

Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency

Board of Directors

Meeting Minutes

Date: July 15, 2021
To: Board of Directors
From: Benjamin H. Pingree, PLACE Director
Subject: Summary Minutes to Board of Directors Meeting of May 27, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT

COUNTY	CITY
Commissioner Nick Maddox, Vice-Chair	Commissioner Dianne Williams-Cox, Chair
Commissioner Kristin Dozier	Mayor John Dailey
Commissioner Carolyn Cummings	Commissioner Curtis Richardson
Commissioner Brian Welch	Commissioner Jeremy Matlow
Commissioner Rick Minor	Commissioner Jacqueline Porter
Commissioner Bill Proctor	
Commissioner Jimbo Jackson	

I. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

Commissioners Matlow, Porter, Richardson, and Minor pulled Item 5 for discussion.

M1. Approval of the Allocation of Tallahassee-Leon County Office of Economic Vitality Funds in Support of Project Mango

Cristina Paredes provided a brief overview of the confidential business expansion opportunity, code name Project Mango, which included an overview of the project and its economic impact on Tallahassee-Leon County, the Competitive Projects process, the Targeted Business program. Project Mango would be a \$200 million capital expenditure for a 650,000 square foot fulfillment center supporting 1000 direct jobs paying at, or above, \$15 per hour. The total economic impact of \$454.1 million and 3,602 direct, indirect, and induced jobs. Approval of the performance-based, incentive package did not guarantee that Tallahassee-Leon County would be selected; however, it allowed Tallahassee-Leon County to maintain a competitive posture as the company evaluated this and other sites for its future location.

Citizen Comment

Sammy Dixon spoke in favor of Project Mango noting the 1000 permanent jobs at a minimum of \$15 per hour.

Jeff Hendry spoke in favor of Project Mango and the diversification of jobs in Tallahassee-Leon County, particularly the construction and indirect jobs

that it would create, the benefit to the airport and institutions of higher education, and the regional impact.

Sue Dick spoke in favor of Project Mango and the indirect jobs it would create that supported talent retention in Tallahassee-Leon County.

Max Epstein spoke in favor of Project Mango and stated that big projects, such as Mango, needed more time for public review, comment, and vetting.

Brian Sealey spoke in favor of Project Mango for the job opportunities and employment diversification.

Stanley Sims spoke in favor of Project Mango and encouraged the company to practice diversity in hiring minorities.

Barney Bishop spoke in favor of Project Mango noting the businesses that would develop because of the business expansion into Tallahassee-Leon County.

Arley Huggins spoke in favor of Project Mango citing the long-term benefits of a similar project to his hometown in South Dakota.

Karla Revels spoke in opposition to Project Mango noting the detrimental impacts to the Arbor Branch neighborhood. She encouraged locating the business on the west side near the airport.

Mayor Dailey stated that Project Mango was a crucial vote for the IA Board, as it indicated that Tallahassee-Leon County was truly open to recruiting private sector business and adding jobs and sales tax to the local economy.

Mayor Dailey moved, seconded by Commissioner Richardson, to approve option 1.

Option 1: Approve the Targeted Business application for Project Mango and allocate \$2,565,299 over six years to support this project from the OEV Capital Budget.

Commissioner Richardson spoke in favor of increasing the private industry sector in Tallahassee-Leon County. He noted the changes in state government jobs and restricted salaries over the past 20 years and need to diversify in order to retain the talent of students graduating from local colleges and universities.

Commissioner Welch spoke in favor of Project Mango for the proactive approach by the company and the ecosystem that would rise up around the business.

Commissioner Minor spoke in favor of Project Mango stating that it was the biggest economic development opportunity in the history of Tallahassee-Leon County that would support the decades long effort to diversify the labor market. He also noted the opportunities to learn from other communities to maximize the investment.

Commissioner Dozier spoke in favor of Project Mango stating that it was an opportunity to see a return on investment of sales tax funds into infrastructure and economic development. Regarding incentive and Targeted Business programs noting that it supported the diversification of the labor market in Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Proctor spoke in favor of Project Mango and strongly encouraged the use of local contractors and vendors, utilizing the talent pipeline out of local educational institutions, that the company embrace diversity, and support Tallahassee-Leon County community activities through sponsorships,

Commissioner Cummings spoke in favor of Project Mango stating that it was a tremendous opportunity for Tallahassee-Leon County. The infrastructure and environmental issues would be addressed through the policy and procedures of permitting through Leon County.

Commissioner Jackson spoke in favor of Project Mango stating that it was a benefit for Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Porter stated that she could not support Project Mango as it felt rushed and needed more time for public input. She cited a Brookings Institute study, which stated that 75% of incentive packages did not affect the company's decision on where to locate, and that 10-30% of new jobs went to residents who were not already employed. Furthermore, while she supported growth and a diverse economy however, she did not feel that tax incentives were an effective way to boost employment. Cities and Counties that invested in transportation infrastructure saw up to 10% greater return on those investments over incentive packages. Lastly, she did not feel that the IA Board had enough time to deliberate on the benefits and that \$15 per hour was not a livable wage.

Commissioner Dozier stated that the local construction industry was desperate for labor and Project Mango would be an incredible benefit. It also provided an opportunity to review the labor force and lift the industry, particularly subcontractors.

The motion passed 11-1 (weighted: 63-7) with Commissioner Porter casting the dissenting vote.

II. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDAED ITEMS

Public comments were received by email to Comments@BlueprintIA.org through 5:00 p.m. on May 26, 2021. All emails received were provided to the IA Board. Live comments were also taken in person and via WebEx during the meeting. Those comments are summarized below.

Citizen Comment

Stanley Sims stated that his own unnamed economic development project was excluded from the IA Board agenda.

Donna Cotterell spoke on the disruption to family legacies and generational wealth lost through eminent domain for Blueprint projects.

Margaret Moore held a moment of silence for the one year anniversary of the death of Tony McDade and the community impact of choices made by the IA Board.

Priscilla Hawkins stated that eminent domain was the new Jim Crow because residents were unaware of the project development and were not fairly compensated through the process.

Steve Martin spoke on the 2014 ballot language and results for the sales tax extension and lack of transparency.

III. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS

- CAC Chair Report – submitted in writing
- EVLC Chair Report – submitted in writing

IV. CONSENT

ACTION TAKEN: Mayor Dailey moved, seconded by Commissioner Minor to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

The motion passed 12-0 (weighted (70-0)).

1. Approval of the April 8, 2021, Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors Meeting and Strategic Plan Workshop Minutes

Option 1: Approve the April 8, 2021, Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors Meeting and Strategic Plan Workshop Minutes.

2. Acceptance of the Draft Blueprint Citizens Advisory Committee and Economic Vitality Leadership Committee May 12, 2021, Meeting Minutes

Option 1: Accept the Draft Blueprint Citizens Advisory Committee and Economic Vitality Leadership Committee May 12, 2021, Minutes.

3. Approval of the FY 2020 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

Option 1: Accept the Fiscal Year 2020 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency.

4. Approval of a Bond Reimbursement Resolution

Option 1: Approve Resolution No. 2021-01, allowing the Agency to be reimbursed from the proceeds of a planned future bond sale for the construction and implementation of various capital projects.

ITEMS PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

5. Approval of the Northeast Gateway Project Development and Environmental Study

Autumn Calder provided a brief overview of the steps included to finalize the draft of the Northeast Gateway PD&E study and submittal to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), consistent with the eligibility requirements for the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Loan. Ryan Wetherell, Design Consultant and Project Engineer with Kimley Horn & Associates, provided a brief overview of the PD&E process and history of IA Board actions, the environmental and engineering analyses included in the technical study, and the economic impact of the project. Mr. Wetherell recapped the purpose and needs statement of the project, collaboration with Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department and the Capital Regional Transportation Planning Agency (CRTPA), community engagement. He stated that the purpose of the document review period and public hearing on the PD&E was to present the design concept and receive public comment. Each comment received would be addressed and that response would be made available on the project website. Mr. Wetherell clarified that it would not end public engagement or input on the project. It was simply a milestone along the road to completion of the project.

Regarding the project economic impact study, Ryan Wetherell stated that the Northeast Gateway project would support 18,500 to 70,339 permanent jobs and \$9.7 million to \$52.1 million in state and local taxes. The study was prepared by the Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis for opening year, 2025, and design year, 2045. Development around the Northeast Gateway would generate \$2.2 billion to \$8.2 billion in total economic development, with economic growth results of \$263 million to \$1.08 billion in tax receipts. Autumn Calder provided an overview of the accomplishments of the PD&E study. A copy of the presentation is on file at Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency.

Citizen Comment

Gay Mitchell spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project noting that the roundabout would take large portions of her property and safety concerns.

Kathy Archibald spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project stating that it was too soon, too expensive, and that cheaper alternatives were available.

Drew McCloud spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project noting significant impacts to residents and the fast-paced nature of the project.

Max Epstein spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project stating that residents did not want the project and questioned why it continued to move forward.

Roy Knight spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project citing the damages that it would bring to the quality of life of residents.

Arley Huggins spoke in favor to the Northeast Gateway project noting the improved traffic benefits, safety, and flow that the project would provide and support of neighbors.

Priscilla Hawkins spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project noting safety concerns of the roundabout for residents.

Eva Armstrong spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project and requested that the IA Board slow the project in order to gain additional data on climate and behavioral changes, brought about by the pandemic, regarding transportation.

Scott Hannahs spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project noting that the PD&E was incomplete, had not considered all alternatives, and should not be accepted by the IA Board.

Randie Denker spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project citing the inability to pursue eminent domain on property owners due to the unconsidered alternatives offered by residents.

Wendy Grey spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project citing the need for more data and analysis, the timing of economic and engineering reports and public comment.

Jeff Blair spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project citing benefits of a resident proposed alternative alignment and ineffective public outreach. He also spoke in opposition to Project Mango.

Steven Martin spoke in opposition to the Northeast Gateway project expressing concern for personal agendas by lobbyist and the owners of Welaunee Plantation.

Commissioner Matlow stated that the speed of the project was unlike any other. The IA Board voted to amend substantially and advance fund the Northeast Gateway project before the traffic study for the original Shamrock Extension was done. He stated that the IA Board was chasing a dream without pausing to evaluate if it was needed or wanted by the community. Furthermore, they had not provided staff the liberty to address it any way other than Shamrock and Roberts Road opening simultaneously. He questioned the wisdom of that direction because of the pushback from the community and the debt service on advance funding it through bonds. Commissioner Matlow stated that the Northeast Gateway, like other advance funded projects and funding requests such as Item 7, were similar in that they served as an opportunity to find funding for projects that the Tallahassee-Leon County community truly wanted.

Commissioner Matlow noted that one citizen discussed Alternative 4, and requested additional information on it. Ryan Wetherell stated that Alternative 4 was presented to the IA Board in December 2019. It stopped short of I-10 that would connect to a Thornton Road extension back to Miccosukee Road. Mr. Wetherell stated that the 2007 framework, used by the CRTPA for regional model,

was updated with current roadway network and land use data, to evaluate the project in 2025, 2035, and 2045. Opening year, 2025, assumed no development because there was not yet a roadway in place to support it; 2035 showed some development with more following at 2045, however, the model predicted that it was long way from being fully built out, even then. In 2025, Alternative 4, provided a comparable level of relief to Centerville and Miccosukee roads. Review of the modeling data for vehicle miles traveled and total volume of traffic on neighborhood roads, drove the decision not to support Alternative 4. Furthermore, Alternative 4 dashed in a greenway crossing, for modeling purposes, which, as Mr. Wetherell understood it, had not yet been approved by the state legislature.

Commissioner Matlow requested information on traffic modeling for Alternative 1 versus Alternative 4. Ryan Wetherell stated that the models for 2025, 2035, and 2045, indicated that Alternative 1 provided greater relief, in all instances, on Centerville and local neighborhood roads achieving those aspects of the purpose and needs. In the opening year, 2025, Alternative 1, carried upwards of 7,000-9,000 cars pulling traffic off surrounding roadways, before any development. Alternative 4 was less than half that amount at 4,000 cars because it was not connected to the network in the same ways. The 2025 modeling data was critical because that would be the immediate relief provided to the community.

Commissioner Matlow stated that while Alternative 4 would only pull half as many cars off existing roadways, it was 80% cheaper than Alternative 1. It would provide some relief without considerable capital investment and bond series. That was money that, frankly, Blueprint did not have to spend and resulted in the IA Board deferring projects, such as Tharpe Street, which was currently at capacity; a project that was ranked higher than any version of the Northeast Gateway by the CRTPA. He stated that the only reason the IA Board was considering the Northeast Gateway was their choice to advance fund and build it as quickly as possible. He encouraged the IA Board to slow the pace of the project and reevaluate all alternatives now that the PD&E was complete in order to find an alternative that was supported by the community.

Commissioner Richardson stated that he was not against the project but encouraged the IA Board to slow the pace of the project, if it had no adverse effect to the project in order to allow for additional public input. He noted the tremendous cost differences between the alternatives and requested staff to address that. Ryan Wetherell stated that comparing the cost of Alternative 1 now, to Alternative 4 from 2019, was comparing apples to oranges because of the number of items not yet contemplated. The 2019 evaluation and estimate assumed a roadway but did not yet include design, greenways, bridges, wildlife crossings, etc. it was an early apples to apples comparison of four alternatives to provide an order of magnitude cost at that phase of the project. The cost of Alternative 1 evolved through the PD&E as it came to include bridge analyses, typical sections, environmental studies, land acquisition and mitigation of impacts to the conservation easements, did not provide the opportunity for a new interchange with I-10, etc. Additionally, construction costs had increased in the last two years. Mr. Wetherell stated that he could not provide a current estimate on Alternative 4, with the additional items included because IA Board direction was to study one build alternative.

Commissioner Richardson questioned if there would be any adverse effects should the IA Board elect to delay the project. Ben Pingree stated that the prioritization and planning process began shortly after the sales tax extension was approved in 2014, in order to be as prepared as possible to push the projects to market when collections began. Mr. Pingree stated that the project could be delayed with impacts to cost and the next steps. Autumn Calder stated that regarding scheduling, the SIB loan application process occurred once annually, delaying would push the project back one year. Additionally, Blueprint received the contract for the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funding from FDOT, which was contingent on providing relief to traffic congestion on Thomasville Road. Delaying the project could result in Blueprint losing that grant funding. Ryan Wetherell stated that from a traffic perspective, there would be no relief to Centerville or Thomasville Roads, or the local neighborhood roadways. On timing, the scope of the PD&E was outlined by FDOT and required a 15-day public review period, ahead of the public hearing. The PD&E documents were on display at the Northeast Public Library and Blueprint offices and available on the project website.

Commissioner Minor stated that he shared Commissioner Richardson's perspective and frame of mind. The project had been around with staff working on it and citizens speaking on it for a very long time however, Commissioners were elected to listen to the citizens. He understood the implications of the SIB loan cycle but it would be available annually. He questioned the implications of losing the TRIP grant. Autumn Calder stated that the grant was for \$1.5 million; she thought it was an annual application process however, it required that Blueprint show relief to the roadway network in order to be eligible for it. Commissioner Minor stated that he felt the need to pause the project in order to allow time for citizens to receive responses to their concerns and speak with staff and Commissioners about them as well. The main question is the cost difference between Alternative 1 and Alternative 4; some of which had been addressed in the meeting. However, he wanted the opportunity for the give and take of dialogue, to address concerns, and move forward where the IA Board could.

Commissioner Dozier revisited the discussion at the April 8, 2021, IA Board meeting regarding Alternative A and Alternative D. She recognized the history of IA Board votes and noted that while they could change their minds, there was considerable money wrapped up in those choices. Delaying the project too long could mean that portions of the PD&E would need to be repeated. Based on conversation at the current meeting, she questioned if the work of the PD&E would be valid in one to two years. Ryan Wetherell stated that in general terms, traffic was the driver of PD&E data; that had a three-year expiration, and therefore would be valid until 2024. Beyond that, the PD&E would need to be repeated in totality. Commissioner Dozier stated that with that and the ability to apply for TRIP again in another year, she did not see reason not to pause the project in order to provide time for additional public comment and to give the IA Board time to digest the comments received. Enough questions existed that the IA Board owed it to Tallahassee-Leon County to evaluate the details of the PD&E and economic assessment and questioned what the next steps would look like should the IA Board not accept the PD&E study. Ben Pingree stated that the project documents

would not be transmitted to the state and would not be in the SIB loan cycle. Blueprint would not issue the contract for consulting services to negotiate right of way acquisition nor the greenway acquisition. Choosing to delay the project might also jeopardize the Northeast Park land acquisition at the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) because as he understood it, the Northeast Park was tied to the Northeast Gateway project and Comp Plan amendment. At a minimum, it pushed all of it back by one year. He was unable to address the implications to debt services, if SIB loans would be funded by the state in subsequent fiscal years. It could also mean an agenda item coming before the IA Board for consideration of many factors.

Regarding the Northeast Park Commissioner Dozier addressed the County Administrator, Vince Long, and stated that she understood that the property owners did not want to proceed with sale until the Comp Plan amendment was finalized. She had not heard that it was tied to Northeast Gateway. The County Administrator stated that it could be very much be tied to Northeast Gateway. Mr. Long stated that the landowner had an interest in the development of Welaunee Boulevard. However, Mr. Long stated that the project could be delayed as long as the IA Board would like, and that the IA Board discussed the merits of the project at the April 8, 2021, meeting and approved it. It was highly unusual for the IA Board to have the PD&E come back and discuss it again but they could do that. This the point in the process where engineering staff would convey any concerns or anything unusual, which was discovered in the PD&E process. That did not happen therefore staff recommended that the IA Board continue with the project. The IA Board could determine the timeline for it, however, there is an awful lot, too much to exhaust in the current meeting, that could be tied to the IA Board's decision on the project timeline.

Commissioner Dozier noted that the 2020 Comp Plan amendment process on Welaunee was one of the most complicated in her 11 years of service. That was in part due to the City and County being caught between folks who wanted no development for 10-15 years; preferring instead to settle the agreements and shore up the property. To rush other decisions, including Northeast Park, when there was not supposed to be any development for 10-15 years made her question the motivation.

Commissioner Welch stated that he understood and respected the concerns of his neighbors and constituents, and he supported the much needed road project. Reflecting on the process, his perspective was that stakeholders supported, or were at least okay, with the Comp Plan amendments passed in 2020. If the will of the IA Board was to delay the project, he could support that because it was clear that some people felt unheard. However, just two months earlier, the IA Board held a robust discussion on the Centerville and Roberts Road intersection style and alignment, and the roundabout concept prevailed. He supported improved access for Roberts Middle and Montford Elementary schools, the Northeast Park, and the improvements to traffic congestion that Welaunee Boulevard would provide. He was not sure that delaying the project a year would change those facts; however he was committed to finding balance between the project and stakeholders. He questioned the possibility of more robust engagement and still make the deadlines

for the SIB loan, retain the TRIP grant funds, and facilitate a project that was needed in the community.

Commissioner Welch acknowledged the housing issue across Leon County and the conversations, from before his campaign for County Commissioner, that the Welaunee development would control the next 30 years of growth in Tallahassee-Leon County. He felt frustrated by the level of disdain for that reality. He acknowledged the years of public engagement and staff work and the reality that some stakeholders still did not feel engaged. He questioned if Blueprint could include even more public engagement opportunities or if the intersection alignment could be revisited or reconsidered by the IA Board. If not, he felt that the discussion needed to evolve to the timing of the PD&E transmittal, summer of 2021 or in another year.

Autumn Calder clarified that the PD&E was simply a consolidation of the previously approved direction of the IA Board. Blueprint could hold another public meeting on the PD&E and the IA Board could move forward the PD&E approval as it represented the decisions of the IA Board. Regarding the roundabout, Ms. Calder stated that it was a single lane roundabout with a large oak tree in the center, very much like the roundabout at Kerry Forest and Ox Bottom roads, and smaller than the roundabout at Jim Lee Road and Orange Avenue.

Commissioner Williams-Cox noted that the PD&E was listed as a “draft final,” and questioned if there would be a final-final PD&E. Ryan Wetherell state that the PD&E could not be finalized until the public comment period was complete and the responses included in the report. A completed PD&E study was the scope to move forward with the design phase of a project as it addressed and included the public, engineering, and environmental aspects for the design. Mr. Wetherell reiterated that it was not the end of the road, simply a milestone along the road. Commissioner Williams-Cox clarified that if the IA Board approved the draft final PD&E, Blueprint could continue to hold public meetings and engagement opportunities for public input, until the final PD&E. Autumn Calder clarified that the public comment period for the inclusion with the PD&E report would close June 7, 2021. However, public comment and engagement on the project would absolutely continue through the very end of the project.

Commissioner Williams-Cox stated that it seemed there was a belief in the room, that approving the draft-final PD&E would take it out of the hands of the public. Ben Pingree outlined the next steps should the IA Board take no action. All comments received through the June 7, 2021 deadline, would be addressed and included in the PD&E and transmitted to FDOT for their review and consideration. Public engagement by Blueprint would continue through design, construction, and the grand opening of the project. What was presented that evening for IA Board consideration was a PD&E that would not need to come back to the IA Board in its final format. If the IA Board wanted the final PD&E to come back for their review and make the SIB loan deadline of June 30, 2021, it would be necessary to schedule a special IA Board meeting. If the IA Board elected to delay the decision to the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 15, 2021, they would miss the SIB loan deadline and delay the project by one year at a minimum.

Commissioner Porter stated that she absolutely believed that the IA Board should push pause on the project; moving forward despite the public questions and concerns was bad governance. She supported the Northeast Park moving forward through the County. She supported keeping Kimley Horn & Associates under contract to facilitate the public engagement process. She understood the implications of the TRIP grant and SIB loan, however, felt that it was “government speak” for business as usual. She felt it was bad planning to continue to widen roadways, stating that it was an outdated idea given the direction of the economy and climate change, and looked forward to future conversations on investments in public transit. Lastly, she expressed great concern over not having been provided all of the material on all alternatives in order to make an informed decision.

Commissioner Porter moved, seconded by Commissioner Matlow to pause the project for more public input; to bring back an agenda item at the July 15, 2021, meeting and give staff the authority to analyze other options during public engagement.

Ben Pingree clarified that at the December 2019, IA Board meeting Blueprint staff presented the four possible alignments to the IA Board, at the beginning of the PD&E process in order to determine which one would be analyzed (along with the standard no-build option) by Kimley Horn & Associates for the cost provided. Based on IA Board direction, Kimley Horn & Associates moved forward with all engagement and created the PD&E document, on one alignment. Evaluating a multitude of alignments would have financial implications. If that was the will of the IA Board, staff would bring back an agenda item that analyzed the financial impacts and sought approval to complete two to four PD&E studies on the project. Autumn Calder stated that staff would need more time than available before the July 15, 2021 meeting, to study multiple corridors and complete the required analyses.

Commissioner Williams-Cox questioned how long they would pause the project. Autumn Calder stated, for comparison, that Blueprint staff received the authorization from the IA Board to analyze the Roberts Road connection in January 2020. That was a 16-month window.

Mayor Dailey agreed with Commissioner Minor, that the Commissioners were elected to listen yes, but also to lead. Part of leadership required making tough decisions. He encouraged the IA Board not to confuse “not hearing” citizens with respectfully disagreeing. He appreciated and respected the citizen who spoke out on the project, however, he did not agree with their position. Through his fourteen-year tenure with the BOCC and as Mayor, many big decisions were made where friends walked out unhappy with the vote. Leadership through difficult situations, take in all the information, make decision, and move forward was what the citizens of Tallahassee-Leon County elected Commissioners to do. The Northeast Gateway project did not come about overnight. The process that led to the current meeting, including public engagement, began in 2016. The project was included in the ballot for referendum approved by voters of Tallahassee-Leon County. There were just as many people, who were not in attendance at the meeting, who supported the project 150 percent. He urged caution against being reactionary to only what was

in front of the IA Board and ensure an holistic approach of the community in the support.

Mayor Dailey stated that the action before the IA Board that evening, was to approve transmittal of a PD&E, which represented all of the legally binding votes taken by the IA Board to that point. Pausing the transmittal did not change the votes or information in the PD&E. The conversation around the table that evening was to consider other alternatives. That was wholly different and sought to unravel legal decisions previously made by the IA Board; that included significant public input throughout the process. He saw that as a tactic to kill the project. Doing so also jeopardized the Northeast Park project, as confirmed by the County Administrator. Mayor Dailey encouraged the IA Board to transmit the PD&E to FDOT, the next step in a five-year long process.

Mayor Dailey offered a substitute motion, seconded by Commissioner Welch, to approve Option 1.

Option 1: Approve the Draft Final NE Gateway PD&E Study.

Commissioner Cummings stated that she too attended the public meeting at Montford Elementary following multiple phone calls and emails from citizens on the project. She also lived near the area, and could attest to the traffic congestion that would only worsen with each new development. She stated that Commissioners were charged with listening to the citizens and being sensitive to their needs. However, the community and County and City governments had to be progressive and that required vision to address the problems.

Commissioner Cummings acknowledged the June 30, 2021, deadline to apply for the SIB loan and past IA Board decisions, including prioritization and choices to advance projects. She questioned if other projects that ranked lower on the prioritization list, would be advanced if the Northeast Gateway project were paused. Ben Pingree stated that he could not answer that question. The Northeast Gateway project was elevated, for a series of budget years, and included a five-year Capital Improvement Plan and aggressive group of bonds across Tallahassee-Leon County. If the the Northeast Gateway project were paused staff would need time to analyze and prepare a complete agenda item on all of the various implications with options for consideration by the IA Board. Commissioner Cummings questioned if the IA Board approved transmittal of the PD&E to FDOT, would the alignment be set or could it still be modified. Ben Pingree stated that the project was at the point where staff would move into design that followed the alignment approved by the IA Board at the December 2019, meeting.

Commissioner Proctor expressed his disappointment with staff work on the project and compared it to the quality of work produced to develop Southwood. The IA Board had a responsibility to direct staff to work that was in the best interest of the community. He believed that pausing the project was consistent with other projects in Tallahassee-Leon County, such as Woodville Highway, Crawfordville Highway, and the Fairgrounds. He stated that he understood the frustration of traffic congestion on Centerville however, there was no analysis that addressed

road capacity or the impacts it would have on surrounding roads. That information was not gathered to the level that the IA Board expected from staff or consultants.

Commissioner Proctor referenced the earlier action by the IA Board regarding Project Mango without asking staff to provide a transportation analysis. He stated that both projects were related in that the IA Board was kidding their selves if they imagined that Centerville and Miccosukee Roads alone could continue to carry the capacities for the rate and speed of development in the area. Adding Project Mango to the area, with its anticipated regional impact, would exacerbate the issues. He thought that the Fairgrounds and Woodville Highway projects were a testament to the ability to pause a project. He urged the IA Board to take smart, caring, and compassionate action to the whole of the development. The IA Board would be well advised to hear the qualitative mindsets and spirited people coming forward from the community on the project. Commissioner Proctor referenced Attachment 4, of the agenda material, and stated that if the IA Board only considered the economic impact that would come through high-density development; they should take action to approve. However, it was about the quality of life for residents in the area, not money.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she appreciated the hard work from staff, the tension of losing the momentum following the effort that came from a series of votes by the IA Board. To imply however, that all votes were legally binding, that the IA Board could not vote again to change policy direction, or that the proposed alignment and its effects had been in place since 2016, was inaccurate. The IA Board, in January 2020, supported the request of residents of Killlearn and committed to build both the Shamrock and Roberts Road intersections concurrently. Autumn Calder confirmed that the original project description in the Interlocal Agreement terminated at Shamrock. It was substantially amended to extend to Roberts Road in January 2020.

Commissioner Dozier stated that Phase 2, the Roberts Road connection, was a Tier 2 project from the Sales Tax Committee in 2014. She was not surprised that some residents were surprised that the project was elevated and substantially amended so quickly. That, along with the Comp Plan amendment in 2020, underscored citizen concerns and she understood why people questioned the justification of moving so quickly on the project and the sense of imminent development in the area. She saw the compromise as reverting to the original project description, to build to Shamrock, and take a year or more to analyze the corridor to Roberts.

Commissioner Dozier further stated that other citizens in the area, who were also concerned by the Roberts extension felt that the connection to Montford Elementary and Roberts Middle schools mitigated their concerns, because it was so desperately needed. It was a profoundly complicated situation; a typical process but atypical project. Lastly, she stated that she was less than thrilled with both motions on the floor, and without a third option, was unsure of where to go other than to pause.

Susan Dawson clarified that under Roberts Rules and because the IA Board previously voted to do everything encapsulated in the PD&E, the IA Board would need a motion to amend actions previously adopted, in order to reverse earlier

decisions. The votes and actions of the IA Board were legally binding and reversing them required following procedure. She reiterated that everything included in the PD&E was the result of IA Board direction. It was simply a report that summarized IA Board direction to staff, and therefore, why the item was on consent.

Commissioner Jackson stated that on April 8, 2021, the IA Board voted 8-3 (weighted 46-19) to approve the alignment and intersection option, known as Alternative A (discussed in the current meeting as Alternative 1). With great deference and respect to the citizens and their concerns for the immediate community, however, to reverse that decision would be defying the will of 67% of Tallahassee-Leon County voters who approved the sales tax extension, which included the Northeast Gateway project. He intended to support the substitute motion and work with stakeholders who were negatively affected by the roundabout.

Commissioner Minor stated that one option, suggested earlier in discussion that would allow Blueprint to meet the SIB loan application deadline of June 30, 2021, was to hold a special Blueprint IA Board meeting. Scheduling a special meeting, to address only Northeast Gateway, after every public comment was responded to and those responses given iterative conversation with the residents would help the IA Board to address the situation. Commissioner Minor requested that as a friendly amendment. Mayor Dailey declined.

The substitute motion failed 5-6 (weighted 27-36) with Commissioners Dozier, Minor, Proctor, Matlow, Porter, and Richardson dissenting and Commissioner Williams-Cox out of Chambers.

Commissioner Dozier moved, seconded by Commissioner Minor to hold a Special IA Board meeting, on the Northeast Gateway project, after the June 7 PD&E public comment period was complete; to include responses and the implications of not moving forward with the PD&E.

The second substitute motion passed 12-0 (weighted: 70-0).

The original motion failed due to the substitute motion.

V. GENERAL BUSINESS

6. Consideration of Funding and Economic Impact Analysis for a Proposed \$1 million Tallahassee Community College Athletic Facility Enhancements

Commissioner Maddox moved, seconded by Commissioner Richardson, to approve option 1.

Option 1: Accept the Report on the Economic Impact Analysis for a proposed \$1 million Tallahassee Community College Athletic Facilities enhancements and direct staff to proceed with the following:

- **Allocate \$1 million of the from the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) Fiscal Year 2021 allocation for TCC's athletic facility enhancements.**
- **Continue engagement and collaboration with TCC throughout their development of a plan for the TCC Athletic Facilities enhancements to finalize details regarding the final scope and budget for the project, prepare an MOU to govern the use of funds, and the timeline for disbursement and expenditure.**

Citizen Comment

Brian Lupiani spoke in opposition to the TCC funding allocation citing the ballot language from the 2014 surtax extension and that while he was not opposed to tax payer dollars supporting the facilities that was not the intended purpose of Blueprint funds.

Priscilla Hawkins spoke on the Northeast Gateway item and traffic issues then encouraged the IA Board to listen to citizens before giving money to outsiders.

Darwin Gamble spoke in opposition to items 6 and 7, questioning where the money from the economic impact of the institutes of higher education was used because it was not reflected in the neighborhoods surrounding the three institutions.

Stanley Sims spoke in support of the TCC funding allocation because of the benefits provided by community colleges, specifically to communities of color.

Barney Bishop spoke in support of the TCC funding allocation for the indirect benefits across Tallahassee-Leon County.

Sue Dick spoke in support of items 6 and 7 citing the opportunity to underscore the economic benefit of the colleges and universities to Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Dozier stated that items 6 and 7 both supported infrastructure funding. She noted that she was the sole vote against funding renovations at FAMU Bragg Stadium because of the impact to the OEV budget. The three institutes of higher education were incredible assets and economic drivers for Tallahassee-Leon County. Other than a Convention Center and the Airport, there were no specifics in the Interlocal Agreement to drive economic development. She requested confirmation of staff's recommendation to fund the one million request out of federal stimulus dollars. Cristina Paredes confirmed that the funding source would be American Recovery Act dollars. Commissioner Dozier expressed her support for the motion.

Commissioner Richardson expressed his support for the motion because of the contributions made to Tallahassee-Leon County by TCC and the precedent set by supporting renovations at FAMU Bragg Stadium.

Commissioner Welch expressed his support for the motion for the value provided to Tallahassee-Leon County by TCC.

Commissioner Cummings expressed her support for the motion, concurring with Commissioners Richardson and Welch.

Commissioner Matlow expressed his support for the motion but cautioned IA Board of discussing precedent as all three proposals from Florida State, Florida A&M, and TCC were fundamentally different in their merits. He clarified that the renovations at FAMU Bragg Stadium were imperative in order to have the 2021 football season in Tallahassee and receive the indirect benefits of that on the economy. He noted that in previous conversations, the possibility of funding the TCC request from the Future Opportunity Leveraging Fund (FOLF). He questioned the use of FOLF. Cristina Paredes clarified that FOLF was currently used to balance the OEV budget in the out-years. Commissioner Matlow stated that the TCC funding request would be an appropriate use of FOLF as long as the IA Board was fiscally responsible enough to prepare for additional future opportunities. He stated that was the basis for his support for funding improvements at TCC.

Commissioner Proctor offered a friendly amendment to the motion to delete the last sentence (not included above), which compared the request to FAMU's request for improvements at Bragg. Commissioners Maddox and Richardson confirmed acceptance of the amendment.

The motion passes 12-0 (weighted: 70-0).

7. Status Report on Negotiations with Florida State University for a Joint Convention Center Project Near the Donald L. Tucker Civic Center and Consideration of a New Funding Request and Economic Impact Analysis for Repairs at the Florida State University's Doak S. Campbell Stadium

Ben Pingree provided a brief overview of the item including the history of IA Board action, an update on the convention center concept and negotiations with FSU, elevation of a new funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium, and next steps depending on the option voted on by the IA Board. A copy of the presentation is on file at Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency.

Citizen Comments

David Coburn spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the annual \$51 million in direct spending generated by football weekends and another \$50 million in indirect spending. Furthermore, the public investment was expected to leverage an estimated \$100 million in Booster support and national television coverage of more home games.

Mike Norvell spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the impact of the FSU football program and university to Tallahassee-Leon County, and the value provided by student athletes through volunteer programs such a free youth clinics, book drives, etc.

Leonard Hamilton spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the uniqueness of the athletic programs and the support for first generation college student who change the lifestyle of their families.

Michael Alford spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium and committed to leveraging the public investment through boosters, season ticket holders, and the fan base for the remaining 80%.

Brian Lupiani spoke in opposition of using Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency funds to support the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium stating that the vote to support economic development was not for the hospitality industry around athletic programs, but to reduce economic stratification and create better, permanent jobs.

Brian Desotell spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the economic impact through direct and indirect jobs in the construction industry.

Sammy Dickson spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the structural safety of the facility, the economic impact through indirect jobs, and provided an example of a clothing company who made 20% of their annual revenue on seven weekends through football season.

Sue Dick spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium.

Matt Thompson spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the permanent jobs in the hospitality industry, the proximity of his six restaurants to Doak, and the economic impact of the industry on Tallahassee-Leon County.

Sierra Bush-Rester spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing that the funds could be better spent to solve homeless issues, for example.

Shelby Green spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium in favor of repurposing fund to move forward infrastructure projects like the Alternative Sewer Solutions.

Lucia Sommer spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium stating that FSU provide no study supporting the economic return on the investment and had access to other resources. Blueprint funds would be better spent in sidewalks, parks, recreation centers, and repairs to existing infrastructure.

Margaret Moore spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium requesting that the IA Board invest instead in the needs of the people in the community.

Max Epstein spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing stormwater issues and the lack of stormwater facilities at Doak Campbell Stadium. He requested that any funds allocated to FSU, be evaluated through the Taskforce on Antiracism, Equity, and Inclusion.

Will Crowley spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing no compelling evidence for permanent jobs or economic impact that depended on Doak Campbell Stadium. He recommended a participatory budgeting process where projects elevated based on community needs.

Lakey Love spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing economic systems that supported historically white universities, businesses, and alumni did not address true economic development because of the unequitable and racist nature of the system. She stated that economic development should have a net positive affect on literacy rates, poverty rates, education, etc.

Barney Bishop spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the increased sales tax revenue through public investment.

Linda Etson spoke in favor of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the community and volunteer outreach efforts of the FSU fan base.

Stanley Sims spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing the access to other resources by FSU.

Michael Yost spoke in opposition of the funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium citing that FSU was a \$2 billion university with an \$800 million endowment and multiple studies and academic papers providing economic evidence against stadium subsidies. The sales tax revenues should be put to use for the needs of the economic base, not profitable stadium.

Pricilla Hawkins spoke in opposition of funding request for repairs at Doak Campbell Stadium stating that the money would better serve Southside communities and encouraged the IA Board to reallocate funding there.

Commissioner Maddox moved, seconded by Commissioner Richardson to approve options one and three.

Option 1: Accept the status report and direct staff to discontinue the MOU negotiations with Florida State University on the convention center project as outlined in the 2015 Interlocal Agreement and at a later date analyze, assess, and identify new convention center project opportunities.

Option 3: Provide staff direction regarding the opportunity to coordinate with FSU on the new economic development project

opportunity regarding repairs at Doak S. Campbell Stadium with the following steps:

- **Conduct a CEFA economic analysis to determine the economic impacts of the stadium improvements and work with Downs & St. Germain to determine the visitor impact of the request and reallocate funding in the amount of \$35,000 from the convention center project budget for these analyses.**
- **Update and expand upon the initial Populus Facility Assessment Report, at FSU's expense, to fully document, assess, and estimate the funding repairs needed at the stadium.**
- **Present analysis, findings and recommendations for the IA Board's consideration full funding analysis with bond options.**

Mayor Dailey expressed his support for the motion stating that Tallahassee-Leon County was a college town with a \$1 billion tourist industry, with college athletics as one of the biggest drivers of that. He clarified that the motion did not allocate funds at that time but simply put in motion the analysis necessary for full consideration of the request by the IA Board.

Commissioner Maddox spoke of the firsthand experience provided by college athletics even though, as a college athlete he did not know the amount of revenue it generated. Regarding public investment, he stated that over the next five years, \$210 million would be invested Southside communities through 14 Blueprint projects; half of which would be under construction in fiscal year 2021. The people in Doak Campbell Stadium also spent money in stores, restaurants, hotels, etc. that provided sales tax revenue for the completion of Blueprint projects. Increasing the experience of the fans, likely increased their indirect spending, which increased sales tax revenue that benefited the Southside.

Commissioner Minor stated that regardless of who funded it, the stadium repairs and upgrades should happen because of the \$50 million in direct spending and \$99 million in economic impact annually by FSU football program. The overall economic impact by FSU as whole was \$10 billion annually. FSU's success was a key drive of Tallahassee-Leon County's success and was, therefore in the best interest of Tallahassee-Leon County to help them boost the economy. At the same time, if current projections held there was only \$20 million available in economic development project for the remainder of the sales tax. Should Project Mango created the multiplier effect Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency would not be able to respond with any type of investment incentive.

Commissioner Minor offered a substitute motion, seconded by Commissioner Dozier, to approve options one and three and direct staff to provide an analysis for \$10 million and \$20 million funding request for project request regarding repairs at Doak S. Campbell Stadium.

Commissioner Jackson shared firsthand experience, through serving as Principal of Fort Braden Elementary school, of the contributions by FSU to socioeconomic challenged communities. He acknowledged the strong community partnership of FSU with Tallahassee-Leon County beyond sales tax revenue, though volunteer programs, jobs, and economic opportunities. He wholeheartedly supported the motion on the floor to support a community partner who demonstrated repeatedly, their commitment to Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Dozier noted the exceptional difficulty of the evening, clarified the difference between infrastructure and economic development funds, and spoke of the unique position the IA Board was charged with in allocating 12 percent of sales tax revenue to recruiting and growing business and diversifying the economy of Tallahassee-Leon County. In earlier conversations on Project Mango, most Directors spoke of diversification and creating jobs in Leon County; an opportunity that had only become available with the collection of 2020 sales tax dollars. As with the funding request for FAMU Bragg Stadium, she could not support the motion at that time or that level.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she agreed with most of the comments by supporters. Tallahassee-Leon County was the recipient of phenomenal contributions from FSU. The Leon County Research Development Authority was making incredible progress at Innovation Park through commercializing the research and technologies coming out of the universities; a tremendous economic benefit that could not be underestimated. The goal of OEV however, was to diversify the economy. OEV was in the middle of updating the Strategic Plan, due to the IA Board in September 2021. She stated that it was extraordinary to make such a decision without the updated Strategic Plan. In the 17 months since Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency began receiving economic development funds, the IA Board allocated \$9.2 million which provided economic relief to 561 businesses, 241 non-profits, and effected 7, 360 jobs. They committed, through the Targeted Business Program, incentive to recruit businesses, including Project Mango, for 1,240 jobs for a \$592 million economic impact. The IA Board leveraged \$2.7 million and brought in \$15 million for minority and women owned small business and to build an incubator at Innovation Park that was the critical missing link to research at FSU and FAMU.

Commissioner Dozier expressed her concern over committing \$20 million to FSU, without evaluating the opportunity costs, would leave OEV with less than \$10 million for the next four to ten years leaving jobs on the table. She clarified that it was not that she did not support FAMU or FSU; stating that she was excited about the changes and vision at FSU. She also knew that in 2018, the FSU Boosters took in \$47 million. That same year, the entire Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency took in \$32.4 million and projections for fiscal year 2022, the projection for the Agency were \$35.6 million. Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency did not have the ability to tap into the resource that FSU could.

Commissioner Dozier stated that she supported the analysis for \$10 million it was needed alongside the analysis for \$20 million and what would be left on the table. She suggested bring the item back, at the July 15, 2021, meeting, to analyze the programs available through OEV. The IA Board zeroed out the Competitive Project

Fund and others. There was only \$600,000 available in Workforce Development over the next five years, if they allocated funds to FSU. Workforce training was critical to the success of OEV and Tallahassee-Leon County. The IA Board could still choose to commit funding to FSU, she encouraged that it follow a deeper analysis of all programs. It benefited both FSU and OEV. She requested a friendly amendment to the motion to include an agenda item for July 15, 2021, that evaluated Doak Campbell Stadium independently and the five-ten year revenue projections for OEV in order to understand the full ramifications of the decision of how many jobs might be left on the table should the IA Board support FSU's funding request.

Commissioner Minor questioned if staff could accommodate Commissioner Dozier's request. Ben Pingree stated that on the first bullet, it would be a tight timeline but possible; the second however, was out of OEV hands. It would be up to FSU and their contractual work with Populus to determine the specific repairs needed. If FSU felt it could be completed, effectively by the end of June 2021, the answer was yes.

Commissioner Dozier clarified that she did not expect FSU to meet that timeframe. The IA Board was allocating \$35,000 with either motion. She was requesting one more step, to analyze the OEV program and funding, drawing out the comparison. Ben Pingree interjected that option 3 of the motion, required input from FSU. Commissioner Dozier recognized the substantial change of the substitute motion. She stated that she could support moving forward with a \$10 and \$20 million consideration, perhaps. She felt however, that the process needed the additional step to include the analysis of OEV programs and funding. Commissioner Minor stated that she made a fair point however he respectfully declined. Commissioner Dozier stated that she could not get there without it and would likely withdraw her second. For the sake of discussion though, she held on that.

Commissioner Cummings expressed her support of options 1 and 3, and the institutes of higher education in Tallahassee-Leon County. From an economic standpoint however, FSU offered employment, training, innovation, and supported the retention of talent and job creation.

Commissioner Porter stated that she could not support the motion because local tax dollars were too precious to fund a state property. She thought it should be funded by the Legislature or through the university community. That said, she supported the project, was excited to see it come to fruition, and believed that it would, independent of IA Board action.

Commissioner Matlow stated that three things that were not up for debate on the item were the economic impact of FSU on Tallahassee-Leon County, the need for all three local governments to have a strong working relationship with FSU, and a coach that would bring FSU, and thereby Tallahassee-Leon County, back to national prominence soon. Categorizing it as supporting FSU or not, was disrespectful the IA Board must consider the opportunity costs in order to move forward. He was glad to see the convention center come to conclusion, as it was not in the best economic interest of the community. That being said, Commissioner Matlow questioned how much cash OEV had on hand, to spend on economic

development projects. Ben Pingree stated that in the current fiscal year, there was just over \$200,000 in the FOLF.

Commissioner Matlow stated that 17 months into sales tax collection for Blueprint and OEV, had \$200,000 in funding available. That meant that every funding request received by the IA Board included not only the allocation of funding to a project but the absorption of debt services on bonds as well. The equivalent of borrowing the money or charging the project to a credit card. Therefore, it was more than a \$20 million request because taxpayers would be on the hook for the interest, the debt service, until it was paid back. He thought that important to note as the IA Board discussed opportunity costs, what would be lost in jobs and money. It was essential to have all the data available to make an informed and considered decision.

Commissioner Matlow agreed with the significant economic impact FSU provided to Tallahassee-Leon County, however the job of the IA Board, through OEV as the economic development agency, was to expand and grow the economy and recruit businesses. The IA Board approved earlier that day, to approve \$2.5 million, approximately ten percent of the funding request from FSU, in incentives for Project Mango, which would create 1000 jobs at a minimum of \$15 an hour, in Tallahassee-Leon County. Underscoring the type of competition that existed for economic development dollars.

Commissioner Matlow asked a series of questions including: if the FSU football program was in jeopardy of not having home games in 2021, as was FAMU when they requested \$10 million for critical repairs, if the estimated \$80-100 million that FSU stated they could raise would be available to fund repairs should the IA Board elect not to allocate \$20 million to the project, and if staff could quantify the economic impact of the \$20 million specifically. Ben Pingree stated that he had not heard that the repairs were necessary to continue having home football games at Doak Campbell Stadium. It seemed a fair statement that other funds would be available should the IA Board elect not to contribute funds to the project. Option 3, would authorize staff to conduct the analysis of the economic impact of the \$20 million investment.

Commissioner Matlow stated that it was challenging to see how the \$20 million would drive additional revenue into the community. He noted that he operated four businesses in the shadows of Doak Campbell Stadium and understood that FSU football brought in customers. However, funding request for economic development dollars did not even make an argument for growth of the economy. Lastly, Commissioner Matlow noted the distinction between infrastructure and economic development dollars, and stated that at the earlier budget workshop, the IA Board elected to take CCQ projects, that could qualify for economic development funding as there was an economic impact, and fully funded them at the expense of Tharpe Street. That was the real cost of decisions, he stated, because projects shifted and unforeseen opportunities would arise. As the IA Board added new projects however, some of what was promised to the voters through the referendum would go unfunded. Commissioner Matlow listed approximately 20 percent of the needed sidewalk projects across Tallahassee-Leon County and stated that, they represented approximately \$20 million of need in the community. He

asked the IA Board to consider the opportunity costs and if other sources of funding could be sought for such projects.

Commissioner Cummings questioned if option 1, discontinued the negotiations for a memorandum of understanding on the convention center. Ben Pingree confirmed that it concluded negotiations for a convention center in the Arena District, as was contemplated in the 2015 Interlocal Agreement. It kept the project on the table for any new opportunity that might arise with FSU or in another location through 2039.

Commissioner Proctor expressed his support of the motion.

Commissioner Welch expressed his support of the motion and noted that he was critical of the convention center project, mainly because he did not think people wanted to come to Tallahassee for a convention. However, people did come to Tallahassee for football. It was an undeniable economic driver and it was appropriate as a local government to invest in opportunities that would increase the sales tax revenues of Tallahassee-Leon County through indirect spending.

Commissioner Richardson stated that funding the FAMU Bragg Stadium renovations was precedent setting because through all of his government experience, he was unaware of a time when public money was used to fund an athletic facility. He supported it because he thought it was the right thing to do. Many people, who spoke in opposition to the project, suggested allocating the \$20 million to education, housing, or sidewalks. That could not happen with money designated for economic development. He expressed his support for the project as it would create jobs and have an impact throughout Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Dozier stated that, as she understood the request for funding FAMU Bragg Stadium, there was substantial need and funds were committed to the convention center setting the precedent that if the IA Board funded a project with one university, they should also fund the other. However, she wanted good jobs for all students, including those who did not make the team, for all the athletes who would choose a different career, and for the professional athletes who return and contribute greatly to Tallahassee-Leon County. She encouraged the IA Board to reflect on economic development funding to recruit businesses that provided good jobs. She express her desire for the maker of the original motion to accept Commissioner Minor's friendly amendment or for another Director to second the substitute motion. She withdrew her second, in order to stay consistent with her vote on FAMU Bragg Stadium.

The substitute motion failed due to Commissioner Dozier withdrawing her second.

Commissioner Williams-Cox clarified that with the failure of the substitute motion, the original motion was again active. She further clarified that the money was allocated for economic development, not infrastructure, and expressed her support for the motion for the indirect jobs and indirect spending that supported great things in the Southside and across Tallahassee-Leon County.

Commissioner Porter requested that the economic analysis go before the CAC and EVLC, prior to returning to the IA Board. Ben Pingree confirmed that it would.

The original motion passed 9-3 (weighted: 51-19) with Commissioners Dozier, Matlow, and Porter.

8. Approval of the Market District Park Concept Plan

Ben Pingree provided a brief overview of the Market District item, request for approval to move forward with the next level of consulting services and to remove from consideration a north-west utility corridor as part of a potential trail.

Citizen Comment

Serena Moyle spoke in favor of the Market District Park project and the collaboration by Blueprint staff with area merchants in creating a regional destination.

Russel Walther spoke in favor of the Market District Park project overall and expressed safety concerns for the west pond and walled off six-acre area.

Erin Shivler spoke in favor of the Market District Park overall and expressed safety concerns for the west pond area.

Donato Pioto de Angelo spoke in favor of the Market District Park citing his consideration of the west pond area over his 33-year history in the neighborhood.

Priscilla Hawkins stated that what effected one neighborhood would affect all neighborhoods and expressed her concern over the short timeframe between announcement and approval of funding requests.

David Goodson spoke in favor of the Market District Park overall and expressed safety concerns for the west pond and walled off six-acre area.

Commissioner Welch moved, seconded by Mayor Dailey, to approve options one, two, and three.

Option 1: Approve the Blueprint Market District Park Concept Plan.

Option 2: Authorize Blueprint to advertise, negotiate, and award a contract for design services for the Blueprint Market District Park.

Option 3: Approve the proposed alterations to future Market District Placemaking Project Elements to remove the northern portion of the Timberlane Greenway and neighborhood connections as shown in Attachment #3 (of the agenda material).

Mayor Dailey clarified that the IA Board was considering activation of the Market District Park with a full stop at the electric sub-station. Ben Pingree stated that the item considered the activation of the central park, not the west pond. The pond

was a City of Tallahassee project that was currently under construction and included an easement for utility access. Autumn Calder added that the park concept included a landscape buffer at the sub-station and neighborhood. She clarified that the Market District central park concept included three elements the central park concept, the connectivity in and around the Market District businesses, and neighborhood trail connectivity to the Market District businesses. The action before the IA Board currently focused solely on the central park concept, in terms of approval and provided an update for the planning that would occur in the fall of 2021, to discuss the connectivity of the next two phases. Planning in advance of that recommended that the IA Board eliminate the north-south trail, from the west pond north to Maclay Road; understanding that other options existed to connect to Maclay Gardens State Park.

Commissioner Richardson agreed with the safety concerns voiced and noted that it would be addressed at the City, as safety and security of residents was a top priority.

Commissioner Porter questioned the potential trail alternatives and requested clarification for the Blueprint and City pieces. Autumn Calder stated that the Blueprint would conduct a public planning process in the fall on the trail alternatives and brought before the IA Board for consideration.

The motion passed 11-0 (weighted: 63-0) with Commissioner Proctor out of chambers.

9. Consideration of Adjusted 2021 Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors Meeting Calendar to Separate Infrastructure and Office of Economic Vitality Meetings (continued from April meeting)

Citizen Comment

Brian Lupiani stated that it would be helpful to begin the IA Board meetings at a time when working folks could attend.

Pricilla Hawkins questioned the need to separate the two meetings. Commissioner Dozier stated that she would address that in her comments momentarily.

Commissioner Dozier stated that Blueprint meetings were incredibly long, and might continue to be long. Historically, infrastructure items pulled more public speakers, the current meeting was an exception, however, the mixing of the two subjects – economic development and infrastructure, held the potential for even longer meetings. She was concerned that the IA Board missed staff presentations, cutting them from the order of events because of the already lengthy nature of meetings. It was important that the IA Board hear from community partners, business, and citizens in the community. Her suggestion to separate the meetings was intended to increase public engagement and partners speaking with the IA Board.

Commissioner Dozier moved, seconded by Commissioner Porter to approve option three.

Option 3: Amend the Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors meeting schedule to hold eight (8) regular meetings per year; hold separate meetings for Blueprint Infrastructure and OEV business, except for when there is a budget workshop or budget public hearing scheduled for the same day as a regular meeting; review this practice as part of the 2022 joint regular meeting.

Commissioner Maddox offered a substitute motion, seconded by Commissioner Richardson to approve option 2.

Option 2: Amend the Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors meeting schedule to hold six (6) regular meetings per year; hold separate meetings for Blueprint Infrastructure and OEV business, except for when there is a budget workshop or budget public hearing scheduled for the same day as a regular meeting; review this practice as part of the 2022 joint regular meeting.

Commissioner Dozier stated that the IA Board used the current six meetings annually to their fullest and often not had time for OEV discussion or presentations.

Commissioner Maddox stated that he did not believe more meetings were necessary to accomplish the work of the IA Board. In his opinion, separating the subject matter would allow the meetings to move more efficiently through focusing on each, without increasing the quantity. He encouraged the IA Board to retain the template of six meetings with the focus provided by the separation, noting that the process could be reevaluated and increased to eight if warranted.

Commissioner Dozier stated that in the past year, the IA Board skipped the economic development presentation for three of the six meetings. The CAC, EVLC, and even community partners received presentations that the IA Board was not privy to on recruitment, business development, etc. She was concerned that the IA Board needed to schedule a special meeting to allow for additional public comment on an infrastructure project. Citizens wanted more involvement. She strongly believed that six meetings would decrease and spread out the time for infrastructure discussions with citizens and increase the challenges before the IA Board.

Commissioner Minor stated that he supported the original motion because the last two presentations of the current meeting were skipped. He noted that the current meeting was nine hours long so skipping the presentations was for good reason. Indicating that the IA Board was unable to cover the material in the level of detail that was necessary for robust discussion. He encouraged the IA Board to try eight meetings for one year. Both economic development and infrastructure deserved in depth discussion on the tens of millions of taxpayer money and the time that required.

Commissioner Matlow stated that option 2 seemed to shuffle the deck and decrease the amount of time available to discuss infrastructure. He anticipated that each meeting would include a request for a special meeting should the substitute motion prevail. He was comfortable with attending two more meetings if it hopefully, meant they would be shorter in length. Therefore, he would be supporting the original motion, not the substitute.

Commissioner Williams-Cox questioned if there was enough economic development business to warrant three standalone meetings and what might happen if there was not economic development business to discuss. Ben Pingree stated that Blueprint staff would notify the Chair of the need to cancel the meeting, as there was no business to come before the body. Cristina Paredes stated that she hoped for more Project Mango opportunities in the future, in the meantime the IA Board would have the updates to the MWSBE Disparity Study and OEV Strategic Plan for consideration. Commissioner Williams-Cox suggested including time limits to meetings.

Commissioner Dozier stated that IA Board could likely anticipate shorter economic development meetings with time for presentations. The current meeting notwithstanding, there was not often as much public turnout for economic development issues.

Commissioner Minor questioned if it was easier to cancel or add special meetings. He proposed beginning with eight meetings and cancelling as necessary rather than maintaining six meetings and adding special meetings. Ben Pingree stated that it was always easier to cancel than add meetings. Staff and the IA Board would see immediately the challenges to add a new meeting based on earlier action for a June 2021 meeting. The goal was to have the optimal amount of meetings.

Commissioner Maddox questioned the number of agenda items split between subjects. Ben Pingree, using the current agenda as an example, including the agenda modification, was evenly split across ten items. There were five joint items, three economic development, and two infrastructure items. Commissioner Maddox reiterated Commissioner Williams-Cox comment and staff response regarding cancelling meetings if there was not enough business to discuss and questioned, from that perspective, why the IA Board would consider increasing the quantity of meetings. He believed that keeping six meetings but holding two infrastructure, two economic development, and two joint meetings would be sufficient. If that did not work, then consider eight.

Commissioner Dozier stated that the IA Board had never received a presentation from workforce partners or ROI, the consultant working on recruiting on behalf of OEV. The IA Board allocated funds to things that they did not get to hear about. More importantly, citizens were curious and questioning what the IA Board was doing with economic development dollars.

Commissioner Porter stated that she supported option 3 and requested that due to the length of Blueprint meetings, that breaks be included. The public deserved efficient meetings but also deserved attentive and focused Commissioners.

The substitute motion passed 6-4 (weighted: 34-24) with Commissioners Dozier, Minor, Matlow, and Porter dissenting and Commissioner Proctor and Mayor Dailey out of Chambers.

The original motion failed due to the substitute motion.

VII. DIRECTOR DISCUSSION

Commissioner Dozier stated that many of the issues discussed by the Sales Tax Committee in 2013-2014, included stormwater in the College Avenue Placemaking area. In the interim, much of that work was accomplished through CRA and the City of Tallahassee. She requested an analysis of the project area, to determine which items were accomplished by the interim work, particularly on stormwater and sidewalk goals, and in the IA Board could apply funding to Brevard and Frenchtown through the substantial amendment process.

Commissioner Dozier moved, seconded by Commissioner Matlow to bring back and agenda item analyzing the College Avenue Placemaking Project and the consideration of a funding allocation to Brevard and Frenchtown.

The motion passed 10-0 (weighted 58-0) with Commissioner Proctor and Mayor Dailey out of Chambers.

VIII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no additional speakers in person or online.

IX. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

*The next Blueprint Intergovernmental Agency Board of Directors Meeting
is scheduled for
July 15, 2021, at 3:00 p.m.*