

Blueprint 2000 TCC Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 30, 2004
Ellis Building – Koger Center
2:00 pm

Tony Park, Vice Chairperson, called meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

Attendees: (TCC Members in Bold)

David Bright	John Kraynak	Bonnie Pfunter
John Buss	Jim Lee	Dan Rigo
Skip Cook	Bill Little	Ed Ringe
Jim Davis	Mark Llewellyn	Marek Romanowski
Jack Diestelhorst	Vince Long	Olu Sawyerr
Shelonda Gay	Phil Maher	Michael Wright
Jaime Girardi	Gabe Menendez	Ray Youmans
Fred Goodrow	Nancy Miller	
Theresa Heiker	Ken Morris	
Carlana Hoffman	Jerry Oshesky	
Jack Kostrzewa	Tony Park	

I. Agenda Modifications

There were none.

II. Information Items

Item #1: Leveraging Policy and Plan

Phil Maher gave a brief overview of the agenda item. Phil stated the policy and plan were scheduled to go before the Intergovernmental Management Committee on September 9, 2004 and then to the Intergovernmental Agency on September 20, 2004. Phil discussed the strategy was still to seek partnerships with other agencies (i.e. NFWMD). He further stated staff had developed a binder which includes grants that Blueprint 2000 can apply for now and in the future. Jim Davis included that Blueprint 2000 has identified a vendor that researches grants and contacts the Agency thirty (30) days before the application deadline. He also stated the cost is \$6800 per year for ten (10) licenses.

A committee member asked a question regarding who occupies the Finance Manager and the Planning Manager positions. Phil stated that he is the Finance Manager and Dave Bright is the Planning Manager. A question was also posed about section 102.06 (e) of the policy which mentions the Planning Department and Director and if those positions are different from the Planning Manager. Phil also answered that these positions are different and are a part of the Tallahassee- Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD).

Item #2: Capital Circle Southeast Design-Build Award

Dave Bright stated that earlier in the year the RFQ process began for the segment from Connie Drive to south of Tram Road. In May, the Evaluation & Selection Committee's, short-listed three (3) firms:

- Coxwell Contracting (Contractor)/ H.W. Lochner (Design)/ Peavy (Paving)/ Greenhorne & O' Mara (CEI)
- Lane Construction (Contractor)/ URS (Design)/ Genesis (CEI)
- M, Inc. and C.W. Roberts Joint Venture (Contractor)/ PBS&J (Design)/ Parsons Brinckerhoff (CEI)

The RFP process began and ended with 30% of the design from each firm presented. He stated that the bid price proposals will be opened on Tuesday, August 31, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. Dave further stated that two (2) of the three (3) firms had the meandering trail on the East side or Southwood side of the road, while the other firm had the trail on the West side. He asked the committee if this was a problem and were they concerned with the conflicting sides of the road.

Jack Dieslethorst asked that since developments were on the West side, would it be a requirement to incorporate sidewalks. Dave answered that each design had a sidewalk on one side and the trail on the other, regardless of which side of the roadway they are on. Jim Davis added that the Multi-Modal System does not require both facilities on each side. Dave presented the group with a video submitted by one of the firms as a part of their proposal (The 8 minute Video was watched with limited comments by the group).

After the video, the group commented on its impressiveness. Michael Wright requested the scores from the bid opening be sent via e-mail to all TCC members.

Item #3: Blueprint 2000 Web Page

Bonnie Pfuntner, Public Involvement Manager for the LPA Group, briefly updated the committee on the Web Page status. Ms. Pfuntner stated the website is up and running and would soon include project specific pages.

III. Consent Items

Item #4: TCC Minutes: April 12, 2004

Item #5: Meeting Dates

Gabe Menendez made a motion to approve the Consent portion of the Agenda; it was seconded by Michael Wright, and was passed unanimously by the Committee.

IV. Presentations/Discussion

Item #6: Master Plan and Capital Budget

Phil Maher presented this item to the committee. Phil stated that the Master Plan was prepared only using existing resources. He also stated that all cost estimates were done using concept reports recently developed by the General Engineering Consultant (GEC). Strategies and priorities were adopted from the October 20, 2003 IA Meeting. Phil further stated a few key points in the plan. The Sensitive Lands portion was completely funded, including the contract with Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWMD) for \$2.5M, Headwaters of the St. Marks River for \$9M, Lake Jackson Basin for \$3.5M, and the Lafayette Basin for \$5.1M. A committee member asked what the Lake Jackson Basin was. Jim Davis explained that there are two (2) parcels of land located at the Lake Jackson Basin, which will serve as trail connectors to Meridian Road. Jim also stated that the Timberlane Ravine is included and is a top priority.

Another question was posed regarding available resources and the totals in the columns of the Master Plan. Phil explained the totals for each column reflected the unnetted interest as directed by the IA. John Buss asked if all projects netted interest and how it was determined whether to pay interest or not. Mr. Maher stated no, all projects did not pay interest. Jim Davis explained that the IA approved a year ago, that if any entity received money early, interest was paid on the project. The accumulation schedule based on a percentage determined if monies were received early. Phil elaborated further by stating of the two (2) proposals that were presented to the IA in June, they chose the one that stated the City and County will receive their share of what money Blueprint 2000 received that year on a monthly basis. Jim Davis further stated that because the plan accounted for approximately \$90M in interest, some road projects could not be funded.

Theresa Heiker asked about the line item titled "other". Phil explained that the \$54,000 in the year 2004 was allocated for Moving expenses/Building Renovations, and the \$75,000 in 2005 would be for Capital Circle Southeast. Theresa also inquired about the difference between "Lafayette Floodplain" and "Floodplain". Phil explained that the "Lafayette Floodplain" is a Blueprint 2000 project that is fully funded, and the "Floodplain" line item is for opportunities that may arise, i.e. land purchases, that Blueprint 2000 can capitalize on in the future. Phil Maher continued to explain the cost and funding for each project. Theresa Heiker asked why the Plan showed Stormwater retrofit lagging construction by 9 years. Phil explained that in order to balance the budget, some items were streamlined, however if other funds became available, the money will allow for gap filling later. Theresa stated that when the original plan was discussed, its purpose was to exceed standards, and the lagging in the Stormwater portion of the project was off course from the original plan. Phil replied that if stormwater retrofit were moved up, then other road projects would have to be put on the back burner. Theresa requested the information to be highlighted in the plan.

A question was asked regarding the segments of Capital Circle Southeast (CCSE) from Woodville Highway to Tram Road and from Woodville Highway to Crawfordville Highway and why the Right-of-Way (ROW) was not acquired until ten (10) years after the preliminary

engineering. Jim Davis answered that the intent was not for that to happen, but to allow sufficient time to acquire money over time for ROW acquisition. A committee member commented that with the price of land increasing over time, there would be a hardship surrounding condemnation. Mr. Davis further stated that there were still opportunities to leverage funds; however there was a \$200M shortfall and the projects that were funded on the Master Plan are funded according to the Priority List. Any additional monies allow for projects to be moved up and other projects to be funded. Phil stated that Capital Cascade Trail (CCT), segments 1-3, are fully funded, however the cost had increased from \$70M to over \$150M. Michael Wright asked why the increase was so significant. It was explained that the Concept Report analysis determined this and projects were broken down by elements known now. Phil also stated that money reflects a 4% inflation factor on construction and 7% on Right-of Way.

Michael Wright asked when an in depth workshop would be held to reflect more detail of the CCT project. Mark Llewellyn of the Genesis Group stated that they have tentatively planned a workshop for October 7, 2004. John Buss asked whether the calculations were done with the time value of money. Jim explained the estimates only project 4.5% revenue growth, but not project cost. Further discussion followed. John Buss also asked if segment 4 was just an allowance in expectation of getting other money to reserve design funds and will it affect the study that is underway. He further stated that a potential problem could be leveraging of funds, which would be moot if ROW was not available until 15 years later. Jerry Oshesky, LPA Group Program Manager answered that the report only reflects money available now and if other funds become available sooner, the plan would obviously change. Further discussion regarding stormwater followed and several points were made, including the Blueprint 2000 vision and the IA considering dropping a major project (i.e. CCT or CCNW, 90 to 20) to accommodate the stormwater retrofit. Theresa Heiker stated the original committee identified the cost of each project to include a treatment facility for the roadway that was greater than the minimum requirement, which is what the additional funds were to be used for in the original construction. She further stated, "the stormwater enhancements were tied to the pavement." John Buss added that Blueprint staff should give the IA an alternative to the Master Plan that includes taking money from other locations to fulfill the stormwater issue. Theresa stated she didn't understand why Greenway and Stormwater were the only entities being moved out. She also stated that Construction can be stalled, not just enhancements. Jim Davis stated that in the preliminary stages of CCNW, stormwater was not to be included with the road. He further stated that the Blueprint vision was incorporated in the Master Plan.

Phil stated that Blueprint was asking for \$78M+ in the Capital Budget for 2004-2005. A committee member stated that it is the TCC's request that the IA be made fully aware of their concerns on this item and other items in the future. John Buss made a motion to approve staff recommendation with the following changes:

- Text of Agenda item should reflect the TCC discussion/concerns with tying the enhanced stormwater with the road construction.
- Blueprint 2000 develops a Master Plan that better connects the stormwater and construction, moving other projects out to make it happen.

Further discussion followed.

Vince Long seconded the motion, and the committee passed it unanimously.

Item #7: Real Estate Policy

Jim Davis stated he wanted to Thank Ray Youmans, Real Estate Manager; Dan Rigo, County Attorney's Office; Debra Schiro, City Attorney's Office; and Maribel Nicholson-Choice, Greenburg-Traurig (General Counsel) for all their hard work and dedication on the policy. He also stated that since Blueprint is planning to purchase 500+ parcels of land, a policy had to be put in place. Since the IA has voted to meet three (3) times a year, it was unreasonable to try to bring all parcels before the Board for approval. Blueprint 2000 has given itself vested authority to acquire property that has been approved by the IA and/or the IMC. This allows Blueprint the capability to react quickly on land purchases. Michael Wright inquired about the maximum price that Blueprint plans to spend. Jim answered the full budget allowance of \$2.8M. Jim has buying authority up to \$100,000 and the IMC has to approve purchases above \$100,000. A committee member asked if Eminent Domain authority had been assigned to Blueprint 2000. Jim Davis answered yes, and is consistent with Rule 163, with condemnation to be presented to the Board for approval.

Michael Wright made a motion to approve staff recommendation with the exception that all purchases have to be approved by Jim Davis and the IMC, and taken to the Board if approval isn't agreed to. John Buss seconded. Jim stated that if the policy is changed with the suggested provision, then the policy is subjected to the Sunshine Law. Questions were raised regarding the use of the City and County Attorney's for Eminent Domain lawsuits. Jim stated that it was more cost effective to use these entities rather than the Agency General Counsel, Greenburg-Traurig. Michael Wright expressed his concern for the timeframe associated with the City and County Attorney's schedules. Jim stated that he was comfortable with the utilization of both Attorney Offices after speaking with Jim English, City Attorney. There was a reimbursement policy being put in place to re-pay the City for services, and talks with the County were forthcoming. Michael Wright withdrew his motion.

John Buss made an alternate motion to approve staff recommendation, Michael Wright seconded, and it passed unanimously.

Item #8: Capital Cascade Trail: Alternative Concepts

Dave Bright introduced Mark Llewellyn of Genesis Group. Dave Bright stated that the Capital Cascade Trail project has been underway for approximately ten (10) months, with two (2) public meetings, the most recent taking place on June 3, 2004. The Capital Cascade Council from Trust for Public Land (TPL), Friends for Centennial Field, Cultural Resources Commission, Florida Department of Management Services (FDMS), The Riley House and Leon High School. The next public meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2004. Mark Llewellyn gave a detailed overview of the project. He stated the schedule was on time. Task four (4)-Data Collection was essentially complete, which included field survey. Right-of-Way surveying was near complete (waiting for Title Searches). Task two (2)-Existing Stream Hydrolysis Analysis was essentially complete with the exception of the file report, which addresses comments from the City and County. Task three (3)-Alternative Analysis was moving quickly and was very detailed, but includes some issues with Water Quality. There were three (3) alternatives for each of the four (4) segments of the project. The segments are:

- Segment 1: Tennessee Street to Apalachee Parkway
- Segment 2: Apalachee Parkway to South Monroe Street
- Segment 3: South Monroe Street to Gamble Street
- Segment 4: Gamble Street to the confluence with Munson Slough

The traffic analysis is in the process of being refined, but is still in draft mode.

Stormwater is the biggest issue and needs to be resolved.

Mr. Llewellyn stated that segment three (3) of the project has required working with FAMU on the FAMU Way issue. Michael Wright stated that the City was in negotiations for parcels totaling ten (10) acres in the Stearn Street/Mosley section. He further stated that the parcels would aid in the development of Capital Cascade Trail and would help to tie in FSU's Woodward Avenue project.

Mark stated that segment four (4) was the connection to all trails. He also stated that there was significant ROW constraint in this area. Mark also mentioned that they were working with CSX on railroad issues and how they would or would not affect construction and land use.

Michael Wright asked what the timetable was on the road project in segment one (1). Mark Llewellyn stated that work is still being done on the Master Plan and should be complete by February 1, 2005. Dave Bright added that the Genesis Group contract does allow design to begin right after planning is complete.

Item #9: Capital Cascade Trail: Stormwater Issues

David Bright gave a brief overview on the agenda item. He stated discussion needed to be made regarding existing conditions of stormwater. The model is being developed by Genesis Group and Camp, Dresser, & McKee (CDM). Dave further stated that Issue B of the agenda item may have been discussed at last weeks meeting. He also stated that the 100-year flood design determination was necessary.

Issue A: Existing Conditions Stormwater Model:

Dave Bright stated the reason the issue was coming before the TCC is for its technical support and expertise. Ed Ringe continued with a brief overview of the issue. He stated the County's Lake Munson Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contract requires Lake Munson be converted to XP-SWMM, which has been completed. It was calibrated within contract limits. The reports are in the works. Mr. Ringe further stated that the most critical part of the model are the trails extensive and expensive design considerations, and should be agreed upon prior to design and/or construction. Jaime Girardi from Camp, Dresser, & McKee addressed the committee to elaborate on Ed's points on model development. He stated many data sources were tied into the development of the model to give a more inclusive report on Munson Basin.

John Buss gave his opinion on the model. He stated that the information on calibration was severely limited. He believed there was far more calibration in Tallahassee that should be

available. He also stated that the model was not in the factory of the scope in the antidotal information. While realizing that no model was correct, City stormwater did not think the calibration done on the central drainage ditch near the FSU branch was done well. City stormwater was also concerned with calibration south of Gamble Street. Mr. Buss further stated that two (2) other areas where the antidotal information was of concern are:

- Tennessee Street variations in 1994 storm
- Wahnish Way variance

Lastly, John Buss stated that City stormwater was satisfied with the model with the exception of the aforementioned concerns. He later expressed concern with the difference of the FEMA maps and the maps in the model.

Theresa Heiker stated that County stormwater felt the questions they submitted earlier regarding the parameters and details of the maps were not answered. The County was not interested in approving re-mapping if not consistent. Ms. Heiker also stated that on Gamble Street since the South portion had a problem with calibration, then the question had to be raised regarding the accuracy North of Gamble Street. Ms. Heiker also stated that City stormwater should have the re-mapping done prior to the completion of the model.

Mark Llewellyn stated that the committee must agree on the existing conditions model in order for the alternate analysis to be completed. Without the model, comparison cannot be made to other stormwater facilities and the cost effectiveness cannot be determined. In addition, the public meeting was scheduled for October 7, 2004 and Genesis Group and Blueprint staff do not want to present information to the public that may be incorrect or may change in the future. Mr. Llewellyn expressed his intent to have the draft alternative analysis for the public meeting.

John Buss made a reluctant motion to move forward with staff recommendation with the expectation that staff report back to the City and County stormwater Directors on there concerns. Jim Davis seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Issue B: Stormwater Level of Service:

Ed Ringe gave a brief overview of the issue. He stated the County would accept the City's criteria for Stormwater Level of Service. He gave an example using Franklin Boulevard. Ed stated that Franklin Blvd. is a county road, but when the stormwater is addressed, City criteria states that Underground Conveyance or Overland Flow must be used. Underground Conveyance will be used because Overland Flow is unacceptable. This in itself shows the high level of service proposed. In addition, Ed stated that FDOT standard criteria on South Monroe with significant continuation must also be adhered to. Mr. Ringe stated that Water Quality is very critical. Full stormwater retrofit will be provided as much as possible, in the form of off-site ponds. Tony Park asked whether off-site improvements for other projects besides those of Blueprint 2000's were considered, for example Lafayette Street, which is a County project. Ed stated yes, and that Blueprint 2000 is looking into acquiring five (5) acres in the Myers Park area, and acquiring the Howard Johnson (HoJo) site. Jim Davis added that Blueprint 2000 is dealing with existing conditions. Where they can provide assistance to other projects they will, but existing conditions are first priority.

John Buss asked for a distinction be made between Roadway Level of Service and Flood Mitigation Level of Service.

Issue C: Land Use Data for Water Quality Determination:

Ed Ringe stated that during a progress meeting, they realized that the land use information presently used in the City of Tallahassee's Non-Point Source Load Model (COTNPSLM) is data collected in 1999. Since it has not been updated with current data, staff feels the need to update it with current or 2004 information. Blueprint staff does not want the perception to be that outdated information was used to represent the model. Ed further stated that the watershed was very stable. Therefore, the data collected in 1999 will suffice since the 2004 data will not change the outcome of the report. Staff asked the committee to allow use of the 1999 pre-existing data. The report will be used to determine alternative treatments for pollutant load factors. Dave Bright stated that issue C was just for TCC information only.

A Quorum was lost at this point.

Item #10: Construction Management @ Risk

Jim Davis stated that a delivery method had been discussed for Capital Cascade Trail. He also stated that because of the complicated issues, varied circumstances, and unique criteria this project is replete with chances to fail. Construction Management @ Risk was the first option as a delivery method. Bill Little stated that CM @ Risk is the delivery method as well as the execution of design option for Phases 1-3 of the Genesis Group contract for the Capital Cascade Trail. Bill stated that as of now, the project has lots of problems, including severe flooding, complicated multi-discipline and on the public's radar screen. Therefore, staff wants the project to be top-notch, retain control of the design, and utilize as many local MBE firms as possible. The project meets three (3) different delivery methods. They are:

- Design-Bid-Build, separately hire a designer and contractor according to low bid.
- Design-Build, hire a single entity for design and construction, single point of responsibility
- CM @ Risk, hire a design engineer, retains control of design, hire Construction Manager who acts also as a General Contractor. As a General Contractor they pre-qualify sub-contractors and take bids for different components of the project.

Bill stated that this practice was done commonly in vertical type construction. Bill stated there were several specifics of CM @ Risk. He stated that when using CM @ Risk you will have a Construction Manager that will provide you with constructibility reviews, value engineering, assistance with project cost, schedule, and help maintain quality of the overall project. It also utilizes a Contingency System for changes once you obtain a guaranteed maximum price. Mr. Little further stated that CM @ Risk has many advantages:

- Allows you to maintain control of the project design
- Allows teaming with Construction Manager to obtain a guaranteed maximum price prior to design completion
- Allows you to use contingency to eliminate costly and time consuming conflicts

- Allows for maximization of coordination between different segments, different designers, etc.
- Allows you to pre-qualify sub-contractors.

Bill also stated that there was a cost associated with CM @ Risk. He mentioned that in the pre-construction phase the contractor charges on a Professional fee basis. It tends to accumulate and ends up being about 1% of the construction cost. In addition, the fee associated with the Construction Manager taking the risk to guarantee a guaranteed maximum price, costs are around 2-3% of the construction cost. In addition, the contract allows for reimbursement at direct cost (labor plus fringes) to the Project Manager when acting in the Construction Manager position. Lastly, he stated that when you hire a CM @ Risk contractor, they may want to perform some work themselves with the Agency approval. The savings at the end of the project is minimum when using CM @ Risk compared to Design-Build, but the effectiveness of the direct input in the project overrides this.

Michael Wright asked what the disadvantages were to the process. Bill explained the disadvantages are that the process is relatively new, fewer claims, and do not carry many downsides due to its uniqueness. John Buss stated that he has many questions and asked that the discussion be continued to the next meeting. He also requested to speak with consultants, contractors, etc. to insure that cost was not hiked up. Mr. Buss also wanted to know if a decision had to be made on the item today. Jim Davis stated yes, because the CM @ Risk needs to be hired before getting all the designers on board and can participate in the selection of a designer. Jim Davis further stated that Blueprint 2000 believes that CM @ Risk was a good idea. He stated that because this project was so complex, CM @ Risk allows for maximum flexibility and allows for complete design control. CM @ Risk also allows for a long congenuity. John Buss also expressed his concern with the short timeframe allotted for this decision as well as the partition in the stormwater design. He also expressed that items of such an important nature should have more discussion time. He further stated that it seemed as though the TCC was painted into a corner every time on issues that should be discussed at length and asked that an agenda item be placed on the next agenda to discuss meeting schedule. Mr. Buss also wanted to know if the CM @ Risk had to be hired now or could it wait until after the January meeting. Jim Davis stated no, the CM @ Risk had to be hired soon because the process would take approximately three months to get him on board. Michael Wright stated that the issue should be tabled to next meeting due to the lack of quorum. Further discussion followed.

V. Citizens to be Heard

There were none.

VI. Items from Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Tony Park, Vice Chairperson, adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m.