

**Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, March 15, 2007

Blueprint 2000 Office – Koger Center

1311 Executive Center Drive – Suite 109

4:30 – 6:30 pm

Terence Hinson called the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

**Committee Members present:**

Terence Hinson	Michael Sheridan
Jess Van Dyke	Kevin McGorty
Anita Davis	Gregg Patterson
Dianna Norwood	Kathy Archibald
Steve Amnott	Nancy Miller
Jerry Conger	Tom O'Steen

**Guests/Presenters/Staff:**

Jim Davis	Shelonda Gay
Dave Bright	Angela Richardson
Phil Maher	Joan Brown
Margie Quillman	Mark Llewellyn
Ed Ringe	Peter Martin
Doug Martin	Mark Thomasson
Paul Hiers	Echo Gates
Randy Matheny	Joe Petrich
Marek Romanowski	June Clark
Gary Phillips	Paco de la Fuente
Bill Little	Robert Burke

Agenda Modifications
----------------------

There were no agenda modifications.

Information Items
-------------------

**Item #1: Leveraging Update**

Dave Bright stated that Mr. Hinson had signed a letter of support for the Capital Cascade Connector Bridge Grant Application that would connect Segments Two and Three in Capital Cascade Trail. The estimated cost of the bridge was more than \$2 million, Mr. Bright stated. Blueprint 2000 had requested \$1 million in the Transportation Enhancement Grant. He further stated that the CRTPA had received three applications and would be forwarding all three to the

FDOT District 3 office for an evaluation of eligibility; they would not be ranked by the CRTPA until summer 2007. The other two applications submitted were for signage in the downtown area of Tallahassee and a greenway trail along Meridian Road. He reminded the CAC that funding, if received, would not occur until the fifth-year of the FDOT Work Program; approximately 2012 or 2013. However, that fit perfectly with the estimated time frame for construction of the bridge.

Mr. Bright thanked Jess Van Dyke for alerting Blueprint that funding was available through the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission that could potentially be used to fund the wetland plantings for the Regional Stormwater Pond on West Tennessee Street. Staff had submitted information to the FFWCC, who saw no problems with the submittal. The amount anticipated was around \$565,000. Blueprint was awaiting their decision and comments on the Draft Agreement. If funding was received from FFWCC it would unencumber the funds in the contract which could potentially be used to fund the building of the park at that facility. Jim Davis stated that staff was also attempting to acquire the used car lot adjacent to the pond as well.

Mr. Davis stated that Ziffer-Stansberry Advertising had submitted a proposal for the marketing strategy for the Capital Cascade Trail amenities for approximately \$40,000. The Board approved that the Plan could be funded out of Blueprint funds if necessary however, Mike Pate with the Knight Foundation had agreed to fund it. He further stated that it would possibly be handled through TPL.

Mr. Davis stated regarding Wood Sink that acquisition of it "looked promising." It appeared that Blueprint would be able to acquire it and approximately 100-acres surrounding it as part of a 1,000-acre deal that The Nature Conservancy had made with the St. Joe Company. Cost estimates had not yet been discussed however, he repeated, that it looked promising.

#### **Item #2: Fred George Basin Acquisition**

Jim Davis stated that the Fred George Basin acquisition was discussed extensively at the previous CAC meeting and their discussion resulted in the approval of the acquisition by the CAC. The Board, at their February 26, 2007 meeting, also approved the acquisition and instructed staff to begin the supermajority vote process to move the project from Tier 2 to Tier 1. That process required recommendations by the TCC and the CAC. Staff intended to move forward unless the CAC had any objections. However the previous vote by the CAC was to endorse that. Kathy Archibald clarified that it was for the matching portion and that the County would come up with the remaining money. Mr. Davis stated that was exactly what was approved by the Board, up to \$2.77 M in Blueprint funds. There were no objections by the CAC.

#### **Item #3: Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest Update (Orange Avenue to West Tennessee Street)**

#### **Item #4: Capital Circle Southwest PD&E Study Update (SR 20 to Crawfordville Road)**

Jim Davis addressed items 3 and 4 together. He stated that the majority of the February 26, 2007 IA meeting was spent in discussion of the CCNW/SW projects. It resulted in the Board's approval of the staff recommendation to move forward with the acquisition of all of the necessary right of way; which was predicated upon the alignment that had previously been

approved by the IA. There was a caveat however that basically stated that the project should be presented to the Board for final approval prior to beginning any construction. That was necessary anyway, stated Mr. Davis, for approval to solicit bids for construction.

Kevin McGorty requested clarification of comments from the Tallahassee Democrat that referenced discussion regarding CCSE. Mr. Davis stated that it was simply a mix-up by Democrat staff.

Nancy Miller questioned how much "weight" was given to the district meetings by the Board in their decision? Mr. Davis stated that he was not sure how to answer her because it varied from Commissioner to Commissioner and was dependent upon who was in attendance. He stated that the plan for CCSW that listed what staff was looking at to make the selection, in an attempt to quantify something. That compiled data, via a matrix, would be presented to the CAC, TCC, and the Board for approval. He further stated that one could not remove the subjectivity from it however staff felt that the matrix of evaluation criteria was the appropriate methodology to involve the Board with the weighting. The numbers would fall where they fell, he stated, and that would become the base line for discussions. Once staff was through the matrix process, and a recommendation was made is when the controversy would begin and Blueprint would be second-guessed on everything that had been done. Therefore, they were trying to collect as much input as possible and document it to ensure that staff / the Board could consider all the facts and available possibilities.

Jerry Conger stated that the turnout was abysmal in comparison to the number of mailers that were sent. He assumed that staff would review why that was the case and pursue options for increasing the turnout. Mr. Davis stated that the Blueprint Public Involvement Office did a phenomenal job and went the extra mile to inform the public. He was not sure however, how to deal with apathy and disinterest. The meeting notices were direct mailed to area residents, published in newsletters, as well as meetings being publicly noticed in the Democrat and on local radio and television stations.

Nancy Miller stated that it concerned her because the reason for realigning the roadway was partly environmental but also because of Innovation Park and economic development. She wanted to know if Blueprint staff had met with their management. Mr. Davis stated that Linda Nicholson was a member of the Community Representative Board for that project and was an active player in it. Innovation Park was well aware of the happenings on the project, he concluded.

#### Consent Items

##### **Item #5: CAC Minutes: February 8, 2007**

Kathy Archibald requested a change in the minutes on Page 5 of 5: "Mr. Sheridan commented that the Blueprint admired and respected that position and it was reflective of what Blueprint was suppose to do in its oversight." She stated that "Blueprint" should have been "CAC." Also in Item 6, the word "subject manner" should be "subject matter". With those corrections **Ms. Archibald moved to approve the minutes; Anita Davis seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Presentations/Discussion

**Item #6: Capital Cascade Trail – Segment 2 Update**

Jim Davis stated that staff had given multiple presentations on the Capital Cascade Trail Segment 2 concept over the past week that had been very well received by the community. He stated that staff's strategy for moving forward was to, at some point, return to the Board with a design and request permission to proceed with construction. Blueprint needed significant community support from key players that would be willing to speak at that IA meeting.

Mark Llewellyn introduced the Genesis Capital Cascade Team, Echo Gates, June Clark, Mark Thomasson, Joe Petrich and Peter Martin, with CLS. He and Mr. Martin briefed the committee on the latest design updates. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is located in the Blueprint 2000 file.) Specific elements were discussed throughout the presentation. They are summarized below.

Nancy Miller asked, during the schematic design discussion, what the cost of the "unfunded" portion would be. Mark Llewellyn stated that the team had not gotten that far as of yet.

Ms. Miller asked if there was anyway that a pedestrian bridge could be constructed where the trail crossed Lafayette Street between the two parks. Mr. Llewellyn stated that there was certainly an opportunity for that, however everything, cost included, would need to be taken into consideration. She stated that it was a long crossing and felt that a pedestrian bridge would be more inviting.

Ms. Miller asked how steep the grading was in the park area. Mr. Llewellyn stated that it would not exceed 4 to 1 slopes. He said that there will not be a lot of places to lay the blanket out, but there would be plenty of places to walk and enjoy the area.

Diana Norwood asked if we have staff from the City that will be able to maintain the unusual aspects of the park. Joe Petrich stated that they had met with City of Tallahassee Parks and Recreation (TPRD) and together they created a preferred plant list; and suggested that garden clubs or special interest groups might perform special maintenance.

Michael Sheridan questioned what level of interaction had occurred between Blueprint and the Council on Culture and Arts. Mr. Llewellyn stated that at least on two different occasions they had met with the COCA. Once a schematic design had been developed the team would meet with them again to discuss the stage design. He further stated that the TPRD and others in the City were on point for coordination of events and activities in the park. Mr. Sheridan suggested that Blueprint should go beyond staging and consider content material, grants that COCA had access to as well as staff resources. Money was critical Mr. Sheridan stated, and he felt it would be helpful to Blueprint if they utilized the organization that was responsible for the collection and distribution of funds to cultural heritage and arts organizations. He further stated that he also wanted to ensure it happened in the last year of his chairmanship to ensure that COCA was committed.

Kevin McGorty suggested that the team utilize designs of the local Native American settlements; for example, the breast plate design that was discovered in the Lake Jackson mounds could be implemented into the historical fence. Peter Martin stated that the team had been involved with staff from the San Luis Mission for the design ideas.

Nancy Miller questioned if, while currently un-funded, the design would remain in place once funding became available. Jim Davis stated that was Blueprint's intention. Furthermore, they intended to sell the amenities; the people who would be "putting up the money" would have **some** input on design but not much. Blueprint planned to create the park as it was being designed and to manage the continuity, control and quality of construction throughout.

Kathy Archibald questioned if the waterfall would be visible from Monroe Street. Peter Martin stated that because of elevation changes in the land form it was created to provide containment during flood conditions. Furthermore, they felt it was important to have an entrance to South Monroe to provide urban design enhancements.

A discussion of the dog park brought a question from Nancy Miller; was the dog park area in the site that was recently excavated. Mark Llewellyn stated, no, that it was the site that was covered with a clay cap; the dog park was south of the railroad track over the box culvert.

Kathy Archibald questioned if the Boca Chuba was simply a mouth that the water flowed into. Peter Martin stated that Boca Chuba was designed with a flap so that the water would pass through. The lips would have three nozzles which would shoot out water.

Nancy Miller asked if the intent was to maintain water levels in the park, or would the stream flow at all times? Mr. Llewellyn stated that the stream would maintain a base flow at all times, however due to drought, it had the potential to be quite small. He stated that they were reviewing opportunities to ensure normal water levels were maintained. Mr. Davis stated that staff disliked the idea of pumping water from the aquifer to maintain flow in the stream. One of the major water sources under review was the FDOT air conditioning chiller. However, it still would not generate enough water.

Kevin McGorty questioned if it was considered to include rusticated limestone similar to what is in the electric building detail. Peter Martin stated that a limestone veneer would be difficult and expensive to protect; brick accents would be cost effective and aesthetically pleasing.

Jim Davis stated that the intent of the briefing was to allow the CAC to experience the evolution of the park design and keep them aware of the issues at hand. He stated that while parking remained in the park the number of spaces were reduced from 307 to 138 spaces which was a significant reduction in parking. Mr. Davis recognized Gary Phillips for negotiating with DOT for the parking plan.

Michael Sheridan noted that transportation from remote parking areas, a trolley perhaps, was something that, in his opinion, should be considered for the future; as well as the possibility of including it in the City's maintenance agreement. He encouraged the CAC, Blueprint staff, and the Genesis team to think in terms of access to the park rather than parking at the park to keep open the possibilities of remote parking areas.

Tom O'Steen questioned where parking might be expected for the amphitheater when it was at maximum capacity. Jim Davis stated that negotiations with FDOT and FDMS had led to an understanding for after hours parking in the surrounding lots and garages. There was no contract, however groundwork had been laid and Blueprint staff would continue to reinforce that.

Nancy Miller questioned if the Genesis team had considered pervious pavement as a possibility for the parking lots. Mr. Davis replied, no. Mr. Martin stated that there was a concern of people becoming injured (twisting their ankle for example). Mr. Llewellyn stated that it could also become a maintenance issue. Ms. Miller stated that she understood the maintenance issues however, she felt that it would be best to not generate additional run-off. Mr. Llewellyn stated that they would look into the possibility of using pervious cement. Mr. Davis noted some of the disadvantages to using it but agreed that staff would investigate it further.

Jess Van Dyke questioned the water quality and aesthetics of the ponds if re-use water was used to supplement the water levels and base flow during drought periods. He further stated that they would potentially need to be treated with herbicides. Jim Davis stated that by utilizing the by-pass culvert design, they would be able to take both ponds off line which would potentially allow treatment via alum injection. Blueprint had proposed that the City of Tallahassee and Leon County participate with Blueprint in an Alum Injection Study (\$42,000) with Blueprint tentatively installing the infrastructure. The estimated cost for installation at those facilities was approximately \$800,000 plus \$200,000 per year to operate and maintain the system. Mr. Davis stated however, that many options were under review. Mr. Van Dyke offered his assistance if necessary.

#### Citizens To Be Heard

There were no public speakers present.

#### Items From Members Of The Committee

No items to be discussed.

#### Adjourn

**Jerry Conger moved to adjourn the meeting; Nancy Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.**