

**TALLAHASSEE-LEON COUNTY  
BLUEPRINT 2000 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY**

**Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2004, 3:00 PM  
County Commission Chambers**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**County**

Commissioner Tony Grippa  
Commissioner Rudy Maloy  
Commissioner Bill Proctor  
Commissioner Bob Rackleff, Chair  
Commissioner Jane Sauls  
Commissioner Cliff Thaell  
Commissioner Dan Winchester

**City**

Commissioner Andrew Gillum  
Commissioner Allan Katz  
Commissioner Debbie Lightsey  
Mayor John Marks  
Commissioner Mark Mustian, Vice-Chair

**CITY/ COUNTY STAFF**

DeLane Adams, County Commission Staff  
Parwez Alam, County Administrator  
David Bright, Blueprint 2000  
Marlon Brown, City Manager's Office  
Craig Diamond, Planning Department  
Jim Davis, Director, Blueprint 2000  
Jim English, City Attorney  
Anita Favors, City Manager  
Shelonda Gay, Blueprint 2000  
Dinah Hart, Mayor's Office  
Theresa Heiker, County Public Works  
Bob Inzer, County Clerk of Courts

Jennie Khoen, Leon County  
Jack Kostrzewa, Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Vince Long, Assist. County Administrator  
Phil Maher, Blueprint 2000  
Sandra C. O'Neal, County Clerk of Courts  
Tony Park, Leon County Public Works  
Dan Rigo, County Attorney's Office  
Debra Schiro, City Attorney's Office  
Wayne Tedder, Planning Department  
Alan Williams, City Commission Office  
Michael Wright, City Manager's Office

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Frederick L. Bateman, Jr., Bateman Harden  
Kathie Beck, Katherine Beck Consulting\*  
Jeff Burlew, Tallahassee Democrat  
Reggie Bouthillier, Greenberg Traurig\*  
Paco de la Fuente  
Jack Diestelhorst, Capital Cascade Council  
Donald Downey, Bateman Harden  
Chuck Duggar, The LPA Group\*  
Billy Hattaway, BDI  
Terrence Hinson, Citizen's Advisory Committee

Paul Lannom, OLH International\*  
Bill Little, Jacobs\*  
Chris Merritt, PBS&J  
Jerry Oshesky, The LPA Group\*  
Daniel Parker, County Commission Candidate  
Bonnie Pfuntner, The LPA Group\*  
R. J. Probst, LPA Group\*  
Gina Tullo, Moore Bass Consulting\*  
Sheeba West, Moore Bass Consulting\*  
Ray Youmans, LPA Group\*

\* indicates Blueprint 2000 Consultant

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bob Rackleff called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm.

### **I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**

Jim Davis stated there were no agenda modifications.

### **II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

#### **1. Right of Way (ROW) Acquisition**

Debra Schiro and Dan Rigo provided the Board with a presentation regarding the process that would be followed to acquire right of way (ROW). Ms. Schiro stated that the Florida Statutes provide the property owner maximum protection often to the detriment of infrastructure projects. She stated that Florida Law protects the rights of property owners by putting them on equal footing with the government by requiring the government to compensate them for all reasonable fees and costs. Ms. Schiro further stated that ROW was acquired typically in two ways (1) purchase or (2) condemnation. She stated that one method used by DOT was to include an attractive incentive offer in the initial written offer sent to property owners. This incentive was offered to the property owner in an attempt to encourage settlement prior to the initiation of eminent domain litigation. Another method was to use the pre-suit procedures adopted by the legislature in 2000. These procedures encourage settlement prior to the filing of a suit by utilizing aggressive negotiation strategies, such as formal mediation. And the newest acquisition method was to create a land bank to hold the property until it was needed for a project.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the City currently has a policy to offer 15% above appraised value to try to avoid condemnation. She asked if the Blueprint 2000 Land Banking Policy would be similar to this policy. Mr. Davis stated that it would. Commissioner Lightsey asked if the Board needed to move forward with the corridor management policies through the Comprehensive Plan, and for all transportation corridors, and she asked for an update. Mr. Wayne Tedder stated that the Comprehensive Plan amendments would be going before the City and County Commissions on May 11, 2004, for transmittal to DCA. Commissioner Mustian agreed that corridor management should be applied to non-Blueprint roads.

Commissioner Grippa asked whom Blueprint would be using for appraisals. Mr. Davis replied that there would be a ROW appraisal team with Weigel-Veasey and one additional firm for ROW and condemnation actions. He further stated that there would be other firms used for the appraisal of properties by willing sellers, etc. He stated that this was based upon the advice of counsel with the idea being that the first appraisal would set the tone for the remaining negotiations. He stated that Weigel-Veasey was considered to be one of the best. Mr. Davis stated that the ROW acquisition for CCNW was funded for \$24.5M and as of 30 days ago the estimate was over \$31.M. Mr. Davis stated that there was one parcel in particular that could add an additional \$5M to the cost.

Commissioner Grippa asked where the Weigel-Veasey offices were based. Mr. Oshesky replied that they were from Orlando but they have an office in Jacksonville. Commissioner Grippa

replied that the County had done many appraisals and they had used Mr. Disken, Ketcham Appraisal Group, and also Boutin and he asked why Blueprint was not using a local appraisal company. He said if there was an opportunity to use someone local since they know the environment, the market, etc. He asked if it could be changed or supplemented since it was RFP'd out or was it left for the general consultant to choose the appraisers.

Mr. Davis replied that it could be changed, Weigel-Veasey was part of the team, but they would not be used for everything. One additional appraiser would be chosen for condemnation and possibly two other local appraisers to do other work for Blueprint. Mr. Davis stated that legal counsel stressed the importance in having the best people for the appraisals and who were good in the witness stand in order for the success of the program and to limit cost. Blueprint did not want to go out wholesale with an RFP and select firms that came back with the lowest offer. Mr. Davis stated that this process was very deliberate. Commissioner Grippa stated that the Blueprint projects were more unique than FDOT since all the projects were located in Leon County and that local firms were left out. He further asked when local businesses would benefit from the sales tax. He stated that local appraisers have an advantage since they knew the market, they know when something might spike and they do daily business in Tallahassee.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that he agreed and the challenge for any appraiser would be knowing the body of law and appraisal practice that was specific to road widening. He stated that once negotiations were starting for very expensive pieces of property, they needed to have the best. He said that he did not hear anyone say that the firms mentioned could not participate; it was just that the lead was being taken by Weigel-Veasey. He said if the Board wanted to change that decision they could but he would not recommend it.

Mr. Grippa stated that he was not saying throw anyone out, he just wanted to point out that the Board did not make the decision to hire this appraisal company. This company was not local and they were selected by the general consulting firm rather than the Board. Mr. Davis stated that Blueprint was compiling a real estate team, which would include additional appraisers. He stated that the team would consist of two appraisal firms that would handle condemnation issues. There would be another team that would provide appraisal for willing sellers, a team that would handle the acquisition of greenways, a team that will be relocation specialists, and a demolition team. Many of these firms would be local.

Commissioner Grippa asked how much Mr. Davis anticipated paying the firm and what was the budget. Mr. Davis said that he could not say exactly, it would depend on each job. Commissioner Grippa asked if there were budget parameters. Mr. Davis stated that the appraisals were done by the parcel and until they looked at each parcel the cost would be unknown. He further stated that they were not sure how many parcels there would be.

Commissioner Lightsey stated she did not believe progress could be made at this meeting and that if the Board required a full discussion on the item then it should come back with more information. She stated that if the Board wanted to do anything other than what was contemplated in the item, then they should take a vote to agenda it to have full information.

**Commissioner Grippa moved that the item be agended for another meeting and Mr. Davis provide background information to include a potential appraiser budget.**

Commissioner Proctor asked if there was a local preference policy being followed. Mr. Davis replied that there was a policy for contracts that were awarded but with the GEC team, they came with a team of experts and Weigel-Veasey was on the team. The local preference was applied to the GEC but they would not apply to every sub-consultant.

Commissioner Proctor then stated that when something was as wide spread as appraising property he could not see any reason that Blueprint would overlook local appraisers.

Commissioner Lightsey asked if the decision to agenda this item would cause the projects to lose ground or delay actions in the interim. She stated that the Board had already approved this item and that any work that needed to be done before the next meeting should not be held up.

**Commissioner Grippa amended his motion that nothing should be held up by bringing this item back to the Board for further review.** Commissioner Lightsey stated that she wanted to be sure that this action did not override any previous actions; it should refine the actions that the Board previously took. The motion was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **III. CONSENT ITEMS**

**2. Minutes of February 16, 2004, Intergovernmental Agency Meeting**

**3. Bylaws Update**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Approve the By-Laws included as Attachment 1.

**4. City and County Water Quality Program Appropriation Amendment and Allocation Methodology**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Option 1:** Allocate the Water Quality funds based on the percentage of the Water Quality funds to the total estimated sales tax receipt with the following conditions:

- A. This amount would be adjusted each year for changes in the sales tax projections.
- B. These funds will be transferred to the City and County on a monthly basis not to exceed \$25 million including consultant and interest costs.
- C. Interest would be charged on funds that are requested early. The interest rate to be applied will be recommended by the Finance Committee and approved by the Intergovernmental Management Committee.

It also recommends approval of an amendment of \$4,123,134 to the current appropriation of \$2 million for City and County water quality projects.

Chairman Rackleff asked if there was motion to move Consent. **Commissioner Lightsey**

**moved approval of all consent items.** Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion.

Commissioner Grippa stated that because the bylaw agenda item was not provided in a red lined version and he was unable to reference the previous version. He asked that in the future when a policy is being modified that it be provided to the Board in red lined format.

Commissioner Proctor stated that regarding Item #4, City and County Water Quality Program Appropriation Amendment and Allocation Methodology, that the residents of Frenchtown did not want a stormwater facility in the community and that he would like to request that the funds be used on another project. He stated that the citizens did not want the \$10 million dollars even though the majority of his district supported Blueprint for approval, however one of the elements was the \$10 million stormwater facility in Frenchtown that the citizens did not want.

**Commissioner Proctor moved that the funds be moved from the Frenchtown Area to Lake Munson or any other place.** Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion for discussion. Mr. Davis stated that this was a policy decision that was not addressed in the agenda item. He further stated that when the water quality money was established, \$10 million was set aside by the City of their \$25 million for specific projects. The County set aside \$5 million of their \$25 million for specific projects. He stated that if the Board elected to change this decision that it would be a policy decision. He further stated that the agenda item addressed how the money would be disbursed. At what rate does the City and the County accumulate the water quality money.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that it was procedurally incorrect to address this motion. She stated that the study was underway and that Mayor Marks was the liaison for the project and that one government did not get to reallocate another's money without discussion and staffing. Commissioner Rackleff called for the vote on Commissioner Proctor's amendment to the motion to approve the consent items. Commissioner Proctor stated that the majority of people in Frenchtown did not want that project and that the money would be better spent elsewhere. Commissioner Grippa withdrew his second to the motion. He stated that he would like Commissioner Proctor to discuss that issue with Mayor Marks and that he did not want to assert the county's authority over the city. Mayor Marks stated that he had knowledge to the contrary on this issue but that he was more than willing to discuss it with Commissioner Proctor.

The motion to approve the Consent items carried unanimously.

#### **IV. PRESENTATIONS/ACTIONS/DISCUSSIONS**

##### **5. Change 1 to the Interlocal Agreement (Planning Department and MPO Reorganization)**

Mr. Davis stated that the current Interlocal Agreement, dated February 1, 2003, tasks the Planning Department to be the liaison with the MPO. With the recent separation of those two organizations, this task to the Planning Department was no longer viable.

**Commissioner Grippa moved approval of the change to the Interlocal Agreement.** The motion was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

*The Board adjourned as the Intergovernmental Agency and convened as the County Commission.*

***Chairman Sauls called for the motion by the County Commission to approve the change to the Interlocal Agreement. Commissioner Grippa moved approval of the change to the Interlocal Agreement. The motion was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.***

*The Board of County Commissioners adjourned.*

*The Board convened as the City Commission.*

***Mayor Marks called for the motion by the City Commission to approve the change to the Interlocal Agreement. Commissioner Lightsey moved approval of the change to the Interlocal Agreement. Commissioner Gillum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.***

*The City Commission adjourned. The Board reconvened as the Intergovernmental Agency.*

## **6. CAC Performance Report Recommendations**

**Mayor Marks moved approval of the recommendations as presented.** Commissioner Grippa stated that he understood that the CAC did not recommend an employment contract for Mr. Davis.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that the recommendation stated that with the incumbent City Manager and County Administrator that the employment contract for the Director was not a critical issue however that should either of these individuals depart and be replaced, then this issue could be addressed again at that time. She also stated that the recommendation of the Performance Audit was to expand the membership on the CAC to up to 20 members. She stated that the CAC recommended that it be expanded to only 13 voting members. Mr. Davis stated that this was correct.

Commissioner Thaelle stated that the CAC recommended that the number of Intergovernmental Agency meetings be reduced to once every four months to consider matters of policy and critical issues as specified in the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Davis confirmed that this was the recommendation. Commissioner Thaelle stated that he assumed that additional meetings could be scheduled as needed. Mr. Davis stated that the Chairman could call additional meetings. Mr. Thaelle asked if the IA had addressed delegating authority for issuing contracts and if there was a policy. Mr. Davis stated that the delegation policy and real estate policy would be developed.

There was further discussion of each recommendation.

**Recommendation # 1. Report Recommendation:** Create a management contract for the position of Staff Director.

**CAC Recommendation:** A contract for the Director offers advantages as articulated in the report. The CAC supports this recommendation however we also realize that a contract with the Director would establish a precedent that may be undesirable. Further we believe that with the

incumbent City Manager and County Administrator that this is not a critical issue however we are concerned that should either of these individuals depart and be replaced, then there is the potential for the Director and the Program to be adversely affected.

**Implementing Action # 1: None**

Commissioner Katz stated that he understood the need for the position of staff director to have a contract. Blueprint was a major project that was being overseen by both governments and he was not clear why there should not be a contract. He said that the comment of the reason why not, was that Mr. Davis had confidence in the city manager and county administrator, this was true, but if they were no longer in their position, then that could alter the decision. He felt either there should be a contract for Mr. Davis's position that outlines what was expected or the group should decide that he would not be held accountable. The city manager and county administrator would be held accountable for his behavior, yet he was to be held accountable for other things. He stated that there should be a delineation specifically on what he was expected to do.

Commissioner Grippa wanted clarification on if they were discussing severance pay and things like that. Commissioner Katz said his concern was that the expectations should be clearly stated. Commissioner Grippa commented that was in the job description. Commissioner Katz stated that a job description was generic and was not very specific in nature, where a contract would be specific.

Mr. Davis said that it was recommended by MGT that he have a management contract in order for him to have more independence, etc. In his conversations with the Management Committee, Anita Favors and Parwez Alam, he stated that he was very comfortable not having one. He stated that with these two administrators, he felt that they provided the guidance and support that he needs, however should either of them leave, the question could resurface at that time. Mr. Davis stated that Item #1's implementing instructions reflected his personal preference after discussions with the Management Committee. Commissioner Katz replied that he felt these decisions should be institutional in nature, not individually motivated. He felt that either there should or should not be a contract, regardless of who was the city manager or county administrator.

**Commissioner Katz made a substitute motion to have a management contract.  
Commissioner Thael seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Grippa further discussed the employment contract versus a job description. He stated that if Mr. Davis were provided an employment contract then other staff would also like to have that luxury. He stated that he would not support a contract that included things like six month severance, car allowance, can only be fired for a felony, etc. He further stated that Mr. Davis serves at the will of the county administrator and city manager. He further understands that the city has a charter that specifically prohibits city commissioners from interfering in employment issues. Commissioner Grippa stated that he trusted Mr. Alam and Ms. Favors to manage Mr. Davis, who works directly for them. He pointed out that Mr. Davis did not want the contract and if the council made a decision, it would be going against whatever Mr. Alam, Ms. Favors, and Mr. Davis had discussed on the issue.

Commissioner Thael stated that he agreed that the position and the role of the staff director of that agency was an institutional matter and it was larger than an individual person. He pointed out that the Intergovernmental Agency was a separate agency and that the position was not akin to a public works director, etc. He stated that both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County Board of County Commissioners created the position, however it was outside of both governments. He stated that he disagreed and that the contract was like a job description and he believed that when they met twice a year, they would have less interaction as a policy making body with the director or the staff.

Terence Hinson spoke briefly on why the Citizen's Advisory Committee made that recommendation. He stated there were quality people in place and they did not want to set precedence since no other employees had contracts. He further stated that Mr. Davis felt comfortable working under Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam and therefore they agreed not to recommend a contract.

Mayor Marks agreed that they should do one method or the other and he agreed with Commissioner Grippa that they should keep it as it was since Mr. Davis had faith in the two administrators. He did not think that the issue should be brought up again, if either of the two administrators left, if there was a policy then that policy should be adhered to regardless of who the parties were.

Ms. Favors stated that she wanted to clarify that she and Mr. Alam had spoken with Mr. Davis on the issue and were comfortable with the current arrangement. She also wanted to point out that neither she nor Mr. Alam added the caveat that should either of them leave that the contract would come forward. It was added by Mr. Davis and the Citizen's Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Katz said that if there was a contract negotiated, it should be between Ms. Favors, Mr. Alam, and Mr. Davis and then it should be presented to the IA. He stated that the issue was that there was an enormous amount of money being overseen over a long period of time and it was irresponsible not to have the person charged with the responsibility to have a clearly delineated contract on his role and responsibility. Mr. Davis would report to the City Manager and the County Administrator and they should have the luxury of having such a contract and even though they may not feel they wanted one today. The decision should not be based on who was sitting on the Intergovernmental Agency Board, in the City Manager's seat, in the County Administrator's seat, or the Blueprint Director's seat. Over the next 15 years, \$700M dollars of the citizens money was being collected and he believed a contract should be in place for the person in charge of overseeing the projects.

Commissioner Grippa stated that the Citizen's Advisory Committee recommended no contract and Mr. Davis was comfortable without a contract. Mr. Davis concurred. Commissioner Grippa asked that the Board vote against the substitute motion. He stated that the bylaws said that Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam would hire and fire the person in this position. He asked how would they get out of the contract and would the Board have to amend the bylaws to reflect the contract.

Commissioner Gillum stated that nothing had been discussed as to the details of the contract and anything in that direction would be an assumption. He stated that what he did take issue with was the discussion of a management contract under the parameters that personalities would

change, and the policy should not be based on personalities. He said also that the original Citizen's Advisory Committee supported having the contract. He wanted to know what kind of parameters could be expected to come from a management contract.

Mr. Hinson stated that in their discussions that if the Director felt comfortable not having a contract then they supported his decision. He stated that the tax extension only lasted for 15 years; therefore, that was considered a temporary position.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that that was a significant procedural issue and having a management contract would take away any uncertainty and that this was the most appropriate action. She said MGT made the recommendation based on the fact that they conduct audits all over the country. She further stated that it should not be left to the director to place it back on the agenda if his boss were to change because that would place him in a difficult position.

Commissioner Rackleff called the question on the **substitute motion to have a contract. The motion carried 7-5 (38-32, weighted vote)**

Commissioner Grippa moved that the contract should not come back to the Intergovernmental Agency; they should trust Anita and PA to negotiate and handle it. Ms. Favors stated that she opposed having a contract, there were many adverse issues that could arise, and she would like to bring the issue back before the Board when it could be staffed better and the Board could be provided more information. She stated that she felt it set dangerous precedence for other staff in the city and county even though the position was a little different. She further stated that she would like the opportunity to spend more time talking about it. Ms. Favors stated that if the Board felt that it needed to move forward with the action that they should move to remove the part that deals with one of the managers leaving because she did not agree with that part of the recommendation. She stated that establishing a contract for an employee would have other repercussions with both organizations. Commissioner Rackleff asked Ms. Favors if she disagreed with the motion that was made and she said yes, she did not support it.

Commissioner Katz said that he still felt a contract was appropriate but he believed that it should be negotiated with the management team, Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam, and they could send off a copy for review, just to see if there were any big issues or concerns but it should not have to require approval.

After the further discussion, **Commissioner Mustian moved to reconsider the motion.** The motion passed unanimously. **Commissioner Mustian moved to take the city managers' recommendation and bring the issue back before the Board with full information.** Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Proctor stated that he would like to discuss recommendation #3 and #7.

**Recommendation #3. Report Recommendation:** Prepare a Revenue Leveraging Policy and Plan

**CAC Recommendation:** We agree that this needs to be done. We further recommend that *all assets of the City and County be coordinated in the efforts to leverage Blueprint funds.*

Currently both the City and County have resources that are dedicated to the acquisition of, and management of, grants and other leveraging vehicles. These resources as well as the Blueprint Staff should be mobilized to pursue leveraging opportunities. This economy of scale offers the greatest payoff.

**Implementing Action #3:** Blueprint staff is currently developing the Leveraging Policy. Each Commission must direct its staff to assist Blueprint in identifying leveraging opportunities.

**Recommendation # 7. Report Recommendation:** Create specific sub-workgroups, or Task Forces, with limited duration, for the purpose of developing practical action steps on critical issues, such as identifying leveraging opportunities.

**CAC Recommendation:** We agree with the caveat that these entities must be *streamlined and void of the administrative burdens* currently imposed on committees. A standard set of By-Laws could be adopted and the Director should be authorized to form and approve the membership.

**Implementing Action #7:** Blueprint Staff to develop a policy with a standard set of By-Laws (each set of By-Laws will be modified to reflect the purpose of the work group).

Commissioner Proctor stated Blueprint had the opportunity to leverage funds by investing in local banks that score high in the Community Redevelopment Act (CRA). He stated that Blueprint had the opportunity to bank with banks that showed favor to our community. He stated that these two recommendations did not deal with banking, however they did deal with leveraging funds and resources. He stated that Blueprint funds should not go out of state and where no money was invested in this community.

Mr. Davis stated that the leveraging policy had to do with how to get funding from other sources, whether that be the state, Florida Community Trust, Ted Turner Foundation, etc. He further stated that these recommendations stated that rather than Blueprint staff doing this unilaterally that they would be better served working with City and County staff to obtain these funds.

Commissioner Proctor asked that Mr. Hinson have the Citizen's Advisory Committee to request that Blueprint funds be invested in local banks.

Commissioner Lightsey asked if there was an approved investment policy. Commissioner Rackleff stated that there was a policy. Commissioner Lightsey pointed out that there had been several discussions of this issue and that if the group wished to revisit the investment policy that it be done separate from these recommendations.

**Commissioner Proctor moved to revisit the investment policy.** Commissioner Rackleff stated that Blueprint does not hold money in any bank. He stated that the funds are invested according to the City's investment policy as directed by the Intergovernmental Agency. The motion failed due to lack of a second.

**Recommendation # 2. Report Recommendation:** Require a majority vote of the IA in order to task Blueprint staff for work outside of the program objectives.

**CAC Recommendation:** The organizational concept for Blueprint was to have a very small staff augmented with a General Engineering Consultant (GEC). Tasking to the staff must be considered by the Agency as a whole since such taskings have a direct impact on the projects. Additionally, taskings that impact the GEC have a direct cost to the program. For this reason a methodology must be implemented to ensure that no Member of the Board can unilaterally direct the staff. The Staff must take direction from the Intergovernmental Management Committee, IMC, or from the Board, but not from individual Board Members. It is recommended that the *Agency adopt a policy requiring any tasking to the Blueprint Staff by any member of the Board be supported by a vote of at least three other Directors* thus ensuring that staff time is protected and can be devoted to the Tier 1 projects. Implied in the recommendations is a clear identification that any tasking is directly related to Blueprint Projects only.

**Implementing Action #2:** Amend the Agency By-Laws to reflect the recommendation.

Mr. Davis stated that MGT recommended that in order for a member of the IA to task Blueprint staff with a project that was outside of the program objectives that it would require a majority vote. He further stated that the Citizen's Advisory Committee had recommended that it should require 4 votes, however in a subsequent meeting with the Technical Coordinating Committee, they recommend that this should take a majority vote.

Commissioner Lightsey asked for clarification on this issue. She stated that she understood the recommendation to say that between meetings, Blueprint staff could not be tasked with projects unless it had been approved at an IA meeting.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he did not agree with this recommendation. He stated that the task should go directly through Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam. **Commissioner Grippa moved to have all tasking go through the Intergovernmental Management Committee, IMC (Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam) or that if the Board tasked the staff, that it would be done at an IA meeting with a majority vote.** He further stated that the IMC would determine if the tasking would be within program parameters. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Recommendation #4. Report Recommendation:** The IA should meet once every four months to consider matters of policy and critical issues as specified in the Interlocal Agreement. During the year 2005 and beyond the IA should meet once every six months.

**CAC Recommendation:** We strongly agree with this recommendation. This is a difficult issue requiring the Board to delegate authority to the IMC and the Director. This methodology is radically different to the normal course of business conducted by the two Commissions. Meeting twice monthly affords each Commission the opportunity to be decision makers as compared to policy makers. *Operational decisions for Blueprint need to be made by the IMC and the Director* to move the program forward at a rapid rate. Meeting five times per year, as the IA currently does, is not conducive to timely decision-making. A timely decision cycle is mandatory for the success of this program. We cannot continue with "business as usual".

**Implementing Action #4:** Revise the schedule

Commissioner Mustian stated that he was concerned that the Board would not meet very often. **Commissioner Mustian moved that the Board should have 3 meetings in 2005 instead of only 2.** Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. It carried unanimously.

**Commissioner Proctor moved that the IA instruct the CAC to review the investment policy** so that when Blueprint begins receiving the sales tax money there would be a standard for the investment of the \$700M of the people's money with a local bank that favors the community and does business with the community.

Commissioner Rackleff asked if Commissioner Proctor was referring to an investment policy that the CAC would develop. Commissioner Proctor replied that he did not know what type of policy it would be. Commissioner Grippa stated that he would have to make a motion to put the item on the agenda. Commissioner Proctor said that he was not sure what procedure this needed to take. The CAC had made some recommendations to the IA and that there may be a conflict because Mr. Smith was the chair of this committee. He stated that he felt strongly on this issue and however if the if the board felt that this item needed to come from the CAC to be agendaed then he would go that route.

Commissioner Rackleff then asked Mr. Davis if the current investment policy addressed those concerns. Mr. Davis stated that the current investment policy said that the City of Tallahassee invested Blueprint money, along with their own. If the City's policy was to invest money out of state then that would be where Blueprint's money would go also. Blueprint was looking at other methodologies to invest the dollars. Commissioner Proctor interjected that Blueprint needed to stop the sales tax money from leaving the state.

Mr. Maher stated that what Mr. Davis said was correct and he recalled that right before he started work at Blueprint that there was talk about a banking policy, however what was being discussed currently was the investment policy not the banking policy.

**Commissioner Proctor moved to favor a banking policy that would have criteria that weighs banks that do business with the community.** Commissioner Rackleff asked for clarification from Commissioner Proctor. He wanted to know if he meant Blueprint money that goes into a bank. Does Blueprint put money into a bank? Mr. Maher replied that currently they use the City for the accounting system and the City uses a particular bank. He stated that there was money that would come in through the sales tax that would be invested and there was also money in the operating budget.

Mr. Davis said that there was no Blueprint 2000 bank account in any bank anywhere. Commissioner Rackleff asked Mr. Davis if there would be a banking account in the future. Commissioner Proctor wanted to know what would be done with the money and how would it work. Mr. Davis stated that every dime that was collected from revenue went into the City's investment account and the finances were managed by the City in accordance with the City's investment policy. He further stated that the City paid Blueprints bills, salaries, they handled the money, and invested in the same accounts as its own. The Blueprint investment policy was the city's investment policy. Commissioner Proctor then stated that they would have an opportunity to set a standard with this. He stated that he understood that this sales tax would generate \$700M, they have not begun to collect any of it, but this was the opportunity at the front end to

keep the funds in the community. Commissioner Rackleff then stated that he was trying to understand the motion because if they passed it, there would be no practical effect on anything because Blueprint would not have any money in any bank at any time.

Commissioner Lightsey said that she could not support a motion that directed a change in procedure until they knew what the impact would be, so she could not support it. **She stated that the maximum she could support would be to ask Ms. Favors, Mr. Alam, and the Blueprint Finance Committee to look at the issue and decide whether there was any benefit, implications, or any negative aspects associated with changing the policy and setting up Blueprint accounts. She stated that this was a substitute motion.** Commissioner ThaeLL seconded the motion. Commissioner Lightsey restated that she could not go the route that was being suggested since there was no information and they would be directing something to happen that may have an adverse impact on the program.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he had two points to make. He stated that Commissioner Proctor brought up a worthwhile point and as for a banking relationship, when eventually checks were cut, which was different than an investment relationship. They would have to write a check or checks would be written to general contractors and they were going to be written from some account, from somewhere. He further stated that he would be fine with writing checks from the City's accounts but the City would be liable for anything that goes wrong.

He further stated that from an investment standpoint the SPIA account was now earning 4.5%. He stated that he had asked Mr. Davis six months ago to investigate this account. The City's investment fund was currently earning 1.5% - 2%. He further stated that he had requested that Mr. Alam and others also investigate this account. He mentioned that the fund was earning 4.5% and that it is 100% liquid and money could be removed immediately. Commissioner Grippa stated that the Blueprint program qualified for this fund and he had yet to see an agenda item to review this information. He stated that this bothered him because this could mean earnings of \$500,000.00 based on \$20M or \$30M in the bank. Mr. Davis stated that in regarding the SPIA account, there was a problem with the insurer and whether or not Blueprint could invest in that account. He further stated that they had been working on that issue very intensely. He stated that bond council had advised against investing in that account.

Mr. Grippa replied that it was a state treasury account with \$10 billion in assets and it was the State Board of Administration. Mr. Davis agreed with this assessment, however it invests in BAA securities, which was the problem. He stated that this was a problem with the insurer of the Blueprint bonds, and that it needed to be resolved. Mr. Davis stated it was a great idea and it looked very promising but there was a "hiccup" they were trying to get over. Commissioner Grippa then asked if they could bring back the whole investment policy, not the judging the policy but have Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam to take a look. (Commissioners are saying "NO" in the background) Commissioner Grippa then says, "so they did not want the SPIA account and they did not want to look at that"? (There were additional background comments) and Mr. Grippa said that he wanted it on the record that they did not care about the \$500,000. Several Commissioners spoke that "no that was not what was being said, that was his interpretation." There was a call for order.

**Commissioner Lightsey said that she had made a substitute motion that they task Ms. Favors, Mr. Alam, and the Finance Committee with a task of coming back and staffing them on the issue, of the implications of establishing a separate banking relationship. Specifically for any funds that were Blueprint funds that would not undo the whole approved investment strategy, the banking relationship, and whether the Board should change the policy and to bring that back to the June 14, 2004 meeting.**

Commissioner Proctor stated that he would like the CAC to work conjunctively with the group. Commissioner Thael asked if he was asking that the CAC work with work with Mr. Alam and Ms. Favors? Commissioner Proctor replied in the affirmative. Commissioner Lightsey stated that the general procedure was that Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam would work with the Finance Committee, and like all major policy issues, it would go before the CAC before the it came back before Intergovernmental Agency. Commissioner Rackleff agreed that the CAC would see it.

Commissioner Rackleff called for the question. The motion passed 9-2, with Mr. Maloy not voting.

**Recommendation #5. Report Recommendation:** Expand the membership of the CAC to no more than 20 members, following recommendations from the IMC and the Blueprint Staff Director.

**CAC Recommendation:** We agree, however, the current 12 members the CAC is a workable size and we do not recommend expanding the Committee with the exception of *one addition; a representative from the Education community including the two universities, TCC, and the Leon County School Board.* What we recommend is one new voting member to be selected from the afore-mentioned organizations. The three non-voting institutions would be encouraged to attend all CAC meetings and become involved in the Blueprint program. This voting position would rotate every three years, as do all members of the CAC. Initial conversations with Dr. Bill Law indicate that Dr. Law is agreeable to discuss this concept with the university presidents and the Director will approach Superintendent Montford if this concept is approved.

**Implementing Action #5:** Blueprint Staff to contact the Leon County School Board and Dr. Law to implement this recommendation

**Recommendation #6 Report Recommendation:** Invite the *Florida Department of Transportation to serve as a non-voting member of the Technical Coordinating Committee*, to ensure ongoing positive communications and coordination.

**CAC Recommendation:** We agree

**Implementing Action #6:** Blueprint Staff to contact FDOT to implement this recommendation

**Recommendation #8. Report Recommendation:** *Assign an MPO staff position specifically to coordinate with Blueprint.*

**CAC Recommendation:** Strongly agree. This is the second year this recommendation has been made. Coordination between the MPO and Blueprint is critical to ensure that MPO policies and

procedures are followed. Blueprint projects will be the major construction projects in our community for the next several years, thus Blueprint must be a point of emphasis for the MPO. Frankly we are disappointed that this relationship between the MPO and Blueprint has not previously been adopted.

**Implementing Action #8:**

- a. Chairperson of the MPO to direct the MPO Staff Director to designate a member of his staff to be the liaison with Blueprint. *Note: Action Completed; MPO Acting Director Jack Kostrzewa has agreed to serve in this capacity.*
- b. Amend the Interlocal Agreement to:
  - a. Reflect the Planning Department reorganization with the creation of the MPO as a separate entity.
  - b. Add the MPO and its responsibilities to the Interlocal, including the designation of a liaison person.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

1. That the Agency Board approves the recommendations as presented in the letter from the Chairman of the CAC, attached.
2. That the Implementing Actions be executed.

**TCC:** The TCC approved the Performance Audit recommendations and actions with the following exceptions: For Recommendation #2, the TCC voted to require a “majority” vote for tasking Blueprint staff (vs. the CAC sub-committee recommendation of “three other directors”). No vote was taken by the TCC on Recommendation #4 related to changing the IA meeting schedule.

**CAC:** The full CAC reviewed the item, and concurred with recommendations and actions included within.

**Mayor Marks moved to approve the recommendations of the CAC as amended.**

Commissioner Grippa seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**7. Capital Circle Northwest Regional Stormwater Facility Tri-Party Agreement between Blueprint 2000, Leon County and the Department of Transportation**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1:

Approve the Tri-party Agreement among Blueprint 2000, Leon County, and the Florida Department of Transportation. Appropriate \$2,000,000 (inclusive of settlement cost, contingencies, and an amount to acquire a less than fee title of a portion of the property southwest of the pond) to fund the initial deposit and authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to amend the appropriation for any subsequent funding that may be required.

The TCC and CAC both approved Option 1.

There was no discussion.

**Commissioner Thael moved approval of Option 1.** Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**8. Headwaters of the St. Marks River: Recommendations of the Sensitive Lands Working Group**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1:

1. Accept the recommendations of the Sensitive Lands Working Group as related to prioritization of parcels recommended for acquisition of conservation easements and submit the list to the Water Management District for action.
2. Authorize Blueprint staff to work with Planning Department staff in preparing and submitting an FCT grant application for the Blueprint Major Sinks project.

The TCC and CAC both approved Option 1.

Commissioner Proctor asked how these recommendations compared to the study of the south Leon County Woodville Area being conducted by Mr. Sean McGlynn. Mr. Bright stated that Mr. McGlynn assisted with this committee as well. He stated that the process of using several weighted criteria and applying it to specific parcels was the same, however the criteria for the headwaters area was different than that which was used for the Woodville study area. Jim Davis noted that the methodology used by this Working Group was presented at a workshop held in Bay County recently.

**Commissioner Thael moved approval of Option 1.** Commissioner Sauls seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**9. Multi Modal Design Guidelines**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Option 1. Approve the Multi-Modal Design guidelines and the typical section as depicted on Attachment 1.

The TCC approved the Design Guidelines (Option 1) with the recommendation that an additional pedestrian refuge be considered when crossing more than four lanes and noted that the Guidelines should be presented to FDOT for acceptance.

The CAC approved the Design Guidelines (Option 1). The discussion included a recommendation that the title reflect the guidelines are “for Blueprint Projects” versus just Capital Circle Southeast. A suggestion was made that the street light poles be of a similar color (rust/brown) as proposed for the signal mast arms.

**Mayor Marks moved approval of Option 1.** Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he would vote against this motion because these guidelines prevented the Board from spending bike pedestrian money inside the city limits to connect the universities and neighborhoods to schools. He further stated that meandering trails along Capital Circle SW do not make sense. **Commissioner Grippa made a substitute motion to approve the guidelines, however to allow staff to put the bicycle paths and the natural trail where they feel they would be used and to dedicate the other money to connect the universities and neighborhoods to schools.** Commissioner Rackleff asked for clarification from Commissioner Grippa on the motion. He asked if Commissioner Grippa did not want bicyclists to use Capital Circle SW. Commissioner Grippa stated that he supported their use of it, however he did not believe that anyone would be using it. Commissioner Proctor seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mustian stated that the bike lane would be a part of the roadway, however he disagreed with him because with a curb and gutter six-lane road, the additional space allows a driver to pull off of the road if necessary. It also provides a sloping area to get water off of the road. He further stated that the trails would be attractive and would tie into Southwood's facilities. He stated that there should be more of this type of design and less straight and narrow design.

Commissioner Rackleff stated that about 50 years ago the County Commission stated that Capital Circle was only a rural area and that they only needed to purchase enough property for two lanes. He further stated that we are now going to spend millions of dollars to expand the roadway and that this roadway will be used for 50 to 100 more years. It looks rural now but that is changing but it would be foolish thinking that it will always be the same way.

Commissioner Lightsey stated that she was reminded today that there will be a new development on Capital Circle near the Woodville Highway. She stated that these roadways were interconnections.

Commissioner Thael stated that he was reminded of the cost savings to maintain the roadbed and that without this type of construction the edges of the road ravel and require more maintenance. He stated that he agreed somewhat with Commissioner Grippa, however because of the cost of maintenance, the removal of the bike lane would be a-wash cost wise.

Commissioner Grippa stated that he did not agree with the meandering trails in this area. He stated that these guidelines would apply to all roads, not just the Southwood area. He stated that this would take money away from bike trails in the areas of schools and universities and that it would be poor planning to have this type of trail on all roads constructed by Blueprint. He further stated that the Board should not move forward to prioritize the bike/ped. process without consulting the Bicycle/Pedestrian master plan. He stated that the reason that the ROW costs are high is because Blueprint is trying to put meandering trails all the way around Capital Circle.

Commissioner Rackleff pointed out that this was only a guideline and not a standard. It was the desired way to do the construction, however if it does not make sense it will not be done. Commissioner Proctor stated that it would be cheaper to make a special policy for Southwood and the other special neighborhoods that we would like to do this for. He stated that what would end up happening was that Blueprint would find a way to wavier it for other areas that were deemed undesirable and the southern part of the county would not get the meandering sidewalks.

Commissioner Sauls asked who would make the decision on who would decide where the meandering paths would go. Mr. Davis stated that the IA would decide. Each segment of the road would be brought back to the Board for review. Commissioner Sauls stated that this was a guideline and she supported the motion. Mr. Davis stated that every segment would be brought back before the IA.

**Commissioner Grippa withdrew his motion. Commissioner Rackleff called for the question on the original motion to approve Option 1.** The motion passed unanimously.

**V. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

There were none.

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

There were no items.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Rackleff adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

**APPROVED:**

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Bob Rackleff**  
Chairman of Blueprint 2000 IA

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Shelonda Gay**  
Secretary to Blueprint 2000 IA