

Blueprint 2000 Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting

Wednesday, August 29, 2001

(continuation of August 24th TCC meeting)

Meeting Attendees: Dinah Hart
John Buss
John Davis
Edgar Grant
Theresa Heiker
Vince Long
Michael Wright

Guest(s): Bruce Barrett
Gary Herndon *(spoke on financial plan)*
Jack Kostrzewa
Anil Panicker
Tom Ballentine *(stand-in for Kevin Pope)*

Recording Secretary: Jeanette Lindsey

Meeting called to order by Dinah Hart at 1:40 P.M.

Dinah Hart

We previously agreed to make the changes to the proposed staging plan, discuss some other issues, and come back to you prior to trying to get the finalized plan to take to the Intergovernmental Agency on September 17. I would also like to bring up one more quick issue and that is, I would like to finalize the issue about the significant changes that we discussed last week; we said we would go back to it when we came to the water resources issue so that we can get it on the agenda, because it has been hanging around since February. And we ran out of time last week so we need to finalize this.

Item #8 – Strategies for Blueprint 2000 project implementation

The purpose of today's meeting is to talk about where we are in this draft staging plan, and I have asked Gary Herndon who is the Interim Treasurer-Clerk to join us to discuss some of the financing issues, because some of the numbers based on the staging plan that we have in front of us are very high, and he is looking at some other creative financing options to help us out.

Jack Kostrzewa

Made presentation to discuss the changes he had incorporated in regards to the projects and funding.

Previous projects lacked a description; new listing provided today has project descriptions and project text to explain what is included in the project.

Discussion held on various projects in the draft plan: environmental issues, Jackson Bluff Road improvements, stormwater/greenway projects; \$200,000 funding for round-about, right-away acquisitions, revenues, etc.

Michael Wright

- Discussed administrative costs.
- Discussed briefly the utilization of consultants as an option for working on projects.
- Discussed the interchange on page 5.

Gary Herndon

We are working up a financing plan; we are looking at doing the Sunshine State program so we can get some lower cost financing on this project. I think we can make the financing work time wise. We have been in touch with the financial advisors and asked them to work up, based on this revenue stream, the total amount that we can borrow. This will give you a ballpark number to work with, although there are a lot of variables in this plan--projected costs and revenue growth. Then we will come back and try to do a more detailed projection based on the timing and need for the money. We are looking at going through a variable program where we can borrow money in series of loans, and not do a bond issue; and then at some point do one large bond issue. Gary indicated that he would verify if interest earned is for eighteen months or three years.

Michael Wright

Discussed the Expanded Project Schedule.

Motion entered to accept the changes for the Blueprint 2000 schedule as suggested by John Davis and Jack Kostrzewa. John suggested some time line changes, and Jack suggested that we move one of the PD&E up six months (Blountstown Hwy. to W. Tennessee Street). Motion carried.

Item #6 – Clarification of reference to “Significant Changes” in the by-laws

Dinah

Discussed the issue of “Significant Changes.” We discussed some criteria that was specified, however, we were wedged on the issue regarding water quality funding. We were to decide if it was needed for us to include something that addresses the need for a super majority vote, or for that to be considered as a “significant change.”

Theresa Heiker

Under the clarification reference to “significant changes” we would identify water quality program project list in the initial approval, and then it would fall under the other criteria of changes and project scope; beyond that point, if it exceeds the threshold it would again be subject to the super majority vote. We would add it as an additional bullet under the definition.

Further discussion led to the decision to show this in the water quality programs funding item, to state that the adoption of the individual program list would require a super majority vote.

Motion entered to accept what was proposed initially, which are the four bullets for the significant changes. Motion carried.

Item #7 – Discussion of Water Quality Program Funding

Theresa – Discussed Water Quality Funding Issue -

Three Options:

1. Developing specific criteria for adoption by the Intergovernmental Agency; and each jurisdiction would propose projects in compliance with those guiding criteria.
2. The development of the full-scale plan to identify the priorities for funding the joint resources plan.
3. Each jurisdiction independently would develop the projects for implementation; and we would independently be responsible for documenting the need and the benefits occurring from the projects in order to meet the BP2000 oversight issues.

Recommendation: We are recommending that individual staffs will develop projects list for adoption by the Intergovernmental Agency to utilize the water quality funding.

Meeting adjourned at 3:18 P.M.