

Blueprint CAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 13, 2015
Cascades Park, Meridian Point Building

Kent Wimmer called the meeting to order at 4:37 pm.

Committee Members present:

Gordon Hansen	Andrew Chin
Chris Klena	Jim Stevenson
Neil Fleckenstein	Stewart Proctor
Kent Wimmer	JR Harding
Henree Martin	Christic Henry

Committee Members absent:

Terence Hinson	George Smith
Dale Landry	

Guests/Presenters/Staff present:

Charles Hargraves	Wayne Tedder
Autumn Calder	Gary Phillips
Susan Emmanuel	Roger Cain
Gary Phillips	Marek Romanowski
Shelonda Meeks	Debra Schiro
Angela Ivy	Junious Brown
Violet Wall	Jeanie Connor
Allen Stucks	

Agenda Modifications

There were no agenda modifications.

Information Items

Item #1: Review of Blueprint's Staff Code of Ethics and Standard of Conduct Policy

This item was informational only. Blueprint Attorney, Debra Schiro, provided an overview of the Blueprint 2000 Code of Ethics.

Item #2: Project Updates

This item was informational only.

Regarding Magnolia Drive sidewalks, Kent Wimmer questioned if the work in front of Big Bend Cares would be included in their expansion rather than through Blueprint. Autumn Calder stated that Big Bend Cares wanted to integrate their project into the work to be done by Blueprint as much as possible. However, Blueprint wanted them to include standards that would be beyond what was normally completed by the developer but were consistent with the Sense of Place district.

JR Harding questioned if Phase 7 would ever be completed. He thought it made more sense to extend the sidewalk up the west side versus zig-zagging it to the east. Wayne Tedder stated that it was extremely expensive. The idea was to get the phases in place then see where the gaps might be and where they can be filled in the future. That was the commitment at the IA, construct the phases and observe the operational characteristics for a year or two and what real barriers exist. The effort at that point was focused on capturing the pedestrian traffic from the neighborhoods in the right places. Charles Hargraves stated that the business damages at the gas station would also be substantial because of the close proximity of the fuel pumps to the right of way.

Christic Henry questioned the synergies with Star Metro stops. Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint identified funding for bus shelters in the cost estimates approved by the IA. However, she was not certain where the stops might be located or how the conversation might have progressed. Ms. Henry requested that, and hoped the IA understood the need for, the shelters to be covered. The families and youth utilizing Star Metro services along the corridor and had often observed them waiting in the weather for their bus. She felt the enhancement would also improve safety as well as comfort.

Gordon Hansen questioned the status of lighting and review by the Sheriff's Department. Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint did not contact the Sheriff's Department for review. Mr. Tedder stated that funding was included for lighting along the corridor with trail lights in between the existing street lights.

Andrew Chin requested that future maps, particularly ones prepared for the public, of the Magnolia Drive project include more of the neighborhoods served to the south of the project. As presented, it appeared that the project and sidewalks served the country club community and Indian Head Acres. He anticipated questions from the South City area because, as presented, it gave the impression that it served one over the other. Wayne Tedder stated that the maps were made and that the sidewalk network had been communicated through the ULI group. Mr. Chin stated that his concern was not the ULI group; rather when the map would be presented and staff was not there to explain the broader region served. Mr. Tedder agreed and acknowledged the perception it created.

Regarding the garden boxed in the Smokey Hollow Commemoration, JR Harding asked if they could be raised to 36" for the "Aging in Place" community. Ms. Calder stated that the boxes were constructed of 6x6 timbers and set. Three of the boxes, closer to the street, were taller because of the slope of the land. One of them might actually be 36". Mr. Harding noted too that the mulch around the boxes was not a hard, flat surface and could be challenging for some people to navigate.

Item #8: Proposed Fiscal Year 2016 Blueprint Operating Budget

Autumn Calder gave a summary of the agenda item.

Henree Martin requested additional information on the 2020 projects that would not be handled through the Blueprint office. Ms. Calder stated that the annual allocations, table #4 from attachment 5, were adopted by the IA and would be split by City and County; some in coordination with Blueprint.

JR Harding questioned how much of the budget would be used for maintenance. Wayne Tedder stated that it would be \$20M over the 20-years of the tax. Ms. Martin stated that under state statute there were only certain items that would be eligible for maintenance funding. Mr. Tedder stated that only infrastructure, parks, or property that was constructed or acquired with sales tax fund could be maintained from those dollars as well.

Neil Fleckenstein questioned if any variation of the amounts listed was anticipated. Mr. Tedder stated that the goal was to have a reoccurring yet set amount. However, it was possible that it could change or funds could be withheld. The hope was to keep all parties whole throughout the process.

Kent Wimmer noted the total shortfall of the 2020 program. Mr. Tedder stated that over the life of the sales tax compared to the project list there was a \$150M deficit. The current program had successfully leveraged \$126M to date. He suggested to the IA that the best bet to leverage dollars was to pursue state roadway projects. Ms. Martin stated that the key to that was to be "shovel ready" when the money became available. The first step was to have all Blueprint projects included in the Regional Mobility Plan, which FDOT reviewed for all communities. In the latest update, all of the Blueprint projects were listed as Tier 1 or Tier 2 projects. The second was to position the Blueprint projects as the top priorities to be better positioned for funding.

Christic Henry requested a follow up to request from the last meeting regarding a list of sidewalk priorities from the City and County. Mr. Tedder stated that the City Commission adopted a priority list for all sidewalks. He was not certain what the top priority was but the list was approved by the Commission. He anticipated it to be updated annually; he would determine who held it and the best method for distribution to all.

Mr. Wimmer stated that there was no emphasis on conservation land acquisition in the program. There were small potential opportunities in the Greenways Master Plan; possibly within Water Quality and Stormwater Improvements but those were to be split between the City and County. In the future if there were opportunities to protect watershed areas, Blueprint would have to work with the City and County. Mr. Tedder stated that it was yet to be determined because specific opportunities had not been identified. Without a doubt however, if the City and County were in a project together, Blueprint would be as well. Ms. Martin stated that while the list of projects was proposed, if an environmentally sensitive parcel became available that impacted an area watershed the political pressure would be there to acquire it. Mr. Wimmer's concern was that the CAC would not be involved in the process only after the fact.

Stewart Proctor questioned if maintenance funding would be allowed to be spent on past sales tax projects. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it was; even from the 1989 sales tax list.

Ms. Martin stated that the original program projects were under design in 2000 for a 2004 tax; Blueprint was within that window for the 2020 program. She questioned when Blueprint would actually begin designing those projects. Mr. Tedder stated that because of the cost of bonding the 2020 funds Blueprint would be pursuing opportunities to leverage state and federal funds to advance the projects. Blueprint was working with FDOT District 3 to advance fund and move Capital Circle Southwest up for construction.

Mr. Tedder stated that staff was doing all that they could to advance the projects. However, he foresaw struggles for establishing priorities in the first few years because there were 28 projects and not enough money to complete them. Ms. Martin questioned if the highest priority would be to complete what remained from the unfinished 2000 projects. Mr. Tedder confirmed that Capital Circle Southwest was the number one priority. Ms. Martin included bike paths and greenways as well. Mr. Tedder stated that the only project carried forward as into Tier 1 of the 2020 projects was Capital Circle Southwest. Blueprint would borrow from the 2000 sales tax fund to begin designing the 2020 projects.

Regarding the new positions, Kent Wimmer questioned if the increase in government staff was to be in lieu of continuing the contractual relationships. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it was. Even in adding two positions, he stated, the budget would not be much over where it was historically.

There were no speakers on the item.

Chris Klerna moved approval of the operating budget. Henree Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #9: Proposed Fiscal Year 2016-2020 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan and Fiscal Year 2016-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan

Autumn Calder gave a summary of the agenda item.

Kent Wimmer questioned how frequently the revenue numbers were adjusted. Wayne Tedder stated that Blueprint followed the City and County processes and used their numbers. The City budgeted at 100%; the County was required to budget at 95% of the projected revenue. Blueprint followed the more conservative route established by the County.

Jim Stevenson requested clarification on the allocations for the Lake Lafayette floodplain. The numbers listed in the attachment differed from the agenda item. Ms. Calder stated that \$750K was the annual allocation for the 2016 budget cycle. The Allocated to Date column, Mr. Stevenson referred to, was the amount over the lifetime of the program.

There were no speakers on the item.

Niel Fleckenstein moved approval to the adopt the FY 2016-FY 2020 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan, appropriate FY 2016 of the Capital Improvement Plan, and adopt the Budget Resolution (Attachment 1). Christic Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Henree Martin moved approval of the utilization of reserve funds for allocation to projects subject to IA approval. Christic Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Information Items – Continued

Item #2 Project Updates:

This item was informational only.

Jim Stevenson questioned if there were conditions under which Elberta would connect with the flow of Capital Cascades Trail Segment 4. Charles Hargraves stated that because of the elevations the hydrology did not support it.

Kent Wimmer stated that the rail line right of way, of the St. Marks Trail, continued north beyond where that trail terminated. He was curious who owned it. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was owned by FDOT and managed by FDEP.

Consent Items

Item #3: CAC Meeting Minutes (February 5, 2015)

Include John Outland as a guest and Stewart Proctor as a CAC member.

Item #4: Approval to Extend General Engineering Consultant Contract

No comments.

Item #5: Proposed 2016 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules

Correction to CAC schedule should be Thursday April 7, 2016

Neil Fleckenstein moved approval of the consent agenda. Chris Klena seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Presentation Items

Item #6: Citizen Advisory Committee Appointments

Chris Klena moved approval of the following nominations:

Representative from the Civil Rights Community: Allen Stucks

Representative from the Minority Chamber of Commerce: Windell Paige
Representative from the Economic Development Council: Chris Klena
Representative from the Elderly Community: Gordon Hansen
Representative from the Big Bend Environmental Forum: Kent Wimmer
Representative from the EECC Natural Scientist/Biologist: Jim Stevenson
Christic Henry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Kent Wimmer noted that CONA nominated two representatives. **Chris Klena moved approval of Claudette Cromartie. Gordon Hansen seconded the motion. It passed unanimously; with abstention by Christic Henry.**

Item #7: Cascades Park Amphitheater Sound Mitigation

Autumn Calder gave a presentation on the agenda item and discussed the three proposed mitigation options: sound curtains, noise barriers, and new audio equipment. The CAC supported the use of the sound curtain as much as possible. The noise barrier concept study suggested using one of three barriers: a precast noise wall, similar to what one would see along a highway, a berm constructed of shipping containers, or an earthen berm. The last would not be a feasible option because of the enormous footprint and slope necessary to reach a 30-foot berm. It would be short, only 125-feet and sound would escape around the sides. Of the two berm options, the precast wall was preferred along with it being aesthetically pleasing or hidden by landscaping.

Gordon Hansen spoke in favor of high quality, outdoor speaker because they seemed to be the most effective, in terms of directing sound to designated areas and cost less than a wall. He felt that should be the first consideration.

Christic Henry stated that the main concern was not the sound quality for quests of the amphitheater but the sound that escaped into the neighborhood. She was extremely concerned about that and always had been. Part of the responsibility on the CAC to contribute to balancing both sides. She stated that she heard comments from various producers and performers that because of the sound issues in Tallahassee, they could not perform to their full extent. She clarified that she was not advocating for the performers, she also wanted to avoid the stigma of Tallahassee not being a place to perform. Ms. Henry suggested using a combination of approaches that were satisfactory to the neighborhood. However, if it did not provide the mitigation they were hoping for, what options would be available? Sound was subjective.

Mr. Hansen stated that it was also subjective on the performer's side as well. He was concerned that Blueprint would spend \$500K or more and it could still not be resolved if performers wanted to continually increase the volume. Ms. Henry stated that the performer's position was significantly less relevant in her opinion than that of the neighborhood.

Ms. Calder stated that Blueprint was waiting on a proposal from the sound experts for another study that would consider the specifics of the proposed sound barrier, as well as enhanced audio equipment that would provide more detailed analysis to support the decision making process.

Wayne Tedder stated that no matter what measures were taken, there would always be someone who complained. Blueprint was seeking a definitive decision from the IA on the final actions to be taken by Blueprint; move on to other projects. The solution for the wall would only affect areas immediately behind to it. Occasional complaints were submitted by a variety of locations surrounding the park. It would not have any effect for them. As he stated earlier, at the September IA meeting, he would be seeking the final directive for Blueprint regarding the amphitheater.

Jeanie Conner stated that issues with sound, whether from concerts or the sound checks beforehand, were due to topography. She did not feel that anyone was villainous or incompetent. Regarding the curtain protected the north and east, somewhat to the south, but no protection to the south allowing the sound to go directly into the Myers Park neighborhood. They heard not only ticketed events but everything else too. Anytime anyone had a mic on the stage they could hear it. That unanticipated intrusion of sound was a serious problem. She felt that directed audio equipment and a physical sound barrier was necessary. The neighborhood was comfortable with and supported the three options, including the wall.

Following a comment about the quiet nature of the neighborhood, Kent Wimmer noted that was the exception to when the train passed by. Ms. Conner stated that the predictability and short duration of the train made it tolerable. The unanticipated sound at varying levels was stressful.

Andrew Chin stated that the benefits of a precast wall would be a longer life cycle, it was always in place, as well as the psychology of "people hear it when they see it." The impact would lessen if people could not see the sound source. He felt that, regardless of what stamp might be used for decoration, it would still be a concrete wall and the best that could be hoped for was landscaping to disguise it.

Mr. Hansen questioned if Ms. Conner noticed a difference between amplified and non-amplified sound. He stated that he lived three miles from campus and could hear the FSU band practicing. Ms. Conner stated that they could hear touchdowns from Doak Campbell Stadium. And that, she did not mind. There were certain events that were hosted by the City that were "absolutely wonderful." She could also hear the lone person on stage with a microphone in a private performance. Shakesphere was wonderful, she stated, and it was quiet as she walked home. It had to do with "who was doing what and how." She did not think that so many restrictions could be placed on the amphitheater that people could not use it. The solution needed to be one that was usable.

Stewart Proctor stated that he agreed that it was necessary to retain a great and viable asset to the community that was not restricted so that it could not be utilized to its fullest potential. He understood that the curtain was used to buffer sound from bouncing off of the concrete wall behind the stage. He questioned the repercussions of the amphitheater projecting sound onto a 30-foot concrete wall reflecting it back in the opposite direction. Was that considered as part of the sound study? Furthermore, in the spirit of leveraging dollars, was there a way to require the musicians use specific equipment rather than the community providing it? He wondered if that burden could be shifted as part of a contract rider with the performers.

Ms. Calder stated that requiring in-ear monitors had multiple variables that needed to be considered; not only cost but sizing too. Staff recommendations on the audio equipment were directed at the house system which was mainly used for local events and smaller acts that probably did not have the funds to cover such equipment. She would request that Parks and Recreation include an evaluation of the requirement of in ear monitors in their recommendation.

Regarding the impact of the reverb off of the concrete wall, Ms. Calder stated that staff met with the person who performed the first analysis and that concept designs were based off of. Her initial take on the issue was that the sound barrier wall would be at a distance great enough that it would not be an issue. However, analysis of that would be included in the next study because of the different materials. Also to know if there were other materials that could work better in that scenario.

Mr. Hansen stated that if it was still anticipated that the area of the Meridian Point Building could one day be a residential component that too would need to be taken into consideration in the analysis. It could be that a situation could be created where no developer or residents would want to live there because of decisions made now. Mr. Tedder confirmed that there were developers actively pursuing the Meridian Point Building site because of it was adjacent to the Amphitheater and park. Mr. Hansen stated that to find the solution, they needed to start with the nuisance itself. Which was "some users" of the sound system. Current data indicated that some shows worked well and others did not. Mr. Tedder spoke to the subjectivity of musical preference. He stated that while he might like country music, Mr. Hansen might not. Therefore, if Mr. Hansen, in this scenario, could hear it at all he would be annoyed. The subjectivity of preference was the largest and most challenging piece of the issue.

Items from Members of the Committee

There were no additional comments by the members of the committee.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were no additional citizens to speak.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:38 pm.