

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
 Wednesday, January 19, 2005
 Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center
 1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109
 5:00 pm

Chairman Bill Smith called the meeting to order at 5:06 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
Bill Smith	

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Jim Davis	Phil Maher
Dave Bright	Jerry Oshesky
Ed Ringe	Ray Youmans
Ben Fusaro	Shelonda Gay
Koren Taylor	Mark Thomasson
Julie Hauserman	Angela Richardson
Eric Gooch	Tammy Peters
DeWayne Carver	Linda Jamison
Bruce Richie	Sean McGlynn
Wendy Grey	Delmas Barber
Mark Llewellyn	Bob Rackleff
Bill Chandler	Martha Wellman

Agenda Modifications

None

Informational Items

None

Consent Items

None

Presentations/Discussion/Action

Item #1: Capital Cascade Trail Master Plan

Mr. Smith began the meeting by thanking everyone for coming, thanking Blueprint staff and welcoming guests. He stated that speaker cards were not necessary for this meeting. Guests would be called on to speak during each segment.

The purpose of this special meeting was to workshop the draft design concepts for Capital Cascade Trail as requested by the CAC at their January 13, 2005 CAC meeting. The concept presentation was given in detail at the January 13 meeting therefore, this was an opportunity for the committee to ask questions and clarify the options with Blueprint staff.

Mr. Dave Bright detailed a list of handouts associated with the agenda packet. Included with the packet was specific information requested by the committee: a draft of the minutes from the January 13, 2005 meeting including the motion put forth by Mr. Jess Van Dyke in Item 9 of that agenda, cost comparisons for each concept, a detailed concept highlights narrative, an e-mail from commissioner Rackleff, and a letter from the Science Advisory Committee. Additionally, Mr. McGorty requested members comments be more clearly identified in the minutes.

Mr. Davis reviewed the recommended concept for segment 1.

Mr. McGorty stated he thought the Economic and Environmental Consensus Committee (EECC) made a critical mistake in recommending a four-lane roadway. Their first choice was a smaller road system to allow for a scenic boulevard. The issue, in his opinion, is not the boxed culvert. Progressive cities have recognized that slowing down traffic in their downtown area has enhanced their economic opportunities. The proposed concept was a mistake and there would be more design flexibility with a reduced road system. He further stated that without the cooperation of the Leon County School Board (LCSB), City of Tallahassee and Leon County, doing something north of Tennessee Street and in Lafayette Park, this project cannot accommodate all the storm water needs of the system. Key objectives of this project are storm water, flooding and water quality, and the cooperation of those organizations is critical. They must contribute funds to realize a solution that meets the holistic goals set by Blueprint. He clarified that he intended no misinterpretation because the EECC did recommend the four-lane boxed culvert option. That he merely wanted his opinion on record.

Mr. Ben Fusaro stated that he agreed with Mr. McGorty. The majority of the problems stem from run-off due to the impervious surfaces. If previous developers and city officials had decent respect for the natural topography the community would not be in this situation. He would prefer to begin with a stream that is of natural riparian value; attempts should be made to reverse the damages not continue to make it worse. This stream is a prime conveyance of water and is there; boxed culverts are not natural or necessary. Leave it as it is and save millions of dollars.

Mr. DeWayne Carver spoke on the preferred concept, specifically the Franklin Boulevard cross-section. He stated that Blueprint 2000 was sold to the community as a transportation package. For years, bicyclists have encouraged others to use this form of transportation and have constructed miles of bicycle lanes. Problems occur when non-cyclists regulate cyclists by telling them where, when, and how they should ride. This design is attempting to accommodate bicycles by providing, firstly, a 13' wide shared lane and secondly a 10' multi-use path. The 13' lane is not shareable, a shareable lane is 14', and also, there is no shoulder or gutter along the road. The multi-use path would not be a safe option either. Students rushing to class and parents strolling with toddlers, sharing the same path, is asking for an accident. This is a tremendous step backward for multi-modal transportation and bicycle transportation in Tallahassee. The multi-use path could be narrowed to 8' and the strip between the sidewalk and curb to 1' to allow the addition of an on road bike lane.

Mr. Sean McGlynn spoke from the biological and geological perspective of the stream valley. He stated that he felt this project was doomed unless work began north of Tennessee Street. Storage and treatment north of Tennessee are necessary. The increase in construction and impervious surfaces has worsened erosion problems. The run-off will overwhelm the culverts and the floods will worsen. He also stated the stream is spring fed and spoke of the flora and fauna living there. This area is the heart of downtown, the Country Club district of the 1820's; it is mixed, residential and commercial. Slowing down traffic through this area is vital to both residents and local businesses. Think of pedestrians; think of the stream first.

Ms. Julie Hauserman, author of an essay about the Cascades waterfall in the book, *Between Two Rivers*, which was a volunteer project by the Red Hills Writers Project. Their goal was to tell the story of the region before it was developed into something that they did not recognize. They hope that by telling those stories, it would spark a love of place and activism that would lead to growth that does not roll over the community's character. Franklin Blvd is in a lovely residential community; she suggested one lane on each side and widening the ditch to restore the stream.

Ms. Linda Jamison, of the Big Bend Sierra Club, advocated for the stream also. She read a portion of their policy on flood plains, which is published nationally. "In flood protection, emphasis should be placed not on structural controls, but on floodplain management, including flood proofing ... and zoning for compatible uses to control future development. To maximize environmental benefits, floodplains should be utilized for wetlands, agriculture, parks, greenbelts, groundwater recharge, buffer zones for protection of in stream uses, and other uses compatible with the flood hazard. Structural devices should not be used where they would encourage development in floodplains." (Sierra Club Conservation policy on water can be found at <http://www.sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/water.asp>) Ms. Jamison further stated 50-80 % of the water in St. Augustine Branch comes from the 341 acres north of Tennessee Street. Understanding that this is outside of Blueprint's project boundaries, but it is imperative to address it in order to move forward in a viable fashion with plans for segment 1. Human interference destroyed the natural wetlands surrounding the old Lake Leon. Sierra Club advocates restoration of wetlands, as they are natural flood mitigators

keeping excess water near the source of origin. Pervious surfaces need to be installed in that area to reduce the runoff load into St Augustine Branch. They hope that the time would be dedicated for a scientific search for an integrated solution, anything less would only be a band-aid.

Mr. Delmas Barber of FAMU discussed the natural connection between man and water's ability to revive. He felt the stream should be open because it was important to the re-birth of that area.

Mr. Van Dyke stated no matter how hard he struggled, when he looked at that water body, he did not see a stream, only a ditch. The problem was how to incorporate the traffic flow, experts recommend, and a water body that does not look like a ditch. The EECC wrestled with segment one the longest; they were not certain but had to rely on the expert's opinions and recommendations (regarding traffic flow). He did not see water quality improvements with a ditch versus boxed culverts. He acknowledged this was not easy and wanted the experts to consider segment one very carefully to ensure they were not "blowing it."

Additionally, Mr. Van Dyke asked of Mr. Mark Llewellyn, the existing peak flow is 251 cubic feet per second (CFS) and after doing the project it would be 531 CFS, was this because of the addition of impervious surfaces? Mr. Llewellyn explained it was because of the expanded capacity of the channel through the boxed culverts providing more conveyance. Mr. Van Dyke referenced a letter from Mr. McGlynn which stated if the culverts under the bridges were modified the channel would experience increased flow which would satisfy the flooding issues. Mr. Llewellyn replied this was not entirely accurate because sections of the roadway, too, were depressed. There were other issues involved that would not be resolved with replacement of the bridges. It would reduce the flooding but would not solve the issue completely.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. McGorty, for the EECC perspective. Mr. McGorty stated he expressed those opinions earlier also that he was prepared to vote positively for segments two through four, but did not feel segment one was correct. He felt the committee could move in many directions, vote out concept A (the two lane option) or return it to the IA, but segment one was the "sticking point" for the whole greenway project. If it was returned to the IA, it would have the caveat that they must work together with LCSB to find additional funds to make this a better solution. In his opinion, \$30 million being invested was not buying much.

Ms. Anita Davis expressed concern with where the waters were coming from and if there was enough retention along the stream not to cause anymore harm. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Llewellyn to answer her question. Mr. Llewellyn explained the water was entering the system from north of Tennessee Street as well as east and west of Franklin from the side streets. Most of the water from the north of Tennessee was being piped under Leon High ball fields and Tennessee Street with some surface water contributing to the system also. It would easily connect with the boxed culverts. Piped systems from the neighborhoods adjacent to Franklin would connect into the boxed culverts along the sides.

Ms. Davis felt the problem was in not knowing the topography, were the experts protecting the surrounding properties. She wanted to know what consequences or harm could come from the various concepts of segment one. Mr. Davis explained this was a 3000-acre watershed which collects water because of ills of the past with impervious surfaces. Historically, the runoff would flow into the stream at Franklin, down through the cascades and into a sinkhole that carried it away.

This project alone cannot correct the ills of the past 100 years of unregulated building and the increase of impervious surface in this basin. Segment one is a large portion of the solution; it will not address all of the water quality and storm water issues in this 3000-acre basin. Blueprint is encouraging the support of the CAC to assist in keeping the City, County, and LCSB involved and completing other projects in the basin. A report from 1990 showed a possible solution, but no action was taken. The report recommended the re-creation of Lake Leon, a storm water pond at the old Howard Johnson site, and action taken at Cascade Park were all critical pieces of the solution. The Capital Cascade Trail project is a major component of the solution as well as improvement to storm water issues in that area. No additional water would be generated by this proposal, it would instead, allow for it to be handled in a more controlled fashion. The streets would not flood because the water would be contained in the boxed culverts. There is no water quality treatment in segment one, only storm water conveyance and flood control. The water quality treatment begins in segment two, improves in three and is at its best in segment four. This is how it was designed. This is not the perfect solution for everyone, but it is a good compromise for improvement.

The preferred alternative for all four segments was presented to and recommended by the Capital Cascade Council from the Trust for Public Land (TPL). Mr. Davis' opinion from the stakeholders, persons representing the neighborhood associations, etc, meeting of the previous evening was of general agreement. Additionally, meetings with Tallahassee Community College and the EECC have resulted in support for the recommendations as well.

Mr. Gregg Patterson agreed with Mr. McGorty completely, the preferred alternative is better than what currently exists. He struggles with this segment more than the others because the original selling point of a river walk along Franklin Boulevard. He asked for clarification of the existence of natural springs along the stream. Mr. Llewellyn acknowledged the potential of natural springs and that one had been referenced earlier in the evening's discussions but that he had not personally observed any. Mr. Patterson expressed that everyone embraced the holistic vision of Blueprint and that he had envisioned a "center-piece of Tallahassee" that would differentiate this community from all others. However, with the constraints of the City, County and LCSB he did not want to act to quickly and miss an opportunity to create something great downtown. Understanding how public officials operate, sometimes the court of public opinion will change their minds. This was our opportunity to be more than average or merely better than what exists currently. He was describing a place which would define how our city would be in the future as well as the potential for future economic development. Everyone involved in the project should stretch their imaginations outside of the box, be reasonable, but this is how to create a winner. This was a defining moment in Tallahassee's history to create something that would serve the entire community.

Ms. Cassie Moran thanked everyone for their patience and stated that she felt the "vocal minority" carried more weight than the silent majority. In regards to the Capital Cascades Council approving the preferred alternatives she wanted clarification of who carried more clout, them or the CAC. Mr. Davis confirmed that the CAC does as far as the IA is concerned. Mr. Smith interjected that he hoped by the end of that workshop the CAC would take some form of action, a recommendation on the whole project and/or individual segments of the project and would send that recommendation forward.

Ms. Moran continued by asking in there was a traffic expert available to explain why a two-lane option would not be feasible. She was confused as to which road traffic would be diverted to that would not be acceptable. Mr. Llewellyn, though he is not the traffic expert, explained that information from the initial analysis showed that the parallel roads were already over taxed. By reducing Franklin Boulevard to two lanes it would push additional traffic onto those streets or through neighborhoods in the surrounding area. Mr. Bright stated that the nearest street, Meridian Street was residential in nature and the nearest north/south street would be Magnolia Drive, approximately one half mile to the east. It would not serve the same destination as Franklin Boulevard. Mr. Llewellyn reminded the committee that there is very limited right of way space, with sidewalks, two lanes of traffic and turn lanes, to reconfigure a natural channel. It would not change from what exists today.

Ms. Moran stated her concern lay more closely to the safety possibilities because it was a precarious road to travel anyway. She questioned Mr. Davis on the division of the lanes. He clarified for her that the lanes were in fact divided either by a median or turn lanes. Mr. Llewellyn further explained the County would require some minimal concrete barrier between lanes. The right of way there is extremely constrained. Mr. Carver offered a transportation planner's opinion of the concept, based on several years of experience. In his experience, these types of studies always result in recommending that the roads must be widened. In this area we have the opportunity to create something greater than a four-lane highway.

Mr. Jerry Conger questioned if, at any point, throughout the project if experts considered an alternative to the concepts presented. Did this develop out of the EECC recommendations? Mr. Davis answered that is where staff began because the EECC provided the most specific guidance for segment one of any in the project. The EECC had looked at options to the four-lane roadway. Staff reviewed various options for improvement on top of what the EECC recommended, however, they did not attempt to revisit every possible alternative. The job of the Blueprint staff is to implement the Blueprint program. This is what staff has created as a compromise based on what the EECC gave them as a start.

Mr. Conger asked if the Sierra vision was considered at all. Mr. Davis explained that it was, after the fact, when they surfaced the idea approximately 30 days ago. Prior to that, Nancy Miller, a member of the EECC as well as a member of the Executive Committee of the Sierra Club, expressed to Mr. Davis that the Sierra Club voted in supported in the Blueprint program, including Franklin Boulevard. However, Mr. Davis stated that he was told on Tuesday 1/18/05, that the Sierra Club had voted again and no longer

supported segment one; adding that this was purely hearsay. Mr. Conger stated that he had the impression that staff came into the project with decisions already made. Mr. Davis said that he was correct, direction from the EECC. Mr. Smith offered 'strong guidance' instead of 'decision' and Mr. Davis corrected himself by stating rather than decisions, strong guidance would be more accurate.

Mr. McGorty explained that he, Martha Wellman, and Jess Van Dyke were three members of the EECC and he would like to recognize Ms. Wellman. She acknowledged that segment one was the most difficult because it was such a constrained area and the right of way was so expensive. The entire budget for Blueprint could be spent in this segment. The EECC met concurrently with transportation and storm water and this was the compromise they came too. After listening to the discussions of that evening, however, she recommended postponing the construction of segment one to the later years and building segment four, first, where most of the water quality treatment takes place. In the intervening years, work with the City, County and LCSB to create something that satisfies more people in segment one. She recommended building segment two, four then three and work with the aforementioned agencies to create a viable solution.

Mr. Terence Hinson expressed his concern regarding beautification and safety issues of Franklin Boulevard in addition to the flooding issues. If the ditch were made deeper, it would increase the safety issues. He noted that most people were aware of the drowning which occurred in the 1970's which resulted in the existing guardrails. He questioned how they would balance aesthetic and traffic flow improvements as well as safety. Also how litter would be handled, due to runoff. Mr. Davis explained that the culverts would generally be self cleaning. Normal flow is only 3 CFS, however, in the first few minutes of a significant rain event the flow would increase, clearing the culvert of debris. Additionally, the storm drains would be engineered to help eliminate debris from entering the culverts initially. There would be more issues in the stilling pools down stream. As the water level rises and falls residue would remain along the sides. That would be a simple maintenance issue.

Ms. Dianna Norwood had philosophical concerns. Given that the EECC spent two years developing the Blueprint plan, they should not consider options not included with the original EECC documents or discussions. It was her perception that Blueprint staff was using the excuse of "...because they did not think of it ten years ago, they could not be creative now." She felt it went against the original vision and expressed her offense. She further stated the average voter may have read a few articles in the Democrat or maybe just the brief description the ballot. For the committee to say what they did or did not vote for was an injustice. Mr. McGorty responded that the object was to create model public works projects that melded green and gray infrastructure. He felt that the EECC would be the first to stand up in approval if the committee came away with a better design and consensus to move forward. He felt that three of the segments should move forward but segment one required more work.

Mr. Charles Pattison stated that in his opinion the issue was to protect the possibility of creating something better. The preferred alternative for segment one precluded that option. He understood the constraints, however, felt that downstream segments should be completed first in order to process the water quality and storm water issues. He felt the

committee should vote specifically on segments two through four and work on segment one longer.

Mr. Mike Sheridan felt that the speakers were mainly focusing on segment one but he was more concerned with segment four. The preferred concept dedicates 619 plus acres to storm water flood plain capacity. He was very impressed and felt four should be constructed first followed by three; that segment one was the least important in the process. Without segment four, they could do anything with segment one and it would only exacerbate the issue.

Mr. McGorty supported the direction of the discussion. It places the necessary focus on segments two through four and then return to the elected leaders of the community to find funding sources and more creative solutions to segment one.

Mr. Smith stated it appeared, taking segments two through four off the table for the sake of this discussion, it appeared there was no consensus to move forward, with what was been presented at this time, on segment one. An alternative to segment one should be crafted. He also asked the Blueprint team to send forward the recommendations of the CAC with conceptual thoughts presented and the spirit of the discussion. Mr. Pattison clarified that staff scheduled the CAC meeting with the idea that they would take what the CAC recommended to the IA on January 31, 2005. Mr. Smith confirmed that and suggested the recommendation might be that segment two, three and four are great, but one does not make it.

Mr. Pattison stated it appeared the committee was close to consensus, and that on segment one, it was not correct yet, and that a prioritization of segments two through four, which would allow for time to reconsider segment one with, perhaps, more resources or concepts. Mr. Van Dyke suggested adding language to the recommendation that says the City, County and LCSB must "step up" in regards to Lake Leon and create a storm water pond at the old Howard Johnson site in order to develop a total solution, and for everyone to think "outside of the boxed culvert". Perhaps have water volume and rate controls elsewhere. He did not know how it would all work but felt they were heading in the right direction.

Mr. Sheridan asked if it was also possible to set budget parameters. Noting that all proposals for segment one fall in the \$23 plus million range, and the CAC believes that future design concepts should be comparable. This would provide an overall number for the IA, as to what the CAC thinks the project would entail, even though they offered no specifics. Mr. Davis stated that he did not see a problem with the CAC including a number to their recommendation nor did he see a problem with approving two through four, with the exception of one. He liked Mr. Van Dyke's comment that "...a proper solution to segment one must include..." Blueprint has identified they cannot unilaterally solve all water quality problems in that basin and must incorporate actions by the City, County and LCSB.

Mr. Sheridan wanted to include the budget parameters because he was concerned of possible erosion to the commitment to all four segments if the re-design took awhile. Mr. Davis stated the staff was attempting to implement what they thought you, the citizens,

wanted. Problems arose when there was no clear guidance provided; without that Blueprint would not know how to proceed. It was recommended that there should be a second CAC workshop to review Franklin Boulevard concepts to provide such guidance.

Mr. Smith, addressing the speakers, summarized that on segment one, there was not agreement with the plan as presented and the major conceptual points presented will be condensed by staff in anticipation of the IA meeting on January 31, 2005. With that in mind he requested speakers keep their comments to point that had not been addressed previously in the evening.

Mr. McGlynn wanted to correct the misperception of the drowning death of the children. It occurred at Leon High and they were drawn into the culvert under Tennessee Street; similar to the student at FSU recently. The culverts are dangerous. The technology in stream restoration has advanced in the past ten years; it is unbelievable what can be done now. Julie Hauserman added that she was certain the engineers would be able to drain that basin of water, after all, engineers drained the everglades. However, they should remember that the water is our heart. Think beyond the constraints of needing to move water and cars. It is not necessary.

Mr. Barber took the opportunity to remind the committee of the necessity of constructing segment four first, then three.

Commissioner Bob Rackleff spoke in favor of keeping an option open for Centennial Field construction in the future. He felt it was important because Blueprint was about revitalizing the urban core of Tallahassee. It would provide that by attracting activity most days and nights of the year. Activity was what would make it an urban park, not dark and deserted at night. Kleman Plaza would not be available much longer due to the construction in that area and Cascade Park would be its equal. He referred to a memorandum from PBS&J with solutions to provide stormwater capacity which would allow Centennial Field.

Ms. Norwood asked Commissioner Rackleff, being an elected official, to address any Commission thoughts regarding beginning with segment four. Commissioner Rackleff responded that he was the wrong person to ask what other commissioners might be thinking. In his opinion, however, it seemed to be a rational approach. He added that the County has already invested millions downstream of segment four.

Ms. Jamison spoke again of Sierra Club's position and her tenure with them in regards to Mr. Davis's comment of support/withdrawal of support. Mr. Smith thanked her for her time. He also questioned Mr. Davis and Mr. Bright, regarding the minutes of today's meeting. Mr. Davis proposed Blueprint staff would craft the minutes in concise manner capturing the spirit of the discussion. There is a section on the agenda that goes forward to the IA, for recommendation from the CAC. Staff will include the CAC's concise comments there, if that met his desire. Mr. Smith clarified that the CAC recommendation would be that there was no agreement or recommendation on Segment one.

Ms. Moran asked if there was also agreement to revise priority on funding for segment four. Mr. Smith explained that would be discussed later in the agenda. She further

questioned if the trail would be paved and would the ponds look like Lake Ella or Lake Elberta?

Mr. Patterson agreed with a budget per segment but he did not want it to be self-limiting. He wanted to encourage contributions via other governmental agencies, public, or private contributions, and grants.

Mr. Davis reviewed the recommended concepts for segments two through four. Elaborating on segment four being unfunded in the current Blueprint Master Plan and asking the committee to realize that did not mean it would not be built. Rather, view it as an opportunity for City, County, Blueprint, TPL, etc. to come together to create something wonderful for the community. Mr. Smith asked Phil Maher how much leveraging dollars Blueprint has obtained in the past two years. Mr. Maher replied approximately \$50 million in SIB loans plus \$4.5 million in grants.

Mr. McGorty stated that at the January 13, 2005 CAC meeting, the committee voted to recommend that funding for segment four (right-of-way) go back into the budget. He wanted to verify that was not in conflict with their message to the IA. Mr. Davis stated that was a hard decision the elected officials would have to make; also that it was a prioritization issue.

Mr. Smith continued to restate committee comments. Segments two, three, and four are acceptable, although there may be tweaking regarding location or size of amenities, but in general those sections were okay. Mr. Conger stated he felt they were passing over segment two too quickly in terms of Centennial Field. He felt that was a crucial issue that had not been thoroughly discussed. Mr. Smith indicated the committee would return to that topic. Mr. Patterson stated he was at the point of moving forward with the prioritization of two, three and four, however, leaving open a door for Centennial Field, or some variation of, in the future.

Mr. Smith asked if other committee members supported Centennial Field besides Mr. Conger and Mr. Patterson. He noted that there was a minority/majority opinion of Centennial Field. Mr. Charles Pattison mentioned a memo from the Science Advisory Committee (SAC) suggesting there was a wet pond at Centennial Field. Mr. Davis acknowledged receipt of the letter but had not had the opportunity to read it yet, therefore could not address it. Mr. Pattison continued stating the SAC had concerns regarding the possible karst seepage from the proposed pond. Mr. Smith wanted, and stated it would not be advisable to comment on the memo until their experts had the opportunity to review and/or study it. Mr. Davis added that the Blueprint plan would be to line the pond to prevent seepage. Mr. Bright further stated that it could be an EPA decision that Blueprint would have no control over.

Mr. Patterson provided clarification on his earlier opinion, that the recommended concept move forward for segment two but not preclude the flexibility to include the field. Mr. Conger personally was in favor of segment two, concept B which included Centennial Field. He did not like E nearly as much as B. Mr. McGorty expressed his support of staff recommendations on segments two through four. He also shared accolades to Blueprint and Genesis staff. He further stated that the EECC always looked at an

amphitheater as a much more public oriented space rather than a baseball field. The community should recognize that Kleman Plaza would not be available much longer and Sringtime Tallahassee has completely maximized space downtown. The proposal for concept E, segment two, provides for the large festival type activities to take place in Cascade Park. His only caveat, raised by TPL, was that segment 2 is the most public used area, yet it has the lowest dollar amount allocated; TPL, Capital Cascades Council, recommended to the IA, if money is surplused or found that it be directed toward this segment. To provide more public amenities because that is what the public expects.

Mr. Smith pointed out there was little right of way cost in segment two, thereby, explaining the lower allocation of funds. Mr. Davis clarified that the public amenities were not funded by Blueprint; those are place-holders to represent a concept. Blueprint would fund the trail network, grading, landscaping, one restroom at \$175,000. The restoration of the historic buildings is not funded by Blueprint either. Basically, Blueprint is responsible for the "backbone" stormwater infrastructure, the trail and lighting for it. Mr. Pattison asked if he understood Mr. Davis correctly when he stated that Blueprint would not fund the amenities, the only way they would be built was if the City, County, public or private businesses or citizens generated the funds to build them. Mr. Davis confirmed his understanding. Mr. Smith, stated he felt Blueprint hoped to set the timing and the other project, in what ever form they take, would be a natural flow of that timing. Mr. Davis agreed and elaborated with possibilities for future economic development surrounding the greenway. Success breeds success, the more people use the space the greater the enticement would be to private investors to develop the surrounding areas.

Mr. Barber addressed the rich African-American history surrounding Centennial Field and the area formerly known as Smoky Hollow and the need to incorporate that heritage into the project. Ms. Wendy Grey acknowledged the need for additional design work, at a technical level, for the additional amenities. She recommended they be designated as cultural placeholders or venues so the community realizes there was a range of things which may be placed there but not so specific that they think there will only be that structure. Ms. Wellman reminded the committee of the train which passes through the area and the noise interruptions with any of the options. Mr. Davis stated he was more concerned with the left fielder, with the life jacket, in the pond.

He further stated, in reference to Mr. Barber's concern, it has always been envisioned there would be some type of historical venue near the Centennial Field area. Additionally, Russell Daws, from the Tallahassee Museum is working cooperatively with Blueprint to research the Smoky Hollow area to incorporate its history into the greenway.

A question was asked regarding the size of the wet pond and impacts to it if Centennial Field was included in the plan. Mr. Davis stated that was one of the original problems with the ball field, depending on the size, it took up the majority of the area needed for stormwater at the expense of the pond. Mr. Smith explained that the pond was critical and the field affected its size; it would create a huge differential to the overall stormwater goal of this segment. Ms. Moran explained she was not in favor of the amphitheater, citing the one at Kleman Plaza, which in her opinion received little use.

Mr. Carver asked about the closing of Gasden Street. Mr. Davis explained that during a high flood event that the area would flood, therefore, closing it would allow for additional storage of storm water. Commissioner Rackleff suggested as a trade off, by including an AA field would mean a smaller pond at the second location. However, if the first stilling pond was increased in size it could still accommodate the high flood capacity of storm water. The only loss would be in parking for Department of Transportation offices. In his opinion, Centennial field was more important than parking and with modifications to the design upstream, the baseball field could be included. Mr. Patterson raised the question of parking agreements with the State of Florida, for those parking lots to be available nights and weekends. Mr. Davis stated at that time the only agreement which had been reached was to re-create any parking spaces which might be taken out during construction of the greenway.

Mr. Sheridan raised the question of what happens to the water in regards to Commissioner Rackleff's suggestion. Mr. Llewellyn responded that the option of providing a baseball field was considered. One of the objectives was to significantly reduce the flooding on South Monroe Street; the models reflected that even including a Babe Ruth sized field would increase flooding on South Monroe Street. That was a key point to not considering that option further. The lower section of the Cascade Park area is where the majority of the capacity is available. In that area, during major storm events, that staging would be up 15-20 feet from the normal water level. There is that much volume available in the lower segment which due to gradient is not available in the upstream segments. Mr. Davis mentioned that another key factor was the ability to move water through this area and under South Monroe Street. Additionally, with apologies to the Commissioner, the majority of public comment did not reflect a baseball field as supportive of the goals. Naturally, the fans do, and staff has considered it but the local neighborhood associations are opposed due to concerns of increased traffic, lighting, noise etc. That was also part of our consideration.

Ms. Jamison expressed concern for the karst area on behalf of Sierra in reference to the remediation site. She questioned how a sinkhole, for example, would be handled during the clean up process. Mr. Davis replied that Koren Taylor was the project manager for the City, the entity responsible for the remediation; she would be the person to elaborate on that scenario. He did state that he was aware of borings and attempts to identify areas that would be sensitive to that possibility. All groups involved with the remediation process would be sensitive to the possibility and exercise due diligence to ensure that does not happen. If it does, however, it would be repaired.

Mr. Smith stated that he felt general consensus had been reached on concepts E, A and C for segments two, three and four. A minority of members wished to preserve options for the venue known as Centennial Field; the majority wished to preserve options for cultural venues. They noted that in moving forward in moving section two through four ahead with general consensus just as segment one was moved ahead with the consensus of no. They wished to have over arching comments included in regards to the City, County and LCSB across all segments and in particular the area north of Tennessee Street. He expressed a possibility that it was an opportunity for some of the ideas which were thought of as constraints to be guidelines. Additionally, a letter would move forward which would recount the spirit of the meeting that would read segment one – no and on

segments two, three, and four - yes. Mr. Sheridan reminded Mr. Smith of comments relative to the budget constraints. Mr. Patterson brought up the priority of construction of the segments.

Mr. Davis asked for the committee to clarify, prior to committing to "non-specific place holders or venues" and realize what Blueprint has depicted in the preferred alternatives was a result of the public input and workshops. Details would be determined in the design phase but to change that to "placeholder"...would be foolish, Mr. Smith completed. Ms. Davis, needing to leave, wanted to express she was in agreement with segments two, three and four as well as putting segment one in a consignment situation.

Mr. Smith called for suggestions, from Mr. Davis or Mr. Llewellyn, to the numerical order of construction. Mr. Davis stated the original plan was to build two, three then one. The reason for beginning in segment two was to coincide with the City's remediation project and capitalize on the work they were doing. Additionally, as a stand alone hallmark section from community involvement was a critical piece. Move to construction of three to address water quality problems and finally moving back to one with segment four remaining unfunded. From an engineering perspective, storm water project should begin downstream and work upstream. No matter the sequence, in his opinion, two should be considered early on due to the remediation process. It would send a positive message to the community and the park amenity would be there early on.

Mr. Smith asked if it was important to include a prioritization of construction in the committee's recommendation. Mr. Davis stated that it would not hurt; from a business perspective two, three, four were justifiable. He further stated if the CAC did not agree with the staff recommendation of two, three, one it was imperative for them to include their recommendation two, three, four in the communication. Mr. Patterson stated, in his opinion, deferring the acquisition of right of way in segment four to the future would only exacerbate the issue because the land would be more expensive. He suggested making the priority two, four, three, one. Several members agreed with his comment.

Mr. Van Dyke stated that 75% of the storm water storage capacity was in segment four; he concurred that segment two should be built early. He suggested two, four, three, one. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Llewellyn, if enough water could be conveyed with the existing channel. Mr. Llewellyn stated that segment two was designed to stand alone, essentially one and two could go without three and four because of the capacity provided in segment two. Mr. Davis confirmed that segment 2 was primarily storm water capacity not water quality treatment. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Llewellyn, in his professional opinion, was the recommendation of two, four, three, one wise or should the CAC merely recommend beginning at segment two. Mr. Llewellyn asked Mr. Mark Thomasson to respond. Mr. Thomasson stated that segments two, three and four had been modeled independently and each could be built independently and net improvement would be achieved downstream. Storm water storage capacity would be added in each segment, where there currently is none, therefore improving the existing situation. The order in which the segments are built becomes political, a right of way and public issue; technically they could be built in nearly any order.

Mr. Smith asked, in moving segment four up, there was right of way funding only. Mr. Davis stated technically, that funding for right of way acquisition was not available until 2017 -2019 under the basic plan. Mr. Bright noted that in the Interlocal Agreement, segment four was funded for right of way only in Tier 1. Therefore if construction was moved forward into Tier 1, two public hearings and a super-majority vote of the IA would be required to implement that change. Mr. Davis noted that should be a joint funding issue between the City and County, not only Blueprint funds. Mr. Llewellyn pointed out that it would be preferred to have the trail amenities continual; completing segment two and moving to four would create "disconnect" in those amenities.

Mr. McGorty stated the vote by the CAC was symbolic in nature; they did not have the technical expertise to make the final decision. However, at the January 13, 2005 CAC meeting the CAC commented and voted to move funds into segment four. Therefore, recommending construction of segments two, four, three, one would send a symbolic message of the CAC's priorities as well as complimenting the vote taken previously. Mr. Sheridan agreed, additionally, he felt it was incumbent upon the committee to make as thorough a recommendation as possible. Therefore it would be appropriate for the CAC to recommend the sequence of construction to the IA. He continued as Mr. McGorty stated, it would send a symbolic message to the IA that the CAC wanted to address all four segments of the project simultaneously to obtain funding. He further stated he would support two, four, three, one as Mr. Van Dyke recommended.

Ms. Grey suggested reallocating construction dollars for segment one to right of way acquisition dollars in four; since there is no land acquisition in one the issues of escalated cost would not be relevant. The question of postponing construction of segment one and how it would affect the northern portion of segment two was raised. Mr. Davis stated he thought it would be fine, however, the committee needed to realize if the funding was reallocated, Franklin Boulevard would not see any activity for ten years.

Mr. Smith requested the spirit and intent of communication from the meeting be drafted into the minutes, a copy forwarded to him for review, and copies to the committee members, prior to submission to the IA.

Mr. Davis stated there were two minor issues to mention if the committee had no further discussion on Capital Cascade Trail. **One issue of the staff recommendation which will go to the IA is that staff exercise the option for Genesis to complete the design for the storm water system for what would be segments two, three, and four, in some order. Furthermore, Genesis would be required to subcontract with a firm which has park expertise, to participate in the development of amenities in segment two; Blueprint, additionally, reserved approval right of said firm. Mr. Smith called for a motion to accept. Mr. Van Dyke moved to accept. Mr. Sheridan seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Mr. Patterson expressed his concern with distinction between public comments and the committee's recommendation. Mr. Smith noted that Mr. Davis would ensure that distinction. He further thanked the Blueprint staff and Genesis for all efforts put forth.

Mr. Smith called for a motion to approve the order of segments: two, four, three, one as well as recommendations and bullet points which were presented earlier. Mr. Sheridan moved to approve it. Mr. Van Dyke seconded it. It passed unanimously.

V. Citizens to be Heard

Citizen's comments were listed above based on the format of the meeting set forth by Chairman Smith.

VI. Items From Members of the Committee

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.