

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, January 13, 2005
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 4:30 pm

Vice-Chairman Mike Sheridan called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

Committee Members present:

Jerry Conger	Gregg Patterson
Anita Davis	Charles Pattison
Terence Hinson	Kevin McGorty
Casie Moran	Mike Sheridan
Dianna Norwood	Jess Van Dyke

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Phil Maher
Dave Bright	Jerry Oshesky
Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Richard Menasco	William Grow
Jack Diestelhorst	Mark Thomasson
Eric Gooch	Dianna Williams
Rita Stevens	Mazie Crumbie
Pamela Chamberlyn	Steve Urse
Bruce Richie	Norene Chase
Wendy Grey	Delmus Barber
Mark Llewellyn	Bob Rackleff
Bill Chandler	Greg Garrett
Martha Wellman	Paco de la Fuente
Linda Jamison	Bill Little
Sean McGlynn	Angela Richardson
Shelonda Gay	Tammy Peters

Agenda Modifications

Mr. Sheridan began the meeting by announcing agenda modifications. Item 10, Capital Cascade Trail Master Plan, was moved to Item 11, to be the last item heard for the evening. Item 11, Blueprint 2000 Master Plan became Item 10. Additionally, Jim Davis rather than Bill Smith addressed Item 9 and Mike Sheridan addressed Item 7.

Mr. Bright announced that Capital Cascade Trail recommended concept maps were mailed to CAC members on 1/10/05; copies were made available to members who had not received theirs. Apologies were made for the delay in distributing agenda material to the CAC members.

For Item 5, opinion letters for the CAFR were distributed.

The City of Tallahassee auditor team was acknowledged and new Blueprint 2000 employees were introduced.

Informational Items

Item #1: Leveraging Update

Phil Maher state that Blueprint received tentative approval of a Florida Forever Grant in the amount of \$732,160 from the Northwest Florida Water Management District Governing Board for the construction of the Gibby storm water pond at Capital Circle Northwest and West Tennessee Street.

Blueprint also received a 2% State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) loan in the amount of \$26.7 million dollars for the construction of Capital Circle SE from Connie Drive to Tram Road. Our financial advisor calculated the loan has an estimated \$4.7 million saving over traditional financing.

Tentative notification was received from the Department of Transportation (DOT) that \$1.3 million (from SIS funds) would be included in the FY 2008 work plan for design of the section of Capital Circle NW from US 90 to SR 20. However, DOT is expecting additional funds from the federal transportation reauthorization bill. FDOT has committed that funding for the right of way cost of I-10 to US 90 would be considered as a high priority for them, as well as, additional funding for right of way cost of Capital Circle from US 90 to Orange Avenue. Additionally, funding for Capital Circle is the number one priority on the City and County's legislative priority list.

Item #2 Budget Policy Date Changes

Phil Maher noted that the budget policy needed to be amended to reflect placement of the proposed budgets on the May meeting agendas, for consideration by the IA meeting. This is due to changes in the Intergovernmental Agency's (IA) meeting schedule.

Item #3 Acquisitions for Capital Circle Southeast

The Real Estate Policy was approved at the November IA meeting. Section 105.09 of this policy (Acquisitions for Capital Improvement Projects), calls for the approval by the IA of a Resolution stating the public purpose of the project and the necessity of acquiring the parcels identified in the Resolution. This acquisition can be in the form of a negotiated settlement or through an Order of Taking. There are 13 parcels to be acquired in the vicinity of the Tram Road intersection with Capital Circle SE.

Item #4 Conservation Easement: Thompson Property (Headwaters of the St. Marks River)

In 2004 the Sensitive Lands Working Group evaluated and prioritized sensitive land properties in eastern Leon County. Three of the parcels that were designated priority 1 and 2 have been offered to Blueprint for acquisition; either through conservation easement or purchase of timber rights. Discussion is underway with both the Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWFMD) and the property owner. The parcels are located near the 168-acre Copeland Sink parcel Blueprint hopes to acquire fee simple through the recently awarded Florida Communities Trust Grant.

Blueprint and the NFWFMD have executed a Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) which states they will share in costs to acquire conservation easements. There is concern, however, regarding the timeliness of this process and discussions with Mr. Lex Thompson. The possibility of losing the two priority 1 parcels, of which there are only seven, is high. Mr. Davis advised the board that Blueprint was prepared to take unilateral action to acquire this land. Funding is available and proper NFWFMD procedures will be followed.

Mr. Thompson's proposal was to sell the conservation easement for the value of the lumber. Using procedures NFWFMD can accept, Blueprint will try to acquire the parcels first. The Water Management District would then take ownership and subsequently kick in their half per the JPA. If it does not proceed in this manner, Blueprint would probably still take the property because they are priority 1 and 2 parcels.

If it becomes necessary to take unilateral action and the NFWFMD does not share in the cost, Blueprint staff will possibly apply to the Florida Community Trust for a grant to share in the cost. Recovery of cost will not be made through selling the timber as it is this mature upland that Blueprint is trying to protect.

Consent Items

Item #5: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)

Mr. Maher noted that the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) of the Blueprint 2000 program for the year ended September 30, 2004 will be presented to the IA on January 31, 2005. The CAFR and the draft of the independent auditors report were included with agenda packets. The auditor report was in draft form because it had not yet been approved by the board. A completed 2004 CAFR will be provided to members of the CAC at the March 2005 meeting.

Mr. Phil Maher announced that a Certificate of Excellence in financial reporting on the CAFR was awarded to the City of Tallahassee from the Government Finance Officers Association of America for the second year in a row.

At the end of the fiscal year, \$69,872 remained unexpended and \$21,462 remained encumbered for contracts, for a balance of \$91,334 in the operating fund. Therefore, Blueprint will request the IA to approve \$21,462 of the fund balance at the end of FY2004 be appropriated to the approved FY2005 operating budget for outstanding encumbrances and the unexpended balance

of \$69,872 be brought forward, for future Capital Projects, through a transfer from the operating fund.

A motion was made by Gregg Patterson and seconded by Jerry Conger to accept the CAFR. It was passed unanimously.

Item #6: CAC Meeting Minutes: November 17, 2004

There was no old business to discuss. Mr. Bright did mention, when questions raised by Committee members, which are not answered by Blueprint staff but are listed in the minutes, that item will be taken off the Consent Section to be answered at the next CAC meeting.

Mr. Jerry Conger noted two typo mistakes in terms of the language. Iammonia was spelled ammonia and in Mr. Gregg Patterson's comments he would take "fiduciary" not judiciary responsibility.

Ms. Dianna Norwood moved to approve the minutes with the corrections listed above; Mr. Terrance Hinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Presentations/Discussion/Action

Item #7: Election of CAC Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Sheridan relayed to the committee that if Mr. Bill Smith were nominated and elected as chair he, Mr. Smith, would be happy to serve in that capacity. Mr. Sheridan called for a motion to elect a chair.

Mr. Kevin McGorty motioned that both the current Chair, Bill Smith, and Vice-Chair, Mike Sheridan, retain their positions. Ms. Anita Davis seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Item #8: Appointment to the CAC (Capital City Chamber of Commerce representative)

Mr. Bright noted that the CAC already acted on the re-nomination of Anita Davis as the representative from the Civil Rights Community. This position expired in November 2004, and is currently filled by Anita Davis. The appointment will be presented to the IA on January 31.

Mr. Terence Hinson was re-nominated as representative by and for the Capital City Chamber of Commerce. This position expires in February 2005, and is currently filled by Mr. Hinson. The appointment term will be through November 2007.

Gregg Patterson moved, seconded by Charles Pattison the re-nomination of Terence Hinson. The nomination was approved unanimously.

Item #9: Modification to Agency Agenda and Schedule Development Policy

On November 24, 2004, the Chairman of the Blueprint 2000 Citizens Advisory Committee wrote to the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Agency regarding the Committee's displeasure with the IA's vote on the Killlearn Lakes septic system issue. Mr. Davis quoted a portion of the letter- "Finally, we recommend that in the event of a perceived emergency where the CAC has not reviewed an agenda item that a formal vote of the Board be required to validate the emergency." After reviewing the letter, Commissioner Lightsey supported modifying the Agency Meeting Schedule and Development Policy, and requested it be place on the IA agenda.

Mr. Sheridan requested Mr. Davis read the specifics of the rule modification. 103.0 C 4 - "Determine if a suitable agenda item that has not been reviewed by the Citizen's Advisory Committee will be considered by the Board. This shall be done by separate vote of the Board."

Mr. Jerry Conger moved the changes to the Policy and it was seconded by Ms. Davis. Mr. Davis stated in his opinion the modification would be approved by the Board without any discussion. Mr. Sheridan asked if there was any response from the elected officials or specifically by Commissioner Mustian's office. Mr. Davis said one of the elected officials expressed that they wish the item had been handled differently. Again, in Mr. Davis' opinion, the Board would pass the modification without resolution.

It passed the CAC unanimously. The CAC will be advised of the outcome of the vote at the next meeting.

Item #10: Blueprint 2000 Master Plan

At the September 2004 IA meeting, the Board made several comments and recommendations regarding the Blueprint 2000 Master Plan. Comments ranged from reducing the right of way width, elimination of sidewalks, cost savings per mile from the stated reductions, placing funding on each segment of the road, complete the Capital Circle project at the expense of Capital Cascade Trail, and develop Master Plan alternatives. Blueprint staff attempted to incorporate the recommendations into the plan; consequently only the 'backbone' of Capital Cascade Trail was funded.

Capital Circle Northwest, I-10 to Highway 90 and Capital Circle Southeast have been funded. Funding for ROW has been provided to FDOT on Capital Circle NW and Capital Circle SE is under contract. Blueprint did look at a reduction of right of way width from 230 to 200 and the savings per mile is estimated at \$780,000.00. Elimination of the additional ROW, sidewalk and trail and bike lanes would save \$1.4 million per mile. If these elements were removed on the segment from Tram Road to Highway 20, \$14.1 million could be saved.

Ms. Casie Moran asked if the recommendations were consensus or only information. Mr. Davis explained Blueprint staff was going to show the IA the results of their recommendations from the last meeting. Basically, the elimination of the sidewalks and trail amenities would not release enough funding to be cost effective and allow funding of another project. Even if all amenities of the Capital Cascade Trail were eliminated, it would not save enough money to complete one of the unfunded portions of Capital Circle. The CAC has previously enthusiastically endorsed the priorities Blueprint proposed in the Master Plan. These priorities have, generally, not changed. All environmental issues are still fully funded.

Mr. Sheridan requested that Mr. Maher contrast what the CAC proposed and what modifications the IA requested as well as what remains pending. Mr. Charles Pattison asked, what role, if any, does the CAC have in suggesting that an alteration is or is not appropriate? If the IA makes drastic modifications to the plan, contrary to recommendations by the CAC, would the CAC ever see or have the opportunity to comment? Mr. Davis explained, the option to comment or express pleasure or displeasure would always be available to the CAC. The staff recommendation, however, eliminates none of the amenities previously mentioned. The purpose of the Master Plan Facts presented was for the IA to reach their own conclusion that an additional project would not be able to be funded with the dollars saved. Additionally, the IA is the final approving authority for all Blueprint issues. This is the CAC's opportunity to provide comments on the Master Plan as the advisor to the IA. Comments or recommendations would be provided to the IA for consideration prior to the vote. Items would not come back to the CAC unless, according to the by-laws, a super-majority vote was required. In the event, as a committee, there was significant objection or concerns as to the vote, the option is available to resurface it in a letter or other media, as in the case of the Killlearn Lakes issues.

Mr. Sheridan asked, when the CAC processes are exhausted and the IA votes contrarily to the CAC's recommendation, if the IA would instruct Blueprint staff to begin implementation. At that time, could the CAC depend on staff to inform the committee of the difference between recommendation and what was approved? Mr. Davis replied, "It is all public record and Blueprint would certainly share that with the committee." Mr. Sheridan confirmed the committee would appreciate it.

Mr. Kevin McGorty expressed two points. One, everyone is attempting to avoid another Killlearn Lakes issue and, two, the committee does not want to operate in a vacuum. Additionally, he expressed his concern regarding the timetable of the decision related to Capital Cascades Trail. With the IA reducing the meeting schedule to three per year, it has given the CAC little 'give and take' opportunity with staff. If the committee had additional questions or actions for staff to take, they no longer have that opportunity. Mr. Charles Pattison raised an important process and philosophical issue. If there were a fundamental shift from the vision of Blueprint, the CAC would want to know and at the next opportunity make a comment to it. Our duties are not only to the IA but also to the citizens of the community.

Mr. Davis acknowledged Mr. McGorty's concerns and explained that was the reason Blueprint presents items to the CAC, before anything is presented to the IA, virtually every agenda item. The committee has the opportunity to comment on each item before it is presented to the Board. Killlearn Lakes was an anomaly. There are situations where the agenda would not be presented to the CAC. With Killlearn Lakes, Blueprint staff had not received the agenda item from the County until after the September 2004 CAC meeting had occurred. Under the circumstance and according to the Agency Agenda and Schedule Development Policy, neither staff nor Ms. Favors or Mr. Alam can refuse to hear an item requested by a Commissioner. The Killlearn Lakes issue was requested by a Commissioner. Blueprint staff position was clear in the presentation, that the item had not been reviewed by the CAC. Mr. Davis would like the CAC to see everything, however, literal interpretation of the policy states that the CAC does not have to review every item. If that situation develops again, per Item 9, the entire board must have a separate vote to

validate it as an emergency, or no it is not, and reschedule it to include the CAC review and advice before consideration.

Mr. Davis continued, if it is the recommendation of this committee, that the Master Plan item not move forward to the IA, he would relay this information to Ms. Favors and Mr. Alam who approve the IA agendas. They will make the decision to move it forward or not. Blueprint staff has had significant issues and time constraints and have worked diligently to create what is still a viable and best alternative.

Mr. Sheridan commented that the Master Plan that was being submitted was not in complete acceptance by the CAC. He stated that there were still some issues that the CAC needed to responses to. Mr. Maher confirmed Mr. Sheridan's assessment.

Mr. Maher continued with his presentation stating there were assumptions made by Blueprint staff in that the Water Quality/Sensitive Lands funds would remain constant. Also, the strategy of "funds follow production" was incorporated into the Master Plan. If design is complete and right of way is acquired, when additional funds are available from DOT, we stand a greater chance of receiving them.

In an attempt to implement guidance of the IA, to fund some portion of all segments of Capital Circle, money was moved from Capital Cascades Trail, segment 4. Mr. Charles Pattison asked for elaboration. Mr. Maher explained that approximately \$28 million that was reflected in 2018-2020 for right of way acquisition on Segment 4 was move to the Capital Circle. Segments 1-3 of the Capital Cascade Trail remain funded. Currently Blueprint has funding to acquire right of way for Segment 4, however, the funds would not be available until 2017. Blueprint believes because of the right of ways and water quality issues, there will be great potential for leveraging the dollars on Segment 4. The City and County may provide other alternatives for that area.

Mr. McGorty expressed his concern that Segment 4 was dropped for the Capital Circle priority. The key goal of the EECC was the completion of projects as much as possible without starting other projects. Even though the cash dollars would not come about for another decade, he sees the greatest cost is right of way. He felt it was an important issue and reallocating funds from Segment 4 put a hole in the completion of Capital Cascade greenway.

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Davis to address Mr. McGorty's concerns. Mr. Davis explained the budget constraints and attempted to offer a political viewpoint. In his opinion, there was an issue many citizens have been concerned with from the beginning. The roadway projects would rob the environmental projects. There are members of the Board who are willing to do that. Those same members were the ones recommending funding for all segments of Capital Circle. In the revised Master Plan, environmental issues continue to be 100% funded. Road and corridor improvements are not fully funded.

Blueprint staff tried to determine what strategy would move the program forward by using different funds. It was suggested to make progress on every road segment but not raid the environmental projects to accomplish it. Blueprint staff has chosen to complete the PD&E studies on the Capital Circle and be ready to compete for construction dollars. This applies to Capital Cascade Trail also.

Mr. McGorty expressed his fear that this program was just beginning and already difficult decisions are required and following future IA meetings additional segments could be eliminated. The consequences for Capital Cascades Trail is at this time we probably have the ability to leverage money, for land acquisition at cheaper dollars for the tax payers, and we have no money to acquire property because it was moved to road projects.

Mr. Davis pointed out and explained the literal bottom line funds available per year on the Master Plan. He agreed with Mr. McGorty but also stated that short of deferring construction on some of the projects there is no way, in those years, to acquire the properties. He also said, that on corridor projects there must be a PD&E and a partial design to determine what right of way is required. This plan reflects doing this, in most cases, to acquire the land early on.

Mr. McGorty expressed his understanding and empathy of the situation, however, acknowledged that Florida has the wealthiest land acquisition program in the world. Due to growth in and around Tallahassee the cost of land will only increase. He wanted to make it clear to the CAC the "horse trading" that is taking place.

Commissioner Bob Rackleff, requested to interject, and with Mr. Sheridan's approval stated: "If you are as committed to the vision of Blueprint 2000, as I believe you are, and you believe that the Capital Cascade project is the center piece of Tallahassee, let the IA know. Simply passing this on without comment is acquiescing."

Mr. Jess Van Dyke expressed concern with escalating road costs. He questioned what other communities are paying for this type of roadway improvement. He also asked if there was an analysis to see if this was a local problem with the cost of road construction. He advised if they played road and corridor improvements off of Capital Cascade Trail they would lose an important part of the Blueprint vision. He hoped that the public representatives had the commitment, vision and leadership to find the money that is out there.

Ms. Dianna Norwood expressed concern with storm water issues during construction of Capital Circle Northwest. Mr. Maher explained that storm water facilities related to the roadway construction was included in the construction funding line. The other stormwater line item is for additional retrofit over and beyond what is needed for the road. It is a separate line item. Ms. Norwood indicated she did not want to pull dollars from the top of the Master Plan, the environmental, water quality, and sensitive lands projects.

Mr. Maher stated that a major requirement of the Master Plan is that it must be balanced. It only shows revenue Blueprint currently has either through sales tax, loans, interest earnings, or grants. If they apply for a grant and its award is tentative, it will not be reflected on the plan. Only when the actual funds are available will it be reflected. Only things which are out of Blueprint's control will cause the plan not to be balance. For example, if sales tax does not materialize, based on our conservative estimates, then there will be less revenue. If the sales tax receipts increase or grants are received, we would have more revenue. If costs escalate over our estimated costs, the plan would have to be balanced again.

Mr. Hinson asked for clarification on leveraging. Mr. Bright explained it as using Blueprint funds as a match to receive other funds, generally as grants from the State and Federal governments.

Mr. Jess Van Dyke moved that the Master Plan be approved with the following exception: Capital Cascade Trail be fully funded, as a priority project, at the expense of segments of Capital Circle. Mr. Kevin McGorty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #11: Capital Cascade Trail Master Plan

Mr. Mark Llewellyn, of the Genesis Group, presented the slideshow of the proposed concept for each segment, similar to that which that was given at the November 30, 2004 public workshop. He summarized each of the four concepts for each of the segments and followed up with the staff recommended concept for the segments. (An attachment was included in the Agenda Item which described the Recommended Concept.)

Mr. Jim Davis discussed the November 30 public workshop; many people from all over the community attended. The attendees shared their ideas, opinions, and preferences on the concepts. Some people had very definitive ideas for the trail or park but the majority liked most of the alternatives. Their strongest feeling was to ensure something was done. Subsequent to that meeting Blueprint staff has met with several community groups to learn their positions as well. The information was reviewed and, where they could, Blueprint staff incorporated these desires and recommendations into one of the alternatives for each segment.

The question was raised if FAMU or FSU made any statement relative to the Gaines Street corridor redevelopment. FSU had provided no input. FAMU, School of Architecture, had no major input except through an article in the paper. Larry Peterson and Keith Grey have had comments in the past. Mr. Davis has also spoken to Professor Matt Powers trying to determine what the School of Architecture concerns were. Mr. Bright mentioned that Blueprint staff have also met with the Campus Planning people related to the FAMU Way extension and how this project and other improvements to FAMU Way would effect the FAMU Campus. Mr. Davis elaborated, stating that from his perception, Matt Powers seemed to think that the segments were not connected well.

Mr. Davis also thought that it was a basic philosophical difference between Blueprint and several people at the FAMU School of Architecture. In their opinion, this is an opportunity to have a "world class park" and where they could, they would fit in some storm water requirements. Blueprint's position is that this is a storm water project that must deal with flooding and they would integrate as much of the "world class park" as they can.

Mr. Davis also pointed out that this is a 3000-acre watershed and for years they had not done anything about the storm water. It was not technically possible, especially with all the physical constraints, for one project to cure all the ills of that watershed. Capital Cascade Trail has an exceptional beginning; we need to ensure that our City and County governments continue to press on. Once this project has been constructed the water quality and storm water issues will not have been fully resolved; the City and County must continue to look at ways to deal with them, outside of this corridor. It was the responsibility of the committee and the community to

ensure that emphasis, with the City and County, is continually placed on water quality and storm water issues.

Blueprint has been in discussions with Leon High School regarding what can be done there, per se. Frankly, Leon High School and the City had known the solution for more than ten years: rebuild Lake Leon, but there was a problem with financial resources, relocation of parking, etc. Our recommended solution does not place a facility at Leon High School, nor does it address off site water quality and retention issues that should be incorporated into the total solution by others; we have a very definitive start and finish point for this project.

Mr. Llewellyn, at the recommendation of Mr. Mike Sheridan, highlighted the differences between the original concepts presented and the staff recommended concepts. (An attachment had been provided to the committee with a narrative of the staff recommendations.)

Mr. Davis emphasized the over-riding consideration of the community was the desire to have a trail. Not just sidewalks down each side but a trail network that begins at Leon High School and works its way down. Additionally, the option suggests an optional landscape easement to enhance the greenway effect without buying more right of way. We would like the resident to either allow us to landscape, at no expense to them, or we would request a landscape easement on their right of way, in an attempt to encourage additional landscaping adjacent to the trail and sidewalk.

Mr. Sheridan asked how the committee wanted to proceed, ask questions following each segment or hold them until the end? Mr. Kevin McGorty stated he would like to ask questions at each segment. His reasoning was he did not understand how one could make an intelligent decision with the rush that (1) Blueprint staff has been under, (2) they only received the staff recommendations, a large amount of information, one day prior to the meeting. Mr. McGorty stated that he has severe reservations and concerns. Casie Moran agreed because she had to leave early and without further review would not be available to provide the perspective of people with disabilities.

The recommendation was made, understanding the legitimate guidelines and deadlines, to hold a workshop on this issue with Blueprint staff, Mr. Llewellyn and the CAC. This was probably the most important project; they should not rush to a decision without thorough discussion. All members of the committee agreed that an additional meeting was needed. Mr. Sheridan called for a special meeting to be held at Blueprint offices on Wednesday, January 19, 2005, 5:00-7:00 pm. The summary of public comments and the detailed budget for the project were requested for review prior to that meeting.

Mr. Davis gave a brief summary of staff's recommendations and also emphasized, even though they discussed the segments sequentially, they would not necessarily be built in that order. The lower segments may be completed first in order to handle the storm water that upstream segments would bring down from Leon High School.

V. Citizens to be Heard

Delmus Barber, representative of FAMU:

In his opinion, segment 4 should be completed first because it is a quality of life issue as the university expands in that direction. Funding for Capital Cascade Trail should be secured prior to Capital Circle projects. FAMU students would use this area as well as the area near Hyman Myers. He asked the council to please ensure that the park was in a condition students would use and that would enhance that area.

Other issues include; who would fund the roundabout and the electric substation relocation? When will it be done? One of his concerns is the traffic; would the light at Wanish Way and FAMU Way be removed? Would that become a 4-way stop? This was the main entrance to their campus; we need to be mindful of these issues.

Centennial Field was also a concern; as a life-long resident and someone who played football there he would like the history of the area preserved.

The amphitheater was also something students would use but it must fit the culture of the community. He believed this project was one that would enhance our campuses and community. It was not about community development as much as it was community inclusion. It would be a centerpiece that the whole community would be proud of.

Bob Rackleff, Leon County Commissioner representing the Fans of Centennial Field and as a resident of the neighborhood:

Mr. Rackleff encouraged, at the special meeting, to include language to keep open the option of having a Centennial Field built on that sight. With some engineering changes and a review of the model, there was a possibility of having a field that was approximately the size of Leon High baseball field. It would be used for community sports and other events; it would feature play-off games for the Babe Ruth League or Senior baseball or soccer and even Shakespeare in the Ballpark! He felt, it was important for our historic heritage and it was important to the redevelopment of downtown. It provided one more destination, and nighttime activities to keep people downtown after work or bring people in on weekends. It must have organized activity and nighttime activity for it to be successful. People must feel safe, however. He did not want to see it become a place that is deserted and dark at night. A forbidding place that people would not want to come to at night. With a high level of activity there, they could have a functioning, urban park that welcomes people any time.

Sean McGlynn, representing himself and local residents:

Mr. McGlynn suggested there be a memorial to the volunteers and staff that have made this possible. This is the chance to transform Tallahassee. He presented an article from the February 7, 2000 issue of the Tallahassee Democrat where it states that the people of Franklin Boulevard would have a river-walk and there would be gondolas. The residents did not realize Blueprint was going to cover the ditch; they still think they are getting a river-walk. History remembers your mistakes. If this section was too bad to fix just leave it alone. If you improve the bridges and culverts it would not flood. He said they needed storage at Leon and needed to start at the beginning. The stilling ponds should be at the beginning and free up Cascades Park. He

recommended everyone buy a copy of *Between Two Rivers* and read Julie Hauserman's essay, 'Florida's Lost Waterfall.' He also agreed with Mr. Barber that segment 4 is where construction should begin.

The article and essay were copied for distribution to the members.

Martha Wellman, representing the Sierra Club, EECC and herself:

On behalf of the Sierra Club, she presented a comment on segment 2 of the trail. They looked at principles they felt should be adhered to in the design phase such as it should be designed to retain as much storm water as possible, second, the system should be designed to treat storm water as well as it moves along the branch, and third, to plant with native vegetation and kept as a passive park. They do not believe the ball field would be compatible with their principles but the amphitheater might.

On behalf of herself, she feels strongly that segment 4 should be built first because that would be where most of the treatment would take place. It should be moved up on the list of priorities, at least in terms of Capital Circle.

Jack Diestelhorst, representing Capital Cascades Council:

This was an incredible plan! Blueprint 2000 had done a fantastic job listening to citizen input. Genesis Group had done a fantastic job designing it. The CAC would have the opportunity to review it in much greater detail next week. He asked that they please do not hold approval of the project up. This project needed to move forward to the IA on January 31, 2005. He was glad they voted on funding for segment 4, he would ask though, that they look for places outside the box for funding. There were many places to find funding outside of the box.

VI. Items From Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Sheridan encouraged the committee to do their homework and be prepared to vote on the Capital Cascades Trail concepts at the special meeting. There being no further business Jess Van Dyke moved that they adjourn, seconded by Charles Pattison. The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.