Leon County, Florida and the City of Tallahassee for The Joint City/County Planning and Zoning Department September 23, 2009 AND the Staff Director of Blueprint 2000 as stated in the Amended and Restated Intergovernmental Agreement Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency dated February 1, 2003.**

Commissioner Akinyemi asked if there was a timeline for the transition and how much of the LPA staff would be absorbed. Mr. Tedder stated that he appreciated the opportunity and that until he was able to hire the Blueprint Manager for additional support that he wouldn’t be able to answer the timeline question. He further stated that there were five or six projects coming up in the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that would bring over $63M into the community. Having the right person in the position would help move the projects as fast as possible.

Mr. Long stated that the new organizational structure would take effect immediately upon approval of the Board. Mrs. Favors Thompson pointed out that Mr. Tedder would be the Director of PLACE and that he would then hire a Planning Manager and a Blueprint Manager that would report directly to him. She stated that the plan was to ask Roxanne Manning to take the Interim Planning Manager position.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

1. Approve the proposed reorganization structure for Blueprint and the Planning Department and the Implementing Tallahassee-Leon County Department of Community Design and Implementation MOU.
Commissioner Akinyemi moved staff’s recommendation. The motion was seconded.

Commissioner Miller asked how the CAC, TCC and the IA fit into the organizational structure. Mr. Tedder stated that that structure would not change. Commissioner Miller stated that she hoped that the TCC would be utilized more than it had been used in the past, as pointed out in the findings of the Management Review report. She also asked how staff would be paid that would be utilized to do the work of the consultants because they wouldn’t be able to absorb Blueprint’s work along with their current duties. Mr. Tedder stated that as an example, if Blueprint were acquiring a property that would eventually be maintained by the county, then county staff would be utilized for the tasks associated with the acquisition. Commissioner Miller pointed out that adding Blueprint 2000 work on top of the existing workload could cause the staff to be overwhelmed. Mr. Tedder stated that Commissioner Miller was correct and that he needed to work through the issues to determine the resources that were available, what would be needed, and that he would keep the Board updated.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she wanted more time to review the findings; however, she was in favor of the reorganization of the Agency. She stated that it made sense to have the planning and implementation together. She mentioned that FAMU Way was a great example of how Blueprint 2000, Planning, and the CRA overlapped to work on a project.

Commissioner Miller stated that she wanted Mr. Tedder to think about the fact that half of his salary would be coming from the sales tax that would expire in 2019 if the penny sales tax wasn’t extended. Mrs. Favors Thompson stated that the point was discussed with Mr. Tedder prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Akinyemi asked where the Blueprint 2000 offices would be physically located. Mr. Long stated that they had looked at moving Blueprint’s offices to the Renaissance Building. Mrs. Favors Thompson pointed out that there might be a contractual issue to work out in terms of the current location of Blueprint. Commissioner Akinyemi stated that he was sure that the terms of the GEC contract would also need to be addressed.

The motion carried 9-0.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he would like the amended local preference policy back before the Board as well.

Mr. Tedder stated that item #4, Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update, needs to be pulled for discussion.

4. Capital Circle SW PD&E Study Update

Mr. Tedder stated that currently Kimley-Horn is completing the PD&E study for Capital Circle Southwest and the study is due to be completed by the fall of 2011. He stated that the current contract allows Blueprint 2000 to move directly into design with the same consultant. Mr. Tedder stated that his recommendation was to move forward with Kimley-Horn because of the efficiencies that would be created. Their knowledge of the environmental issues associated with
the project is tremendous. He further stated that getting another firm up to speed on the project would create inefficiencies for the Agency and that moving forward with the same consultant would save money.

Commissioner Dailey moved Mr. Tedder’s recommendation. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried 9-0.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. CAC Meeting Minutes (February 10, 2011)
   This item was presented as informational only.

2. Cascade Park History Fence: Committee Recognition and Example Panel
   This item was presented as informational only.

3. Capital Circle Southeast: Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Road – Design/Build Project
   This item was presented as informational only.

5. Blueprint Enrollment in Federal E-Verify Program
   This item was presented as informational only.

6. Capital Cascade Trail - Segments 3 and 4 Design Update
   This item was presented as informational only.

7. FAMU Way House Acquisition and Surplus
   This item was presented as informational only.

Mr. Tedder stated that item #15, Revisions to Blueprint Real Estate Policy (No. 107) to Include a Relocation Policy for Locally Funded Projects, needed to be pulled for discussion.

IV. CONSENT ITEMS

8. IA Meeting Minutes: February 28, 2011

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
   Approve minutes as provided.

9. Capital Cascade Trail – Segments 1 and 3: Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) Services

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
**Option 1:** Authorize the advertisement for Consultant Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) Services for the Capital Cascade Trail, Segments 1 and 3. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and award the contract once Consultant CEI selection activities are complete.

1. Initiate the procurement process for selection of a CEI Firm for Capital Cascade Trail, Segments 1 and 3, to include solicitation of qualifications, short listing, and issuance of the RFP to no less than three firms. The TCC will be requested to review the Scope of Services.

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

3. For CEI Services for Capital Cascade Trail, Segments 1 and 3, authorize Staff to include the CEI budget in the IA Agenda Item requesting authorization to proceed with construction of each of the improvements.

10. **Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project Update and Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate and Award the Construction Contract**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project at a cost not to exceed $3,600,000 which includes 20% for CEI 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.

2. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and approve a scope and fee with the CEI firm selected under a separate procurement.

11. **Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 Ditch Improvement/Box Culvert Project: Authorization to Advertise, Negotiate and Award the Construction Contract**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 Ditch Improvement/Box Culvert Project at a cost not to exceed $1,800,000 which includes 20% for CEI 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.

2. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and approve a scope and fee with the CEI firm selected under a separate procurement.

3. If additional HUD/FEMA funding becomes available for this project, provide authorization to amend the Master Plan and incorporate into the Capital Budget this new funding to be used for the Segment 3 Ditch Improvement/Box Culvert project.
12. Authorization to Select and Contract Right of Way/Land Acquisition and Relocation Consulting Services Request Advance Funding for Provision of Right of Way Services to COT for FAMU Way Road Project

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize Blueprint, through a RFQ City administered procurement process, to select and contract with at least two (2) right of way/land acquisition and relocation consulting firms to provide right of way/land acquisition and relocation services to Blueprint 2000. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and award the contracts once the firms have been selected through the RFQ process.

13. Request Advance Funding for Provision of Right of Way Services to COT for FAMU Way Road Project

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the advance funding of $100,000 to be used by Blueprint to create a project in order to provide payment for acquisition services provided to the City of Tallahassee pursuant to a JPA between Blueprint and the City. Under the terms of the JPA the City will reimburse Blueprint for all approved payments it makes for the professional services authorized by the JPA.

14. Transfer of Remaining funds from Capital Circle Southeast (Tram Road to Woodville Highway) to Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the transfer of $450,000 in remaining funds from Capital Circle Southeast from Tram Road to Woodville Highway (E-2 project) to the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 project.

There was a motion for approval of the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Maddox seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 9-0.

15. Revisions to Blueprint Real Estate Policy (No. 107) to Include a Relocation Policy for Locally Funded Projects

Mr. Tedder stated that for federally funded projects Blueprint is required to go through a relocation process that is subject to federal standards. However, for local projects, the Agency is not required to do so. He stated that during public meetings regarding the FAMU Way Extension, there was a desire by the City Commission to look at the Blueprint 2000 relocation policies and to prepare something appropriate for that project. He stated that in short, individuals living in the area will be impacted and it is Blueprint’s intention to make the citizens whole and to relocate them to comparable housing as a community standard. He further stated that the policy the Board had in hand would be used for all Blueprint projects that don’t have federal
funds and that the attached policy will be utilized. He clarified that the proposed policy would be utilized for all Blueprint 2000 projects unless the Board instructed otherwise.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1** Approve revisions to Blueprint’s Real Estate Policy to amend Section 107.17 to include additional language regarding relocation benefits when a project is locally funded and renumber Section 107.18, titled “Revisions to Real Estate Policy” to 107.19 and renumber 107.19 titled “Effective Date” to become 107.20 for consistency.

Approve the addition to the policy of a relocation policy to ensure projects administered by Blueprint provide uniform and consistent treatment for persons or businesses displaced by the acquisition of property utilizing local funds and numbering this new section as Section 107.18.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he was in favor of the policy to ensure that projects would remain eligible for federal funds. He pointed out that many of the people who lived along the corridor may be long term renters who have a vested interest in the neighborhood.

**Commissioner Gillum moved staff’s recommendation.** Commissioner Dozier seconded the motion.

Commissioner Akinyemi stated that he would like to know why the agenda item had not been presented to the TCC or the CAC. Mr. Tedder stated that Agency policies that were implemented by the Board and were technical in nature to implement projects which were previously reviewed by the CAC were usually not presented to the TCC or CAC.

Commissioner Mustian stated that he had discussed with Mr. Tedder the properties that were owner-occupied receiving both the right of way incentive payment and relocation benefits. **He stated that he didn’t agree that the owners should receive both benefits. Commissioner Gillum stated that he agreed and wanted that adjustment made to his motion since the owners are already being incentivized through the sale of their home.**

Debra Schiro, Blueprint 2000 Attorney, stated that it was her recommendation that the policy be applied consistently to all properties whether the properties are owner-occupied or not. She stated that the relocation payments are a federal government entitlement without regard to whether the owner is receiving any compensation for condemnation purposes. She stated that the Agency wasn’t obligated to provide this entitlement, but that she wanted to ensure consistency and fairness. Ms. Schiro stated that the relocation payment is capped at $22,500 for owners who reside in properties for more than twelve months and $5,200 for tenants who reside in properties for less than twelve months. She stated she recommended consistency for both owners and tenants.

Commissioner Gillum stated that owners and renters were two inconsistent classes and that an incentive was already embedded in the sale of the property which the renter wouldn’t receive. Commissioner Mustian stated that he agreed with Commissioner Gillum.
Commissioner Miller asked how much all of these things would cost. Ms. Schiro stated that a brief analysis was prepared and that the estimate for FAMU Way was approximately $400,000 for the relocation costs for the 55 parcels impacted. She mentioned that the total cost for the right of way has been estimated to cost approximately $13.2 million. She stated that there are amounts allowed for moving costs and rent differential.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the differences between those who undergo condemnation proceedings, sellers who accept the incentive offers, and renters. Ms. Schiro clarified the information regarding the caps on the relocation fees. She stated that the incentive amount was based upon a sliding scale formula that would be applied. She further stated that under the current proposed policy, owner occupied properties who accept the incentive would also be afforded the relocation benefits.

Mr. Tedder stated that in some condemnation cases the property owner can’t be located and the acquisition is not necessarily a hostile situation; however, the condemnation procedures have to be followed.

Commissioner Desloge stated that for clarification the incentive is offered as a bonus to the property owner prevent litigation and the costs associated with it. He further stated that it is much less expensive to the government entity to pay the incentive.

Ms. Schiro clarified that there are three options that a property owner has with the incentive program (1.) Accept the offer (2.) Counter the offer (3.) Reject the offer. If the property owner accepts the offer, then they will receive the amount of the appraised value, the incentive amount and the relocation fees. She further stated that if the property owner rejects the offer then the incentive offer is withdrawn and the case is litigated.

Commissioner Dozier concurred with the other commissioners that the renters of the properties were a separate category because they wouldn’t receive all of the benefits that the owner-occupied residents receive. Mr. Tedder clarified that the process would be applied consistently for all property owners. Commissioner Dozier stated that her concern was for the long-term renters.

Ms. Schiro stated that for properties that are leased to businesses, the business owners might be entitled to a lease hold interest in the property.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he was in favor of making the property owners and renters whole. However, he was not in favor of facilitating a windfall.

Commissioner Miller asked if in the case where properties are purchased and the house could be moved, whether the property owners had the opportunity to move with the house. Mr. Tedder stated that as outlined in item #7, Blueprint 2000 purchased a house that was only about 3 years old; the staff was working with the City Housing Division to have the house moved. He mentioned that this prevented the house from being demolished and saved the tax payers $20,000; an affordable housing agency was able to use the house to help someone. He further
stated that Blueprint 2000 would be working with the City and County housing divisions to see if there were other houses in the FAMU Way corridor that could also be moved.

The motion carried 9-0.

V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

16. Election of Intergovernmental Agency Vice-Chair

Mr. Tedder stated that he wanted to recognize Commissioner Mustian for serving as the previous IA Chairman.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
That the Agency conduct an election for a Vice-Chairperson in accordance with the approved By-Laws.

Commissioner Mustian nominated Commissioner Miller for Vice Chair. Commissioner Akinyemi seconded the motion. The motion carried 9-0.

17. Capital Cascade Connector Bridge Design and Design Contingency Budget

Mr. Tedder stated that staff was asking the Board to move forward with the full design of the project and that the Board authorize a 20% contingency budget for the design phase to address a reuse water line for future irrigation. He stated that Figg Engineers was present to report the results of the May 14, 2011, Design Charette.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Options 1 and 2:
Option 1: Concur with the bridge concept recommended by the public at the May 14, 2011, Design Charette.

Option 2: Authorize a design contingency budget of $50,000. Funds would come from the current Capital Cascade Trail Segment 3 and 4 Master Plan line item

Denney Pate of Figg Engineering reviewed the summary of the design charette which was provided in the Board’s agenda materials.

Commissioner Akinyemi asked if the solar panels were optional and what type they were. Mr. Pate stated that they will be the same technology that the military uses in remote areas. He stated that the participants felt that this was a worthwhile investment to make use of the shade structure along with the environmental benefits. Commissioner Akinyemi asked about the color and material that the shade structure would be made of. Mr. Pate stated that the fabric would be some type of open weave canvas material; however, the selection hasn’t been finalized and that it would be based on wind resistance and durability.
Commissioner Dozier asked if the solar panels would be built into the fabric and how much it would cost. She asked whether the decision needed to be made upfront on whether to use the solar panels. Mr. Pate stated that the canopies would be separate from the solar panels but they would be pre-fabricated and installed before the canopies were put up and they would be a separate cost item. Commissioner Dozier asked about the self-cleaning cement. Mr. Pate stated that it was a new technology that was used on the gateway monuments on the I-35W bridge project in Minneapolis that Figg was a part of, and that the concrete has a titanium dioxide added to the mixture that reacts to sunlight to clean pollution out of the air, and is self cleaning. He mentioned that the technology was moving towards being a coating rather than a full depth application. Commissioner Dozier asked if the technology could deal with graffiti. Mr. Pate stated that in the full depth application the concrete is dense and smooth like marble so from the cleaning aspect it would be easier. He mentioned that if there were graffiti and the surface were scarified, it would re-expose a new titanium dioxide surface.

**Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation for option 1 & 2.** Commissioner Gillum seconded the motion.

Commissioner Miller asked about the placement of the solar panels being driven by design rather than efficiency, and how the solar panels would be cleaned and how the canopies would hold up to the dirt from traffic. Mr. Pate stated that they would pick a color that wouldn’t show the day-to-day dirt and that the solar panels tend to be self cleaning, to some degree, with the rain. He stated that nothing would be implemented that didn’t have reasonable longevity and efficiency. He stated that the bridge is aligned east-west with a southern exposure and as the sun moves, a particular panel will have a more optimal angle depending on the time of year. Commissioner Miller stated that she didn’t see any numbers comparing the price of the concepts and the feasibility given the technology that is proposed and keeping in mind that one of the charges given the firm was to come in under budget. Mr. Pate said that it would be feasible.

**The motion carried 9-0.** Mr. Tedder stated that he proposed accelerated construction of the bridge in the proposed Capital Improvement Plan so that as soon as the project is designed that the project moved forward to construction immediately.

**18. Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 3 (Van Buren Pond) Right of Way Acquisition and Authorizing Resolutions**

Mr. Tedder stated that these items were for housekeeping purposes.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Approve the Resolutions allowing the acquisition of the nine (9) privately owned parcels, and authorize Blueprint to enter into discussions with the County to acquire the one (1) county owned parcel and the state to acquire the one (1) state owned property, which are all required for the construction of the Van Buren Pond stormwater facility.

**Commissioner Dailey left the meeting at this point.**
Ms. Schiro read the title of each resolution into the record for approval as follows.

Resolution No. 2011-02 - Acquisition of parcel 102T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Miller moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Maddox seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-03 - Acquisition of parcel 103T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Akinyemi moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Dozier seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-04 - Acquisition of parcel 104T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-05 - Acquisition of parcel 105T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Akinyemi moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Mustian seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-06 - Acquisition of parcel 106T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-07 - Acquisition of parcel 104T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Akinyemi moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.
Resolution No. 2011-08 - Acquisition of parcel 108T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Akinyemi seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-09 - Acquisition of parcel 109T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Dozier moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

Resolution No. 2011-10 - Acquisition of parcel 110T for construction of Van Buren Pond as part of Segment 3 of the Cascade Trail Project

Commissioner Akinyemi moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Dozier seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

19. Capital Circle NW/SW: US 90 to Orange Avenue Right of Acquisition (Parcel 803) and Resolution

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the Resolution allowing the acquisition of the permanent drainage easement, Parcel 803, which is necessary for the construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest (SR 263) from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Resolution No. 2011-01 - Acquisition of parcel 803 for construction of Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Corridor Improvement Project from Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street.

Commissioner Maddox moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0.

20. Capital Circle NW/SW: Construction Options

Mr. Tedder stated that the purpose of the agenda item was to request authorization from the IA to modify the design of Capital Circle NW/SW and to authorize Staff and/or the IMC to proceed with the project based on the project bid received in relation to total funding available. He stated that a total of $52.28 million had identified of committed and potential funding as outlined in the agenda materials. He further stated that the estimate for the total project from Highway 90 to Orange Avenue would be approximately $60 million in anticipated expenditures without taking
into consideration the state of the economy or actual bids. Mr. Tedder stated the FDOT has strongly encouraged Blueprint 2000 to encumber the SAFETEA-LU funds by the end of September 2011. He mentioned that Blueprint has not acquired all of the right of way necessary for the project; therefore, staff scaled the project back to the right of way that is in hand. He stated that the proposed new limits would be to about 1,300 feet north of Orange Avenue as shown in the attachment in the Board’s agenda item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Authorize Staff to initiate a low-bid procurement process to construct from US 90 (Tennessee Street) to north of SR 371 (Orange Avenue).

1. If the low bid is **less than $52.3 million**, authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to award a contract to the low-bid Contractor.
2. If the low bid is **more than $52.3 million**, then authorize staff to bring this item back to the IA for guidance.

**Including Pump Station 77 Demolition and Sewer Construction costs but excluding COT water/sewer utility work**

*Commissioner Sauls moved staff recommendation.* Commissioner Akinyemi seconded the motion.

Commissioner Desloge asked Mr. Tedder how the local preference option would be handled for the project. Mr. Tedder stated that if federal dollars are being used, local preference can’t be utilized as a selection criteria.

*Commissioner Sauls amended her motion to request local preference if possible.* Commissioner Akinyemi seconded the amendment. The motion carried 8-0.

21. **Cascade Park Update**

Gary Phillips, Project Manager, reviewed the information provided to the Board and showed photos of the progress in the park. He stated that there have been changes to the contract and 78 additional days have been given for weather delays. The completion date is September 21, 2012.

Commissioner Sauls asked if Myers Park Drive would be closed permanently once construction is completed. Mr. Phillips stated that she was correct.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he would like to impress upon the public that Capital Cascades Park is designed to be a stormwater facility.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

No action requested; presented for information only.
22. Name That Park: Cascade Park vs. Cascades Park?

Mr. Tedder stated that staff was bringing this item before the Board for the decision on the official name for the park and the entire greenway.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Per the recommendation of the CAC: Option 1: The Park should be named Cascades Park. The entire Greenway should be named the Capital Cascades Trail.

Commissioner Mustian moved staff recommendation. Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

23. Cascade Park Amenity Fundraising

Mr. David Bright stated that some of the amenities are funded through design and construction. He reviewed the items that were funded as outlined in the agenda item. The park trails and sidewalks, Meridian Monument Plaza and Stage, Interactive Water Play Fountain, Cascade Fountain and the Meridian Plaza Signature Bridges are all funded. He stated that the History Fence and History Panels, Boca Chuba Artistic Fountain, Hydrological Cycle Educational Fountain, were funded for design but not for construction. Mr. Bright stated that the Commemoration of Centennial Field, Monroe Street Gateway (Grand Staircase) were not funded for design or construction. He stated that the Meridian Plaza would only be partially completed due to the fact that the state-owned Meridian Point building was located directly behind the meridian marker and wouldn’t allow for the construction of the entire plaza facility. He mentioned that some of the amenities would be funded by donations. Mr. Bright stated that there was a concept for the Commemoration of Smokey Hollow and that Blueprint would be working with Althemese Barnes of the Riley House on the location and how it would be tied together with the park. He stated that the historic electric building that was located in the park was owned by the City of Tallahassee and that there are ongoing discussions of what would be best to place in the building. Mr. Bright told the Board that Blueprint 2000 was starting a fundraising campaign called “Buy a Brick” to fund some of the amenities and donations were welcome from anyone who would like to donate for the larger items.

Commissioner Mustian stated that he had a concern that the citizens would have seen the concepts of the project and wonder why items weren’t in the park that were shown. He stated that he wanted to make sure that the citizens’ expectations were inline with what would be actually be feasible. He further stated that maybe the unfunded amenities could be included in the sales tax extension discussion.

Commissioner Mustian stated that city staff has been in discussion with Florida State University regarding the Meridian Point and Firestone buildings for some time. He stated that he thought that something could be worked out with them; however, a final decision hadn’t been made. He mentioned that whatever decision was made would require funding and that a possible source
would be the downtown CRA. He stated that he hoped to have a decision by the September meeting.

Commissioner Dozier stated that four things (Smokey Hollow commemoration, the shade structure, the grand stair case and the electric building) that were not funded are core items for the park that would bring people into the park and be an economic engine for the community. She stated that opening the park with an old boarded up building didn’t make sense. She stated that there needed to be further discussion on the top priorities for the next two years and what could be delayed for the future.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she would like to think outside of the box in handling this issue. She stated that the performing arts center would be coming back with a new proposal for reorganization and that some money has been set aside to fund the center. She further stated that there was enough money already been set aside for a performance base facility. Commissioner Dozier stated that the facility’s purpose would be to bring people into the community and generate economic development. She further mentioned that if the performing arts center were added to the Blueprint 2000 program during the sales tax extension, there would be time to generate more funds for the facility in the future. She mentioned when the park opens in September 2012, there needed to be a shade structure because this would allow the park to begin booking performances. Commissioner Dozer stated that the shade structure would not only provide infrastructure, shelter from the weather, lighting but also make it more of a performance space. She stated that it would be a win for the performing arts center because the design would already be in place.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
For Board information only.

Commissioner Dozier moved to have the funding of the shade structure from the performing arts center money agendaded at the appropriate agency for discussion. Commissioner Desloge seconded the motion.

Commissioner Miller stated that she was in favor of the motion and she looked forward to Shakespeare in the Park using the amphitheater in Capital Cascades Park. She further stated that she agreed that the list of unfunded amenities needs to be discussed and ranked.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he was in favor of the motion. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

*Commissioner Akinyemi left the meeting at this point.*

**24. Sales Tax Extension**

Mr. Tedder stated that the City Long-Range Target Issue Committee had requested that the Sales Tax Extension be agendaded to provide the status of all of the Blueprint 2000 projects. He stated that the agenda item included the verbatim referendum language and the status of each project.
Commissioner Mustian stated that he was very proud of what Blueprint 2000 has done and that the program was started due to a citizen’s initiative which forced the City and the County to work together for the bigger picture. He stated that Blueprint was a success story that can be taken back to the voters to ask for the sales tax extension. He further stated that he had read the County’s agenda items and he wanted to ask the County Commissioners what role Blueprint and the City Commission would play. He mentioned that if both governments didn’t work together for the sales tax extension that he thought the extension would fail. Commissioner Mustian stated that no one entity should control the process.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he agreed with Commissioner Mustian and that at the County Commission meeting the consensus was that the citizens needed to be involved, with some level of staff oversight.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she concurred with Commissioner Desloge. She stated that she had joined the EECC about three years earlier in anticipation of the citizen discussion of the next phase of Blueprint 2000. She stated that her concern was that citizen input is provided up front and in order to prevent competing interests. She mentioned that the direction that staff was given was to come back with a proposal for the structure of the citizen committee. She further stated that there was recognition that the County would work with the City. Commissioner Dozier clarified that there would be a joint decision on who would be on the citizen committee.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he agreed with Commissioner Mustian and that moving forward in a collaborative effort would be the best way to go. He further stated that if the decision is made to move forward with a citizen’s committee, each commission should have confidence around the composition of the committee. He mentioned that if the County Administrator and County Staff move forward with defining the process for the committee and the County Commission votes on the composition of the committee without working with the City, then that creates a spirit of disharmony. Commissioner Gillum stated that he recommended a Commission appointment for the City and County to get collaborative thoughts from the two elective sides about a process for moving forward.

Commissioner Miller stated that she wanted to point out the original EECC was not a group that was appointed by the City and County Commissions, but rather made up of several diverse groups in the community who could identify with them. She further stated that one place that she would look for appointments to the committee is from the Blueprint 2000 CAC because they have shown commitment to the Blueprint program.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she had no problem with the county staff coming back to them with a proposal for the framework of the committee and the process for the appointments. She stated she would rather that the City and County be very deliberate about the makeup of the committee and that they think outside the box for the recommendations.

Commissioner Mustian stated that the City wanted to work with the County to set up the process rather than wait to react to actions that the County has taken on its own.
Commissioner Maddox stated that he agrees with Commissioner Mustian; however, he stated that he felt comfortable with staff handling the process at that point. He stated that he felt that it was important that the City and citizens to be involved.

Commissioner Desloge stated that he expected County and City staff to work together to develop the process.

Commissioner Gillum stated that he wanted there to be a partnership in the process.

Commissioner Desloge called for citizens to be heard on this issue.

Mr. Curtis Baynes stated that he wanted to move forward on the sales tax extension and he that he felt that it would be best if the City and County worked together in a collaborative effort.

Commissioner Miller stated that Blueprint has done a phenomenal job of capturing outside funds. She asked staff to provide information on the amount of money that was used on each project from sources other than the sales tax.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she had asked Harry Reed to speak to Mr. Tedder about funding available for sidewalks along Franklin Blvd.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
No action requested.

**25. Proposed FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget**

Mr. Tedder stated that because of the actions of the Board to reorganize the Agency that there would be a positive change to the budget due to the reduction in staff.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Review and comment on the FY 2012 Operating Budget.

**26. Fiscal Year 2012-2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan**

Mr. Tedder stated that the Capital Budget he is trying to pull together and present is similar to what the City’s and County’s processes show. He stated that he intended to add six projects to the five year CIP for a total of $63M that would be going into the community.

Commissioner Miller stated that she would like to hear about what is going on with Capital Cascades Segment 4. Mr. Tedder stated that Segment 4 was in the process of being designed and that he hoped that there would be more information to bring to the Board in early 2012.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Review and comment on the Capital Improvement Program and the Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan. The Intergovernmental Agency will conduct a Public Hearing and adopt the Budget in September.

VII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no additional citizens to be heard.

VIII. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Mustian adjourned the meeting at 5:58 pm.

APPROVED:                        ATTEST:

Bryan Desloge  Shelonda Meeks
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA    Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA
#5.

Proposed 2012 IA, TCC and CAC Meeting Schedules
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Proposed 2012 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules

Date: September 19, 2011
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Shelonda Meeks
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item lists the proposed 2012 meeting dates for the Intergovernmental Agency, Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee, and the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee. These proposed dates are “effectively the same dates” as for meetings which were held during 2011.

Intergovernmental Agency (Tallahassee City Commission Chambers)
- Monday, February 27, 2012, from 3:00-5:00 pm
- Monday, June 18, 2012, from 3:00-5:00 pm
- Monday, September 24, 2012, from 5:00-8:00 pm (FY 2013 Budget Public Hearing at 5:30 pm)

Technical Coordinating Committee (Blueprint 2000 Conference Room, from 1:00 to 3:00 pm)
- Thursday, February 9, 2012
- Thursday, April 5, 2012
- Thursday, May 31, 2012
- Thursday, September 6, 2012
- Thursday, October 18, 2012
- Thursday, December 6, 2012

Citizens Advisory Committee (Blueprint 2000 Conference Room, from 4:30 to 6:30 pm)
- Thursday, February 9, 2012
- Thursday, April 5, 2012
- Thursday, May 31, 2012 (FY 2013 Budget Public Hearing at 5:30 pm)
- Thursday, September 6, 2012
- Thursday, October 18, 2012
- Thursday, December 6, 2012

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Approve the dates as presented.

Option 2: Board Guidance
Action by TCC and CAC:
The CAC reviewed the proposed dates at their August meeting and had no comments.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Approve the dates as presented.
#6.

Capital Circle SW PD&E Study and CCSW Design From Orange Avenue to Springhill Road
SUBJECT/TITLE: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study and CCSW Design from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This agenda item informs the Board as to the status of the Capital Circle Southwest (SR 20 to Crawfordville Road) PD&E Study and the future design from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. The Agenda Item requests authorization to negotiate and award a contract for the design phase.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
PD&E Study Final Public Hearing: Following completion of the evaluation of various corridor and alignment options, the Intergovernmental Agency Board voted on September 21, 2009, to approve the widening of the existing alignment of Capital Circle Southwest from SR 20 to Crawfordville Road. The consultant is completing final documentation on the study, and the Final Public Hearing will likely be scheduled for November 2011.

West Ditch Study Update: The IA’s September 21, 2009, action included the following task: “Authorize staff to commence with a concept study to implement improvements to the West Ditch and Black Swamp utilizing funds remaining in the PD&E budget.” Kimley-Horn has coordinated several meetings with staff from Leon County Public Works, City of Tallahassee Stormwater Management, the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department, City Growth Management, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and the Northwest Florida Water Management District to review issues and discuss options related to possible improvements along and to the West Ditch that affect Black Swamp and Lake Bradford.

Capital Circle Southwest Design: The FDOT Work Program includes $2.7 million in FY 2012 to design Capital Circle Southwest from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. The Board was advised in June that Blueprint would like to extend the contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates to move directly into design once the PD&E Study is complete. FHWA concurs that this action can occur. The design contract with Kimley-Horn is expected to cost approximately $2.3 million, including a 10% contingency. It is the intent of staff to utilize a portion of the $2.7 million (approximately $400,000) for the Blueprint General Engineering Consultant (GEC) project management costs.
OPTIONS:
Option 1: Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate a contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates for design of Capital Circle Southwest from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. The Kimley-Horn contract (including 10% for project contingency) and the Blueprint GEC project management costs are not to exceed $2.7 million.

Option 2: Board direction.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to negotiate a contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates for design of Capital Circle Southwest from Orange Avenue to Springhill Road. The Kimley-Horn contract (including 10% for project contingency) and the Blueprint GEC project management costs are not to exceed $2.7 million.

TCC and CAC Action: The CAC was advised of this proposed action during their review of the FY 2012 Blueprint Capital Budget.

ATTACHMENT(S):
None.
#7.

Smokey Hollow Design Committee
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item advises the Board that Blueprint 2000 is organizing a Design Committee of seven to nine members to assist in identifying concepts and design elements of the Park amenity commemorating the historic Smokey Hollow neighborhood.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
A commemoration of the Smokey Hollow neighborhood within Cascades Park has been included in the Park concept since its adoption; however, no design for the amenity has yet to be approved. It is recommended that a Committee be organized to assist in the identification and concept design of the proposed Smokey Hollow commemoration.

It is proposed that the group be composed of previous residents of the neighborhood, the NAACP and other black community and business leaders, representatives of historic preservation groups, local historians, and others as required.

Staff assistance would be provided by the Planning Department, City Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Affairs, Blueprint 2000, the Riley House Museum, and others as needed.

OPTIONS:
Option 1: Concur in the development of the Smokey Hollow Design Committee.

Option 2: Board guidance.

Action by TCC and CAC:
CAC member Dale Landry offered to serve on the Committee. Incoming CAC member Andrew Chin also offered to assist.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Concur in the development of the Smokey Hollow Design Committee.
#8.

Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

Date: September 19, 2011
Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff
Contact Person: Dave Bright
Type of Item: Consent

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item advises the Intergovernmental Agency on five (5) required appointments to the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Five (5) CAC positions require action.

1. **Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC) Member:** This position is currently filled by Kevin McGorty. Mr. McGorty was initially appointed in February 2004 to complete the term of Kathy Archibald, and was reappointed to full terms in September 2005 and September 2008. As such, he is not eligible for reappointment. The EECC has nominated Henree Martin to the position. Ms. Martin was a member of the original EECC. The appointment term will be through November 2014.

2. **Chair/Representative from the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Commission:** This position is currently filled by Burt Davy, who has resigned his position on the Planning Commission, and therefore is no longer eligible to serve on the CAC. The Planning Commission, at its meeting of September 6, selected Daniel Parker to serve on the CAC. The CAC concurred that the Planning Commission member selected to serve on the CAC be brought to the IA for approval. The appointment term will be through November 2014, or until that Planning Commissioner’s term on the Planning Commission ends.

3. **Representative from the Disabled Community:** This position is currently filled by David Jones of the Florida Outdoor Recreational Association (FDOA), who was appointed on June 21, 2010, to finish the term of Steve Amnot. Mr. Jones has been re-nominated for the position by FDOA. The appointment term will be through November 2014.

4. **Representative from the Education Community:** Blueprint 2000 received notice that Luciano Ramos has accepted a new job out of state and has resigned his position on the CAC as the Education Community representative. Florida A&M University has nominated Dr. Andrew Chin, Assistant Dean of the School of Architecture for the
Dr. Chin’s appointment will complete the term of Mr. Ramos, through November 2013.

5. **Planner - nominated by the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC):** This position is currently filled by Tom O’Steen who was initially appointed in February 2007 to complete the term of Charles Pattison, and was reappointed to a full term in 2008. Mr. O’Steen is eligible for reappointment. The EECC has re-nominated back to the position. The appointment term will be through November 2014.

   **Note:** Mr. O’Steen’s reappointment will require the IA to waive any conflicts that arise as a result of Mr. O’Steen’s employment as a sub-consultant (Moore-Bass Consulting) to Blueprint’s General Engineering Contract with the LPA Group. Pursuant to Section 112.313, Florida Statutes, entitled Standards of Conduct for Public Officers, conflicts of interest may exist when an advisory board member has a contractual relationship with a business entity that does business with Blueprint. In this case, Mr. O’Steen’s employer has a contractual relationship with LPA, which does business with Blueprint. **This conflict can be waived by the IA upon satisfaction of the following two requirements:** a full disclosure to the IA, prior to the waiver, of the transaction or business relationship from which the conflict arises; and an affirmative vote in favor of the waiver by a two-thirds vote of the IA.

**OPTIONS:**

**Option 1:** Approve the following nominations:

- **Representative from the EECC:** Henree Martin
- **Representative from the Planning Commission:** Daniel Parker
- **Representative from the Disabled Community:** David Jones
- **Representative from the Education Community:** Dr. Andrew Chin
- **Representative from the EECC-Planner:** Tom O’Steen

  - Approval of Tom O’Steen includes the required IA waiver of the potential conflict of interest.

**Option 2:** Provide Board guidance.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Approve the following nominations:

- **Representative from the EECC:** Henree Martin
- **Representative from the Planning Commission:** Daniel Parker
- **Representative from the Disabled Community:** David Jones
- **Representative from the Education Community:** Dr. Andrew Chin
- **Representative from the EECC-Planner:** Tom O’Steen

  - Approval of Tom O’Steen includes the required IA waiver of the potential conflict of interest.
Action by TCC and CAC:
Although a quorum was not present at the August 25 meeting, the CAC concurred in the nominations as presented. The nominations were not presented to the TCC.

ATTACHMENTS:
Application form and resumes for each position as appropriate.
From: Henree Martin [mailto:hmartin@nettally.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2011 9:28 PM
To: nancycaire@comcast.net; Bright, David; 'Kathy Archibald'; 'Tom O'Steen'; 'Kevin McGorty'
Cc: Tedder, Wayne (COT)
Subject: RE: CAC Appointments from EECC

**Dave, Go with Tom and myself for the appointments.**
Thanks

From: nancycaire@comcast.net [mailto:nancycaire@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2011 2:47 PM
To: David Bright; Henree Martin; Kathy Archibald; Tom O'Steen; Kevin McGorty
Cc: Tedder, Wayne
Subject: Re: CAC Appointments from EECC

Tom,
Please hang in there especially now that a sales tax extension is under discussion. Henree,
Please help by taking one of these positions.
Nancy

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Bright, David" <David.Bright@blueprint2000.org>
Date: Wed, 8 Jun 2011 16:34:13 -0400
To: Henree Martin<hmartin@nettally.com>; Kathy Archibald<arch7100@earthlink.net>; Tom O'Steen<tosteen@moorebass.com>; <nancycaire@comcast.net>; Kevin McGorty (E-mail)<kmcgorty@ttls.org>
Cc: Tedder, Wayne<wayne.tedder@talgov.com>
Subject: CAC Appointments from EECC

Hello EECC:

An early heads-up that two **EECC CAC** Appointments come due in November, and will need to go to the CAC in August and the IA in September:

**EECC Member** (This has always been an original EECC member) – Currently **Kevin McGorty** serves in this position. Kevin was appointed in Feb. 2004, completing Kathy’s term, and then served two full terms as allowed; but I will never kick him off!! Kevin, how did you survive?

**Planner – appointed by the EECC** – Currently **Tom O'Steen** serves in this position. Tom was appointed in Feb 2007, completing Charles Pattison’s term after he resigned, and then was reappointed in 2008. Tom, you are eligible for re-appointment if you desire.
July 14, 2011

David Bright
Planning Manager
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
2727 Apalachee Parkway
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dear Mr. Bright:

It is my pleasure to appoint Dr. Andrew Chin, Assistant Dean of the School of Architecture at Florida A&M University to the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee. We are proud to have Dr. Chin represent the University and I know that he will contribute greatly to the exchange of ideas on this board.

We are in agreement that it is important that FAMU be a part of the Citizens Advisory Committee given the start up of design construction of the Capital Cascades Trail along FAMU Way. I’m confident that Dr. Chin’s talent, expertise and background will be of benefit to the Advisory Committee as well as to the university.

I am looking forward to the exciting opportunities that will result from Dr. Chin’s participation on the Committee. Thank you for the work you are doing on behalf of our community.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Hughes Harris, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Cc: Dr. Cynthia Hughes Harris, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
Dr. Andrew Chin, Assistant Dean, School of Architecture
Andrew Chin  
Assistant Dean/ Director of Architecture Programs  
Florida A&M University School of Architecture  
1938 South MLK Blvd, Tallahassee, FL 32307  
cell 850.339.8168/ work 850.599.8763  
andrew.chin@famu.edu  

Andrew Chin is the Assistant Dean/Director of the Architecture Programs at the FAMU School of Architecture. Prof Chin is a tenured Associate Professor and has taught at FAMU since 1991. He received a Bachelors and Masters degree in Architecture from the University of Florida, and completed urban design coursework at the Georgia Institute of Technology College of Architecture. Professor Chin is a PhD student at the Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning. His practice includes urban design services for the City of Daytona Beach, Dunnellon, Englis, Newberry, Panacea and Port. St Joe, FL.

Education  
2006-present  Ph.D., Florida State University, Department of Urban & Regional Planning  
1985-88  Master of Architecture, University of Florida, School of Architecture  
1981-85  Bachelor of Design, University of Florida, School of Architecture  

Administration  
2004-present  Assistant Dean/ Director of Professional Programs in Architecture  
Florida A&M University (FAMU) School of Architecture (SOA)  
2003-2004  Director, Graduate & Professional Programs in Architecture, FAMU SOA.  
2002-2003  Director, Bachelor of Architecture Programs, FAMU SOA  

Teaching  
2002-present  Associate Professor, Tenured, Florida A&M University SOA  
1999-02  Assistant Professor, Florida A&M University, School of Architecture  
1996-98  Instructor, Georgia Institute of Technology, College of Architecture  
1993-95  Assistant Professor, Florida A&M University, School of Architecture  
1991-93  Instructor, Florida A&M University, School of Architecture  
1987-88  Instructor, University of Florida, College of Architecture  

Practice  
2002-present  Consultant, Community Visioning + Design (CVD), Tallahassee, FL  
1991  Planning Assistant, City of Fort Lauderdale, Fort Lauderdale, FL.  
1989-89  Intern-Architect, Sender, Tragash, & Alvarino Architects, Miami, FL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Co-Principal Investigator/Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Midtown Redevelopment</td>
<td>Community planning and visioning materials were developed for an African-American community in</td>
<td>City of Daytona Beach Planning Office awarded the proposal $75,000.</td>
<td>Community planning and visioning materials were developed for an African-American community in Daytona Beach. City of Daytona Beach Planning Office awarded the proposal $75,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project: Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Sustainable Architecture</td>
<td>A three-part event will focus on “Green Schools.” The activities include a service learning</td>
<td>Wachovia Bank awarded the proposal $8,000.</td>
<td>A three-part event will focus on “Green Schools.” The activities include a service learning project with local elementary school students, a case study of local schools and a panel discussion with professional architects. Wachovia Bank awarded the proposal $8,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Downtown Nassau</td>
<td>The yearlong project is developing a GIS based master site file of historic sites in the</td>
<td>The AMMC awarded the proposal $15,000.</td>
<td>The yearlong project is developing a GIS based master site file of historic sites in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. The partners include the College of the Bahamas (COB), the Downtown Nassau Partnership (DNP), the Bahamas National GIS Office (BNGIS) and the National Museum of the Bahamas’ Antiquities Monuments and Museum Corporation (AMMC). The AMMC awarded the proposal $15,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Building Sustainable</td>
<td>The FAMU SOA hosted a Day Institute that focused on funded green service learning. Florida</td>
<td>Florida Campus Compact awarded the proposal $12,000.</td>
<td>The FAMU SOA hosted a Day Institute that focused on funded green service learning. Florida Campus Compact awarded the proposal $12,000.</td>
<td>Florida Campus Compact awarded the proposal $12,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Physical Activity and</td>
<td>The work examines the differences in the physical activity of residents of seven Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td>The work examines the differences in the physical activity of residents of seven Tallahassee communities. The work compares the pedestrian activity of residents in suburban cul-de-sac vs. TND neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Caribbean and Latin</td>
<td>The Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) awarded the proposal $3,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) awarded the proposal $3,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Architecture (CLAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Urban Design &amp;</td>
<td>Community planning and visioning materials were developed for small towns (Inglis, Panacea</td>
<td>The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) awarded more than $27,000.</td>
<td>Community planning and visioning materials were developed for small towns (Inglis, Panacea and Newberry) in north and central Florida. The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) awarded more than $27,000.</td>
<td>The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) awarded more than $27,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Urban Design &amp;</td>
<td>A second phase of community planning and visioning materials were developed for the City of</td>
<td>The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) funded the project $6,500.</td>
<td>A second phase of community planning and visioning materials were developed for the City of Port St. Joe, FL. The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) funded the project $6,500.</td>
<td>The State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) funded the project $6,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning Assistance</td>
<td>Port St. Joe, Dunnellon and Panacea) in north and central Florida. The work was awarded $6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04 Urban Design &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honors + Awards
2002 Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP), FAMU School of Graduate Studies
2002 Tenure, FAMU School of Architecture
2002 Promotion to Associate Professor, FAMU School of Architecture
2000 Robert R. Taylor Faculty Research Award, American Collegiate Schools of Architecture
2000 President's Award, National Organization of Minority Architects
1998 Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant - Georgia Institute of Technology COA
1996-98 Graduate Research Fellowship - Georgia Institute of Technology COA
1995 Faculty Development Fellowship – US Department of Education
1985-87 Graduate Minority Fellowship Program - University of Florida
1985 Board of Regents Summer Fellowship - University of Florida
1984 Presidential Leadership Award - University of Florida
1981-85 Presidential Scholarship Award - University of Florida

Conference Papers + Presentations
2010 Why can't Johnny Breath?. Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture National Conference. USC, Los Angeles, CA.
2010 Service Learning. Building Sustainable Communities. Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL.
2006 Asking Tough Questions. Rebuilding the South. Tuskegee Univ, Tuskegee, AL.
2005 Measuring New Urban Diversity. ACSA Southeast Regional Meeting. Clemson, SC.
2005 Measuring New Urban Diversity. CELA National Meeting Athens, GA.
2003 Diversity & Neo-Traditional Planning. 91st ACSA Annual Meeting. Lexington, KY
2001 The Collection, the Vernacular & the Sacred. ACSA SE Regional Meeting. Atlanta, GA.
2000 Learning from the Everyday, Florida Historic Trust Annual Meeting, Tallahassee, FL

Conference Moderator + Reviewer
2011 Symposium Organizer. Building Sustainable Communities: Green Schools. FAMU SOA, Tallahassee, FL.
2010 Symposium Organizer. Building Sustainable Communities: Service Learning. FAMU SOA, Tallahassee, FL.
2009 Moderator + Reviewer. ACSA Southeast Regional Fall Conference. SCAD., Savannah, GA.
2008 Paper Reviewer. 96th ACSA National Meeting. Houston, TX.
Guest Lecturer

2001 Race and Urban Structure, School of Arch. Lecture Series, Mississippi State Univ.
2000 Displacement, M.Arch. Symposium/ Lecture Series, Florida A&M University
1998 Centered on the Margin, Dept of Architecture Lecture Series, Tuskegee University

Guest Critic

Clemson University Georgia Institute of Technology
Southern Polytechnic University Savannah College of Art and Design
Tuskegee University University of Florida
University of South Florida University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Service

2010 Judson University, Architecture Program Advisory Council
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Florida Network
Florida Campus Compact (FCC), STEM Day Institute, Grant Proposal Reviewer
Florida A&M University, Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
Florida A&M University, Lyceum Committee
Florida A&M University, Space Committee
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair
Abundant Life Fellowship Church, Elder

2009 Judson University, Architecture Program Advisory Council
Florida A&M University, Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
Florida A&M University, Lyceum Committee
Florida A&M University, Space Committee
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair
Abundant Life Fellowship Church, Elder

2008 American Collegiate Schools of Architecture, Southeast Regional Director
American Institute of Architects, Committee on Education, ACSA Representative
Florida A&M University, Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
Florida A&M University, Lyceum Committee
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair

2007 American Collegiate Schools of Architecture, Southeast Regional Director
American Institute of Architects Committee on Education, ACSA Representative
Florida A&M University Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair

2006 Florida A&M University, Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
Florida A&M University, Graduate QEP Committee
Florida A&M University, Graduate Academic Policies Review Committee
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair
FAMU School of Architecture, Undergraduate Council Chair
Tallahassee Trust for Historic Preservation, Chairman

2005 Florida A&M University, Graduate Council, School of Architecture Representative
FAMU School of Architecture, Graduate Council Co-Chair
FAMU School of Architecture, Undergraduate Council Chair
Tallahassee Trust for Historic Preservation, Chairman
Bright, David

From: David Jones [davidjones@fdoa.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Bright, David
Subject: RE: Blueprint CAC

Yes I would like to stay for reappointment.
Thanks

From: Bright, David [mailto:David.Bright@blueprint2000.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2011 1:53 PM
To: David Jones
Cc: Lamar Taylor
Subject: Blueprint CAC

Hey David, I hope you are well. Let me know what your decision is on being reappointed to the CAC. I am beginning to get the agenda items prepared for our meeting in a few weeks. Thanks, Dave

Dave Bright
Planning Manager
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency
2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

david.bright@blueprint2000.org

850.219.1060
850.219.1098 (fax)

www.blueprint2000.org
#9.

Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project Update and Funding Authorization Modification
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the Board on the status of the flood relief project along Franklin Boulevard. The Agenda Item requests that additional funding be allocated to the project for box culvert construction, roadway redesign and reconstruction, and to allow for the construction of a sidewalk.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
Recent activities and issues include:

- A Special TCC meeting was held to discuss modeling, design, permitting and construction issues with several City and County departments and staff.
- Several discussions have been held with COT Electric. Their overhead facilities will be temporarily relocated to the southbound inside lane to meet OSHA safety requirements during construction. OSHA requires a 10-foot clearance from all electrical conductors.
- The current construction approach is to use the northbound lanes as a construction staging area with construction from the east side of the ditch. Lane closures and detours will be required.
- The end result of the project will be a landscaped median on top of the concrete box culvert (See the attached Typical Section – Phase 1).
- Sidewalks and turn lanes are desired by the surrounding neighborhood, and are included in the ultimate design. Current HUD funding is only for the interim drainage improvements (box culvert). The inclusion of sidewalks in this project is being reviewed for feasibility and funding.
- Agencies requiring permits are City of Tallahassee, FDOT, FDEP, and the Army Corps of Engineers.
- The proposed temporary drainage design meets federal requirements for floodplain conditions, but approvals will still be required with FEMA in the future, before implementation of the ultimate drainage scheme.
- Blueprint has been approved for the fast-track permitting process for the COT permits.
- The Natural Features Inventory (NFI) has been submitted to and approved by COT Growth Management.
- The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been prepared, reviewed by Blueprint, and is currently under review by COT Growth Management.
100% Construction Documents have been prepared and submitted to Leon County and the City of Tallahassee for review and comment. A public meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 27, 2011, at 5:00 pm at the Brokaw-McDougall House to review the construction plans, schedule, and construction-related impacts.

The design is scheduled to be completed in September; permits received by November; followed by Invitation for Construction Bids. Construction Notice-to-Proceed is anticipated in December 2011 or January 2012. Construction would be complete in August 2012.

The CAC was advised that the currently estimated cost of project construction as designed will exceed the funds remaining from the HUD/DCA grant, and authorized by the Board.

Previous Board Action: The Board took the following action at its June 20, 2011, meeting:

Option 1: Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project at a cost not to exceed $3,600,000 which includes 20% for CE&I 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.
2. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and approve a scope and fee with the CE&I firm selected under a separate procurement.

Funding Requirements/Increase: As noted above in the Board’s previous action, $3,600,000 remains from the HUD Grant to construct the box culvert and reconstruct the roadway in its current location. However, the development of the design and additional site investigations revealed that the project would require an additional $1,800,000, which brings the current cost estimate for those base activities to $5,400,000 (including 20% contingency and CE&I). The increased costs are due to the necessity to reconstruct the northbound roadway (previously only milling and resurfacing was anticipated) and to install the box culvert in difficult soils and ground water conditions adjacent to overhead electric lines and underground gas utilities.

In addition, if the Board desires to reconstruct the northbound roadway 10 feet to the west (to accommodate a future sidewalk on the east side), the budget will need to be further increased by $200,000 for redesign and an additional $700,000 for construction (additional quantities, etc.). The northbound roadway shift will accommodate a 10-foot wide inside lane, 13-foot wide outside lane and a future 6-foot sidewalk (See the attached Typical Section - Phase 2). If the Board concurs with this approach, the total increase to the project budget will need to be $2,700,000 bringing the total authorization to $6,300,000.

Blueprint has received verbal approval from DCA that it will receive an additional $1,650,000 in HUD funds to construct the Box Culvert planned between South Monroe Street and South Adams Street. These additional HUD Grant Funds will help to mitigate the increased funding requests for the Franklin Boulevard project. A potential source to fund construction of the sidewalk on the east side is the CRTPA.
CAC Action: Although a quorum was not present, the CAC members in attendance concurred that the proposal to reconstruct the northbound lanes further to the west to accommodate a sidewalk on the east side of the road was the proper action to pursue. This action would help improve the pedestrian connectivity from the neighborhoods to Cascades Park.

OPTIONS:

Option 1A: Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project at a cost not to exceed $5,400,000 ($1,800,000 more than currently authorized), which includes 20% for CE&I 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.
   2. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and approve a scope and fee with the CE&I firm selected under a separate procurement.

Option 1B: Based on input received through TCC members and City/County staff, authorize Blueprint to redesign the northbound roadway 10 feet to the west (at a cost of up to $200,000) which will accommodate a 10-foot wide inside lane, 13-foot wide outside lane and a future 6-foot sidewalk, and negotiate a Construction Change Order with the selected construction firm at a cost not to exceed $700,000, bringing the total authorization to $6,300,000. Direct staff to work with the CRTPA to identify a funding source for the sidewalk on the east side.

Option 2: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Option 1A: Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project at a cost not to exceed $5,400,000 ($1,800,000 more than currently authorized), which includes 20% for CE&I 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.
   2. Authorize the IMC to negotiate and approve a scope and fee with the CE&I firm selected under a separate procurement.

Option 1B: Based on input received through TCC members and City/County staff, authorize Blueprint to redesign the northbound roadway 10 feet to the west (at a cost of up to $200,000) which will accommodate a 10-foot wide inside lane, 13-foot wide outside lane and a future 6-foot sidewalk, and negotiate a Construction Change Order with the selected construction firm at a cost not to exceed $700,000, bringing the total authorization to $6,300,000. Direct staff to work with the CRTPA to identify a funding source for the sidewalk on the east side.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment 1: Roadway Typical Section - Phase 1
Attachment 2: Roadway Typical Section - Phase 2
FRANKLIN BOULEVARD ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS
PHASE 1 - TYPICAL SECTION
FRANKLIN BOULEVARD ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

PHASE 2: TYPICAL SECTION
#10.

Approval of Resolution No. 2011-13
Authorizing Issuance of Not to Exceed $40,000,000 Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Refunding Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBJECT/TITLE:</strong></th>
<th>Approval of Resolution No. 2011-13 Authorizing Issuance of Not to Exceed $40,000,000 Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Refunding Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>September 19, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested By:</strong></td>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Person:</strong></td>
<td>Wayne Tedder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Item:</strong></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**
The Blueprint Finance Committee met to discuss the possible refinancing of a portion of the outstanding Leon County-City of Tallahassee Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency Refunding Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2003. It is expected that such action could save the Agency up to $2 million per year in debt service costs, which would then be able to go toward projects.

More detailed information will be provided to the Board at the September IA meeting.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
**Option 1:** Approval of Resolution No. 2011-13.

**Option 2:** Board Guidance

**Action by TCC and CAC:**
Not presented to either Committee.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
Resolution No. 2011-13
#11.

Cascades Park Update
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item updates the Committees and the Board as to construction activities underway at Cascades Park.

Recent and upcoming construction activities include:
- Box culvert is being extended approximately 800 linear feet north through the Upper Park and under the Franklin/Lafayette intersection to near Pensacola Street; 1,800 linear feet of box culvert has been installed. The FDOT Parking Lot off of Suwannee Street will reopen in October. Lafayette Street/Franklin Boulevard are expected to reopen in March 2012. Coordination continues with the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief Project and Leon County’s Lafayette Street stormwater project.
- Stormwater components related to the alum chemical treatment system and trash and debris vaults are under construction.
- Work continues toward the re-contouring and completion of Boca Chuba Pond, and other site grading and sidewalk/multi-use trail construction in the Lower Park.
- Retaining walls are under construction in the area of the Bloxham Promenade, which is the location of the restroom facility, the water play/dancing fountain, and the Cascades Fountain.
- Smokey Hollow: A working group is being formed to help determine the commemoration for Smokey Hollow. A period house has been offered by the Philadelphia Primitive Baptist Church for relocation to the Park. A feasibility and cost analysis for moving and renovating the house is underway.
- Dancing Fountain: A cost proposal has been requested for potential enhancement to the fountain to include multi-colored lighting and the ability to be synchronized to music.
- Funded construction activates are due to be complete in October 2012.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
No action requested; presented for information only.

Action by TCC and CAC:
Presented for information only.

ATTACHMENT(S):
Photos of ongoing construction activities to date will be shown at the IA meeting.
#12.
Adoption of the
FY 2012 Blueprint
Operating Budget &
Resolution No.
2011-11
STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
The Blueprint 2000 Budget Policy, approved by the Intergovernmental Agency Board on June 17, 2002, provides a procedure for the adoption of the annual operating budget.

This agenda item presents the Proposed FY 2012 Operating Budget and the Budget Resolution to the IA for adoption.

- A Public Hearing is advertised and scheduled for 5:30 pm at the September 19 IA meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
At the June 20, 2011, meeting of the Intergovernmental Agency, the Board was presented the Proposed FY 2012 Operating Budget for their review and comment. There were no changes recommended by the Board.

A Public Hearing was advertised and held at 5:30 pm during the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on June 2, 2011. There were no speakers. **A second public hearing on the recommended budget will be conducted on September 19, 2011, at 5:30 pm prior to the Board’s adoption of the FY 2012 Operating Budget and approval of the Budget Resolution (Attachment 1).** The Board’s action will formally appropriate the funds for the FY 2012 Operating Budget, which commences October 1, 2011.

- Changes to the Budget from FY 2011 are highlighted on Attachment 2.
- The Director recommends that pay increases be determined by the jurisdiction in which the employee’s benefits are provided (i.e., if the employee receives City benefits, then City salary adjustments would control.)

It should be noted that due to the departure of the Blueprint Executive Director and retirement of the Blueprint Finance Manager, it is anticipated that there will be upwards of $200,000 remaining in the FY 2011 Operating Budget. Staff has been approached by the City Parks and Recreation Department to determine if any funds are available to assist with necessary improvements to establish a maintenance facility at Cascades Park. More specifically, the Parks and Recreation Department is seeking to transition the Construction Management office into the maintenance facilities for the Park. Staff is recommending that remaining FY 2011 Operating Budget dollars be utilized to assist Parks and Recreation with the appropriate transition of the facilities. To date, estimates for the needed improvements are between $200,000 - $230,000.
Options:
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget as presented and approve the FY 2012 Operating Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2011-11).

Option 2: Revise and adopt the FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget and approve the FY 2012 Operating Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2011-11).

Option 3: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2012 Blueprint Operating Budget as presented and approve the FY 2012 Operating Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2011-11).

ACTION BY THE CAC:
The CAC had no comments on the proposed FY 2012 Operating Budget at their June 2, 2011, meeting. The CAC again discussed the FY 2012 Operating Budget at their August 25 meeting, and those in attendance concurred with the transfer of remaining FY 2011 Operating funds to the maintenance facility for Cascades Park.

ATTACHMENT(S):
(1) FY 2012 Operating Budget Resolution
(2) FY 2012 Budget Comparison
(3) FY 2012 Budget Narrative
WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency’s Budget Policy 102, Section 06, subsection B(2), requires the Intergovernmental Agency to adopt an annual operating budget and appropriate funding for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Agency has acknowledged the receipt of sales tax revenue to fund expenses for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2011, and ending September 30, 2012;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, hereby approves and adopts the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2012 as reflected below, and that all incomplete project balances, requisitions, and encumbrances from prior years will automatically be re-appropriated.

**Blueprint 2000 FY 2012 Budget Summary**

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>$791,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$296,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Liability Premium</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Cost</td>
<td>$54,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Engr. Consultant</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recurring Operations</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,966,496</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Capital Projects</td>
<td>$1,814,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$14,981,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB Loan Transfer</td>
<td>$4,583,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,380,464</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses** $23,346,960

**Source of Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Proceeds</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenues** $23,346,960
Adopted this 19th day of September, 2011.

Tallahassee/Leon County, Florida

By: _________________________
Bryan Desloge, Chairman
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency

By: _________________________
Jim Cooke, Interim Treasurer-Clerk
City of Tallahassee

Approved as to Form:

By: _________________________
Maribel Nicholson-Choice
Blueprint 2000 General Counsel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2010 Actual</th>
<th>FY2011 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY2012 Proposed</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511000 Salaries</td>
<td>$543,139</td>
<td>$552,744</td>
<td>$540,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511500 Temp wages</td>
<td>$10,568</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512000 Overtime</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,117</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512400 Other Salary Items</td>
<td>$12,015</td>
<td>$11,859</td>
<td>$11,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515000 Pension-current</td>
<td>$49,643</td>
<td>$61,452</td>
<td>$61,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515100 Pension-MAP</td>
<td>$37,645</td>
<td>$39,974</td>
<td>$39,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515500 Social Security</td>
<td>$1,722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515600 Mandatory Medicare</td>
<td>$8,761</td>
<td>$10,858</td>
<td>$7,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516000 Health Benefits &amp; Life</td>
<td>$48,672</td>
<td>$51,374</td>
<td>$51,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Health Benefits Retirees</td>
<td>$17,091</td>
<td>$16,676</td>
<td>$16,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516100 Flex Benefits</td>
<td>$11,878</td>
<td>$11,808</td>
<td>$11,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512000 County's Worker Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>$117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Services</strong></td>
<td>$741,134</td>
<td>$803,862</td>
<td>$791,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521010 Advertising</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521030 Reproduction</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521040 Professional Fees/Services</td>
<td>$84,252</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$70,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.Audit, Fin. Audit, Fin. Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Disclosure Serv. ERD, and Internal Control Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521100 Equipment Repairs</td>
<td>$5,006</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521160 Legal Services</td>
<td>$15,790</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521180 Uncl. Contractual Services</td>
<td>$18,540</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521190 Computer Software</td>
<td>$5,607</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522080 Telephone</td>
<td>$1,980</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$20,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523020 Food</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523050 Postage</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523060 Office Supplies</td>
<td>$13,583</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523080 Unclassified Supplies</td>
<td>$1,587</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523100 Vehicle Non-Garage</td>
<td>$3,834</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524010 Travel and Training</td>
<td>$2,066</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524020 Journals and Books</td>
<td>$3,158</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524030 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524050 Rental of Office Space</td>
<td>$98,059</td>
<td>$97,821</td>
<td>$102,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524080 Unclassified charges</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$259,743</td>
<td>$354,821</td>
<td>$296,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>FY2010 Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 Amended</td>
<td>FY2012 Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540040 Liability Insurance Premium</td>
<td>$19,123</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Svcs/Charges</td>
<td>$19,123</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550030 Office Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550040 Computer Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550060 Unclassified Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560010 Human Resource Expense</td>
<td>$5,919</td>
<td>$6,078</td>
<td>$6,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560020 Accounting Expense</td>
<td>$40,680</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560030 Purchasing Expense</td>
<td>$5,348</td>
<td>$32,545</td>
<td>$32,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560040 Information Systems Exp. Alloc. Costs</td>
<td>$51,947</td>
<td>$54,823</td>
<td>$54,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Inter-fund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Eng. Consultant</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>$1,871,947</td>
<td>$2,036,506</td>
<td>$1,966,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612400 Other Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$6,356,290</td>
<td>$1,814,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611300 Debt Service Transfer</td>
<td>$14,984,256</td>
<td>$14,983,606</td>
<td>$14,981,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB Loan</td>
<td>$4,583,685</td>
<td>$4,583,685</td>
<td>$4,583,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for Future Years</td>
<td>$53,252,649</td>
<td>$55,841,736</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$75,492,537</td>
<td>$83,801,823</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Fund Balance</td>
<td>$48,366,753</td>
<td>$55,841,736</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Proceeds</td>
<td>$27,125,784</td>
<td>$27,960,087</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$75,492,537</td>
<td>$83,801,823</td>
<td>$23,346,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount was transferred to capital fund (308) in 2011.
2012 Budget Narrative

511000 **Salaries**- The Interim Director recommends that pay increases be determined by the Jurisdiction in which the employee’s benefits are provided (i.e., if the employee receives City benefits, then City salary adjustments would control.).

511500 Temp wages includes Intern during the summer $10,000 and $10,000 for temporary help to assist in scanning of documents. There is also $25,000 Included for temporary legal assistance.

512400- These costs are determined by the City and County to cover the cost of their respective fringe benefit packages

516100 Fringe benefit packages.

516100 This is the charge to Blueprint to cover the cost of the City’s share of future employees’ health Benefits.

512000 Overtime for Admin Asst and OPS staff

521010 **Advertising**- Public hearing notices, news releases, etc.

521030 **Reproduction**- Annual Financial Reports, copies, letterhead, agenda items, etc.

521040 **Unclassified Professional Fees** - Financial Audit $25,000, Performance Audit $25,000, Financial Advisor $10,000, Bond Information Services $6,000, and misc. $4,200

521100 **Equipment Repairs** - copier maintenance contract and copies, recording equipment, power point projector no longer on warranty, fax machine.

521160 **Legal Services** - Outside General Counsel Attorney services for IA and Blueprint

521180 **Unclassified Contract Services** - two FSU planning interns $16,384 and $4000 misc.

521190 **Computer Software** - Annual software maintenance and licenses.

522080 **Telephone**- Blueprint office telephone / internet services and 3 cell phones

523020 **Food** - 6 CAC meetings, workgroup meetings, lunch meetings, and 1 evening IA meeting

523060 **Office supplies** – Office supplies, printer toner, paper, and general office needs.

523080 **Unclassified Supplies**- items such as surge protectors, safety vests

523100 **Vehicle - Non Garage** - Repairs and service on 3 Vehicles. Average age of vehicles is 10 years

524010 **Travel and Training** –Continuing education training, Florida Communities Trust related seminars and Florida Bar conferences.

524020 **Journals and Books** - legal subscriptions

524030 **Memberships** - dues Florida Bar dues and etc.

524050 **Rent Expense** - The amount reflected is based on our lease.

524080 **Unclassified Charges** - Paying Agent charges


560010-40 Blueprint’s share of Allocated Costs. Accounting Services expense increase is to bring the charge inline with actual usage.

612400 General Engineering Consultant $800,000 and transfer of sales tax revenue to Capital Project.
Adoption of Fiscal Year 2012-2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, Budget Resolution No. 2011-12, & the 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan
Agenda Item

SUBJECT/TITLE: Adoption of Fiscal Year 2012-2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, Budget Resolution No. 2011-12, and the 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan

Date: September 19, 2011  Requested By: Blueprint 2000 Staff  Contact Person: Wayne Tedder  Type of Item: Discussion and Public Hearing (IA)

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:
This item requests the Board’s approval of the FY 2012-2016 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the adoption of the Budget Resolution (Attachment 1), appropriation of FY 2012 of the CIP, and presents the FY 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan (NSTAP).

- A Public Hearing is advertised and scheduled for 5:30 pm at the September 19 IA meeting.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
The CIP will implement the approved NSTAP (a revised version of the adopted Blueprint Master Plan). The NSTAP is based on a cash flow forecast of projected sales tax revenues through the entire program. It was the recommendation of the Finance Committee and Financial Advisor to utilize the same rates as the City and the County. The current model includes a revised growth rate of 1.0% in FY 2012, 1.0% in FY 2013, 1.5% in FY 2014, 2.0% in FY 2015 and 3% to FY 2020. The Finance Committee met on January 27, 2011. Both City and County Budget staff feel that the outlying year’s sales tax revenues are low, but a conservative approach is prudent given the unknowns with the current economy.

Due to the diminishing number of funded projects, staff is looking to simplify the budgeting process. In short, staff is proposing a five-year capital improvement program (CIP) as well as a planned allocation of sales tax dollars through 2020 based on existing and estimated net sales tax revenues. Attachment #2 provides an up-to-date (as of June 30, 2011) accounting of (net) sales tax revenues as well as estimated net revenues for years 2012 through 2020. The estimated sales tax revenues do not include interest income, and assume a flat operating budget is maintained.

The previously adopted Master Plan (September 2010) was used heavily to derive the proposed 2012-2016 CIP (Attachment #3) and the 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan (Attachment #4). Staff continues to work with the City Accounting Department to validate the transition to the proposed format, but believes it to be in an acceptable format for public review and comment.

2012-2016 Capital Improvement Plan
The proposed 2012-2016 CIP identifies a number of current projects that are near completion and should have dollars remaining that can be transferred to other projects once the projects are closed. The projects near completion and the estimated amount of remaining dollars available for reprogramming are:
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Project | Estimated Reserves
--- | ---
Lake Lafayette Floodplain | $857,763
BP2000 Land Bank | $160,255
CCNW I-10 – US-90 (N-1) | $2,309,108
CCSE Connie Dr. – Tram Rd (E-1) | $77,326
CCSE Tram Rd – Woodville Hwy (E-2) | $50,000
CCSW Crawfordville Rd to Orange Ave (PD&E) | $431,236
**Total** | **$3,885,688**

Staff anticipates a number of these projects can be closed out by January 2012. As these projects are closed, staff will seek guidance from the CAC and IA on appropriate utilization of the remaining funds.

In an effort to more clearly articulate individual projects and their associated costs, the proposed CIP and NSTAP both begin to clearly define the scope of each project. Additionally, phases of projects are broken out (i.e., PD&E, Design, Right-of-way, Construction and Project Management) where possible.

The proposed 5 year CIP includes the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Quality /Sensitive Lands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality City</td>
<td>$8,913,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality County</td>
<td>$2,303,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters of the St Marks River</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Projects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCNW - US 90 to 1,300’ north of Orange Ave. (Construction and Project Management)</td>
<td>$52,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSW - Crawfordville Hwy. to Orange Ave. (Design and Project Management)</td>
<td>$2,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascades Trail Segment 1 Flood Relief (Construction)</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascades Park (Continuation of construction)</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 (Design, ROW Acquisition and Construction)</td>
<td>$22,645,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascades Connector Bridge (Construction and Project Management)</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cascades Trail Segment 4 (Design)</td>
<td>$1,824,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA Project Management (Segments 1-4)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$117,645,079</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIP Issues
Capital Circle NW/SW - US 90 to 1,300’ north of Orange Ave. – While policy allows staff to shift dollars to phases within a project, staff is requesting consent from the IA to shift $43,100,000 of remaining funds to the Construction phase. A Request for Bids is anticipated to be issued by the end of 2011. Staff is requesting the IA accept and allocate $9,200,000 from FDOT to this segment of Capital Circle.

Capital Circle SW - Crawfordville Hwy. to Orange Ave. – Staff is requesting the IA accept and allocate $2,708,000 from FDOT to this segment of Capital Circle. The funds are specifically designated for design and project management for the segment from Springhill Road to Orange Avenue.

Capital Cascades Trail Segment 1 Flood Relief – The City is utilizing $4.2 million of HUD disaster relief funds to reduce the flooding along Franklin Boulevard. A preliminary cost analysis has indicated that the construction project cost could be as high as $5.7 million. The proposed CIP and NSTAP allocate additional funds to Franklin Boulevard to ensure that the full cost of the project is funded. Additionally, the preliminary engineering analysis indicates that both northbound lanes will have to be reconstructed after the box culverts are installed. Staff also seeks authorization to analyze alternatives to determine if the northbound lanes can be shifted to the west consistent with the intended final plan for this corridor so that a sidewalk possibly could be constructed and so future cost savings can be realized. Due to the significant time constraints of the HUD grant’s required completion date, sufficient time may not exist for staff to request changes to the scope of the project before the next IA meeting (February 2012). Staff is requesting Board direction on an appropriate action that will allow redesign and construction should such change in scope is deemed reasonable and appropriate. Blueprint has been working closely with the City and County and the TCC in the ongoing development of this project.

Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3 - While policy allows staff to shift dollars to phases within a project, staff is requesting consent from the IA to shift $5 million of remaining funds to the ROW Acquisition phase and $1,889,989 to Segment 4 consistent with authorization in September 2007. Additionally, Blueprint has worked through the City and County to submit for additional HUD disaster relief funds for the Box Culvert Project from South Monroe Street to west of South Adams Street. While no official award has been provided, Blueprint staff has assumed that such funds ($1.65 million) will be made available during FY 2012. If the grant is not approved by DCA, staff will come back to the IA with a recommended option to address the projected revenue loss before a construction contract is executed.

LPA Group Engineering Services (Segments 1 through 4) – While the Management Review Report suggested renegotiation of certain Letters of Authorization (LOA), staff is ensuring that appropriate funds are made available for the design and construction of all segments of Capital Cascades Trail. These allocations will ensure an appropriate range of funds to allow the review and renegotiation of the LOAs as needed.
Total expenditures planned within fiscal years 2012-2016 is $117,645,079.

2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan
While the Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan shows projects in a different format, Blueprint currently is not recommending any major changes to the Blueprint Master Plan adopted in September 2010. The greatest change is a reduction of estimated revenues for Cascade Segments 3 and 4 from approximately $92,000,000 (in 2010) to approximately $41,000,000 (for all projects within Segments 3 and 4) based on anticipated reductions in sales tax revenues over the next eight years.

Lastly, the proposed 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan allocates any remaining sales tax funds to Capital Cascades Trail Segments 3 and 4. At this time, the project costs for Segments 3 and 4 are undetermined, as the project is not fully designed. It will be 2012 before any final costs are determined for Segment 3. However, staff has identified estimated construction costs in the CIP for planning purposes. Once a final cost has been determined, staff will fully update the Committees and identify any needed changes to the CIP and Allocation Plan.

The total estimated net sales tax revenues available for all projects for years 2012-2020 is $49,000,000.

Options:
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2012-FY 2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2012 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt the Budget Resolution (Attachment 1).

Option 2: Revise and adopt the FY 2012-FY 2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2012 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt Resolution No. 2011-12 (Attachment 1).

Option 3: Board Guidance

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Option 1: Adopt the FY 2012-FY 2016 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2012 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt Resolution No. 2011-12 (Attachment 1).

ACTION BY TCC and CAC:
In June, both committees reviewed the proposed Capital Improvement Plan and Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan. They were advised of the outstanding issues related to reallocation of funds remaining in nearly completed projects and the funding available and required for the Capital Circle NW/SW (N-2) project. A Public Hearing was advertised and held at 5:30 pm during the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on June 2, 2011.

The CAC again reviewed the draft FY 2012 Budget at its August 25 meeting, especially as related to funding requirements of the Capital Circle NW/SW project and the Franklin Boulevard Flood Relief project. No additional action was taken by the CAC members in attendance.
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ATTACHMENTS:
(1) FY 2012 Capital Budget Resolution (Resolution No. 2011-12)
(2) Existing and Estimated Net Sales Tax Revenues
(3) 2012-2016 Capital Improvement Plan
(4) 2012-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan
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, 2011, and ending September 30, 2012,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency, hereby approves and adopts the budget for Fiscal Year 2012 as reflected below, and that all incomplete project balances, requisitions, and encumbrances from prior years will automatically be re-appropriated.

Blueprint 2000 Fiscal Year 2012 Capital Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0100234</td>
<td>Water Quality City</td>
<td>$1,662,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100235</td>
<td>Water Quality County</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-760</td>
<td>CCNW - US 90 to 1,300’ north of Orange Ave.</td>
<td>$9,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100227</td>
<td>CCSW - Crawfordville Hwy. to Orange Ave.</td>
<td>$2,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-747</td>
<td>Capital Cascades Trail Segment 1 Flood Relief</td>
<td>$2,264,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100978</td>
<td>Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3</td>
<td>$11,240,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000612</td>
<td>Capital Cascades Connector Bridge (construction)</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-757</td>
<td>Program Management (LPA Group)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$30,724,354</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blueprint 2000 Fiscal Year 2012 Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Taxes</td>
<td>$14,166,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Advanced Repayment</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Funds (Project 03-760)</td>
<td>$9,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Funds (Project 0100227)</td>
<td>$2,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREF Grant</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,724,354</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted this 19th day of September, 2011.

Tallahassee/Leon County, Florida

By: ______________________________   By: _________________________
Bryan Desloge, Chairman     Jim Cooke, Interim Treasurer-Clerk
Blueprint 2000 Intergovernmental Agency     City of Tallahassee

Attest:

Approved as to Form:

By: ____________________________
Maribel Nicholson-Choice
Blueprint 2000 General Counsel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actualized Sales Tax Revenues</strong></td>
<td>28,800,402.0</td>
<td>36,779,013.0</td>
<td>42,791,807.0</td>
<td>50,480,716.0</td>
<td>50,988,407.0</td>
<td>58,400,338.0</td>
<td>67,699,394.0</td>
<td>77,300,948.0</td>
<td>89,276,712.0</td>
<td>91,547,336.0</td>
<td>107,676,380.18</td>
<td>110,342,345.72</td>
<td>123,334,680.00</td>
<td>137,064,937.0</td>
<td>151,464,140.00</td>
<td>167,034,720.00</td>
<td>182,275,138.00</td>
<td>200,224,908.00</td>
<td>217,447,795.00</td>
<td>239,225,910.00</td>
<td>261,929,901.00</td>
<td>285,874,319.00</td>
<td>311,634,797.00</td>
<td>340,975,091.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FDOT Advance Repayments</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,117,545.27</td>
<td>17,577,227.02</td>
<td>20,600,020.00</td>
<td>24,077,445.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenues</strong></td>
<td>24,204,841.0</td>
<td>31,620,198.2</td>
<td>30,988,776.9</td>
<td>29,592,970.8</td>
<td>27,826,546.2</td>
<td>27,125,783.8</td>
<td>24,294,944.0</td>
<td>25,023,792.32</td>
<td>25,774,506.09</td>
<td>26,547,741.27</td>
<td>4,557,362.25</td>
<td>5,037,776.90</td>
<td>6,722,300.00</td>
<td>7,753,297.00</td>
<td>8,753,297.00</td>
<td>9,753,297.00</td>
<td>10,753,297.00</td>
<td>11,753,297.00</td>
<td>12,753,297.00</td>
<td>13,753,297.00</td>
<td>14,753,297.00</td>
<td>15,753,297.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bond/Loan Proceeds</strong></td>
<td>3,500,000.0</td>
<td>5,527,642.79</td>
<td>9,027,642.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Reserves</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service Reserves</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses (future at 2011 levels)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service Repayments</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenues available for projects</strong></td>
<td>3,411,498.16</td>
<td>218,029.66</td>
<td>(309,205.76)</td>
<td>(18,672,439.46)</td>
<td>18,771,945.01</td>
<td>17,396,871.26</td>
<td>16,206,263.00</td>
<td>14,757,781.74</td>
<td>13,018,677.19</td>
<td>10,651,926.06</td>
<td>4,557,362.25</td>
<td>5,037,776.90</td>
<td>6,722,300.00</td>
<td>7,753,297.00</td>
<td>8,753,297.00</td>
<td>9,753,297.00</td>
<td>10,753,297.00</td>
<td>11,753,297.00</td>
<td>12,753,297.00</td>
<td>13,753,297.00</td>
<td>14,753,297.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Available for Projects</strong></td>
<td>3,411,498.16</td>
<td>218,029.66</td>
<td>(309,205.76)</td>
<td>(18,672,439.46)</td>
<td>18,771,945.01</td>
<td>17,396,871.26</td>
<td>16,206,263.00</td>
<td>14,757,781.74</td>
<td>13,018,677.19</td>
<td>10,651,926.06</td>
<td>4,557,362.25</td>
<td>5,037,776.90</td>
<td>6,722,300.00</td>
<td>7,753,297.00</td>
<td>8,753,297.00</td>
<td>9,753,297.00</td>
<td>10,753,297.00</td>
<td>11,753,297.00</td>
<td>12,753,297.00</td>
<td>13,753,297.00</td>
<td>14,753,297.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not include future interest earnings

Does not include any future grants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget to Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Needed Funding</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2012-2016 CIP</th>
<th>Capital Funding Needs Beyond 2016</th>
<th>Funding Allocated 2012-2016</th>
<th>Funding Allocated 2017-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0100234</td>
<td>Water Quality Project City</td>
<td>9,359,491.00</td>
<td>646,732.94</td>
<td>25,000,000.00</td>
<td>15,640,509.00</td>
<td>1,695,023</td>
<td>1,851,007</td>
<td>1,924,389</td>
<td>6,728,841</td>
<td>6,728,841</td>
<td>6,728,841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100235</td>
<td>Water Quality Project County</td>
<td>21,468,990.00</td>
<td>8,112,682.30</td>
<td>22,795,579.00</td>
<td>3,503,091.00</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>303,679</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,503,091</td>
<td>3,503,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03754</td>
<td>NFIP/WNDC Partnership</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>802,580.24</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100288</td>
<td>Headwaters of St. Marks</td>
<td>4,871,390.00</td>
<td>1,510,954.29</td>
<td>10,470,221.00</td>
<td>5,982,831.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102289</td>
<td>Lake Jackson Basin</td>
<td>2,770,000.00</td>
<td>1,510,954.29</td>
<td>2,770,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104137</td>
<td>Fred George Branch</td>
<td>2,770,000.00</td>
<td>1,510,954.29</td>
<td>2,770,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105059</td>
<td>Lake Lafayette Floodplain</td>
<td>2,250,000.00</td>
<td>2,250,000.00</td>
<td>1,392,237.00</td>
<td>873,972</td>
<td>382,889</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010756</td>
<td>Bluegrass 2020 Land Bank</td>
<td>3,507,034.00</td>
<td>9,550,034.00</td>
<td>8,389,779.00</td>
<td>9,389,779.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010757</td>
<td>Sensitive Lands - Project Mgmt</td>
<td>480,447.00</td>
<td>9,637,796.00</td>
<td>9,637,796.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010790</td>
<td>CCWUS US09 to Orange Ave (N-2)</td>
<td>10,698,632.00</td>
<td>48,145,707.59</td>
<td>56,932,924.10</td>
<td>54,385,767.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03760</td>
<td>Design and ROW</td>
<td>13,070,000.00</td>
<td>43,100,000.00</td>
<td>10,470,221.00</td>
<td>5,982,831.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100225</td>
<td>CCSE Tram Rd to Woodville HWY (E-2)</td>
<td>38,355,603.00</td>
<td>1,115,691.90</td>
<td>38,305,603.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100226</td>
<td>CCSE Woodville Hwy to Crawford Rd (E-3)</td>
<td>11,655,551.43</td>
<td>1,007,270.15</td>
<td>11,655,551.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100227</td>
<td>CCSW Crawfordville Rd to Orange Ave</td>
<td>4,507,040.00</td>
<td>672,905.83</td>
<td>4,034,134.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100306</td>
<td>CCNW I10 to US90 (N-1)</td>
<td>7,162,831.19</td>
<td>2,309,108.00</td>
<td>69,303,723.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100306</td>
<td>CCNW/SW US09 to Orange Ave (N-2)</td>
<td>48,145,707.59</td>
<td>48,145,707.59</td>
<td>56,932,924.10</td>
<td>54,385,767.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100978</td>
<td>Design and ROW</td>
<td>13,070,000.00</td>
<td>43,100,000.00</td>
<td>10,470,221.00</td>
<td>5,982,831.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100228</td>
<td>Box Culvert Construction (Adams Street to Monroe)</td>
<td>1,650,000.00</td>
<td>1,650,000.00</td>
<td>1,650,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100229</td>
<td>Capital Cascades Segment 1 Flood Relief Project</td>
<td>11,578,639.00</td>
<td>3,435,944.36</td>
<td>13,842,994.64</td>
<td>7,570,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>3,982,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100230</td>
<td>Castle 2020 Land Bank</td>
<td>34,859,124.00</td>
<td>3,995,954.20</td>
<td>34,859,124.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100276</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>480,447.00</td>
<td>9,637,796.00</td>
<td>9,637,796.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100277</td>
<td>Closed Projects</td>
<td>436,984,881.61</td>
<td>139,608,994.87</td>
<td>420,394,641.48</td>
<td>(8,891,769.14)</td>
<td>45,855,042</td>
<td>32,170,023</td>
<td>29,518,311</td>
<td>7,284,704</td>
<td>2,816,999</td>
<td>117,045,078</td>
<td>12,109,876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Project 03760 does not include $9.2 FDOT funding in grants, but is included in the 5-year CIP allocations.
2. Project 100227 does not include $2,708,000 FDOT funding in grants, but is included in the 5 year CIP.
3. Project 03721 balance represents Stormwater Retrofit funds.
4. Project management costs are included in each project except for Cascade Trail Segments 1-4.
5. No future interest is included in net sales tax estimates.
6. Sales Tax revenues use City/County revenue estimates for 5 years, then 3% annual increase.
7. Operating costs are projected to remain at same funding level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget to Date</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Estimated Net Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2012 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2013 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2014 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2015 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2016 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2017 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2018 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>2019 Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>FY 2012-2020 Estimated Net Sales Tax Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0100226</td>
<td>Water Quality Project City</td>
<td>3,359,901.61</td>
<td>846,732.25</td>
<td>20,039,901.61</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>1,862,005.30</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,886,005.35</td>
<td>2,001,005.30</td>
<td>2,118,005.30</td>
<td>2,001,005.40</td>
<td>1,935,005.50</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>6,726,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100226</td>
<td>Water Quality Project City</td>
<td>3,359,901.61</td>
<td>846,732.25</td>
<td>20,039,901.61</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>1,862,005.30</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,886,005.35</td>
<td>2,001,005.30</td>
<td>2,118,005.30</td>
<td>2,001,005.40</td>
<td>1,935,005.50</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>6,726,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100226</td>
<td>Water Quality Project City</td>
<td>3,359,901.61</td>
<td>846,732.25</td>
<td>20,039,901.61</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>1,862,005.30</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,871,005.35</td>
<td>1,886,005.35</td>
<td>2,001,005.30</td>
<td>2,118,005.30</td>
<td>2,001,005.40</td>
<td>1,935,005.50</td>
<td>15,645,005.85</td>
<td>6,726,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Project 03760 does not include $9.2 FDOT funding in grants, but is included in the 5-year CIP allocations.
2. Project 100227 does not include $2,708,000 FDOT funding in grants, but is included in the 5-year CIP.
3. Project 03721 balance represents Stormwater Retrofit funds.
4. Project management costs are included in each project except for Cascade Trail Segments 1-4.
5. No future interest is included in net sales tax estimates.
6. Sales Tax revenue use City/County revenue estimates for 5 years, then 3% annual increase.
7. Operating costs are projected to remain at same funding level.
8. Net Sales Tax includes FDOT advanced repayment of $3,000,000 (FY 12), $4,000,000 (FY 13), $4,000,000 (FY 14) and $7,777,227 (FY 15).