

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 28, 2014
Leroy Collins Public Library
Program Room A

Terrance Hinson called the meeting to order at 4:31 pm.

Committee Members present:

Terrance Hinson	Dale Landry
David Jones	Jim Stevenson
George Hanson	Henree Martin
Kent Wimmer	Darryl Jones

Committee Members absent:

Tom O'Steen	Andrew Chin
Christic Henry	Chris Klena

Guests/Presenters/Staff present:

Charles Hargraves	Angela Ivy
Autumn Calder	Susan Emmanuel
Dave Snyder	Shelonda Meeks
Gary Phillips	Jasmine Gay
Daniel Crotty	Monique Colberg

Agenda Modifications

There was one agenda modifications on Item #8 distributed at the meeting and is included on file at Blueprint 2000. Also Autumn Calder introduced Darryl Jones, the Chair of the Planning Commission. She explained that Tim Edmond was the typical representative and designated by the Chair. Therefore, Mr. Darryl Jones had the ability to vote in his stead.

Information Items

Item #1: Project Updates

This item was informational only. Charles Hargraves and Autumn Calder spoke briefly on the active projects. Their presentation was interrupted once a quorum was reached to allow for the voting items to be taken up.

Consent Items

Item #2: CAC Meeting Minutes (February 6 and May 29, 2014)

Henree Martin moved approval. Kent Wimmer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #3: Proposed 2015 IA, TCC, and CAC Meeting Schedules

Kent Wimmer moved approval. Dale Landry seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Presentation Items

Item #4: Citizen's Advisory Committee Appointments

Autumn Calder stated that two representatives on the committee were completing their second terms and ineligible for reappointment. With one position, that of Henree Martin, eligible for her second term. All terms would begin in November 2014.

Darryl Jones moved to accept the representative from the disability community, JR Harding, the planning representative from the EECC, Neil Fleckenstein, and the re-appointment of the EECC representative, Henree Martin. Dale Landry second the motion; it passed unanimously.

Item #5: Approval to Extend General Engineering Consultant Contract

Charles Hargraves stated that the original contract between LPA Group, now Michael Baker Inc. allowed for two five-year periods and five one-year periods of renewal. The agenda item was for renewal of the second one-year period.

Henree Martin moved approval. Darryl Jones seconded approval; it passed unanimously.

Item #6: Advance Fund FDOT and Accept Repayment for Bold Initiative Landscape in the Capital Circle Southeast Woodville Highway to Tram Road Corridor

Charles Hargraves gave a summary of the agenda item.

Darryl Jones questioned how a dollar amount was designated without an approved design. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was an estimate based on the original design of the irrigation system for the project. The landscaping material estimate was based on coordination efforts by Blueprint

and City Public Works. The request was to advance up to the \$982,000 available in the balance of the Capital Circle Southwest (E2) project. Construction costs were increasing state wide, stated Mr. Hargraves. By advance funding the project, Blueprint hoped to take advantage of current, rather than future, rates.

Henree Martin questioned if the issues with the original plant material and contractor had been resolved and reimbursed. Mr. Hargraves stated that he was not certain of the details however there were no ongoing request form Blueprint to the contractor for funds. She requested that staff follow up to confirm that all had been settled. David Snyder stated that during design, the proposed irrigation system was included and removed several times in deliberation over costs. Ultimately it was deemed too expensive and was not included in the construction of the roadway and the plants suffered because of it. Because of that however, Mr. Hargraves stated, irrigation was included in the E3 segment and he suspected it would be installed on Capital Circle Southwest (W1). The design was not far enough along to confirm that however.

Jim Stevenson requested that nozzles in the system be aimed appropriately to not water the pavement. Mr. Hargraves agreed and requested Mr. Stevenson phone Blueprint if he saw that on a Blueprint project and he would see that it was corrected.

Mr. Stevenson questioned how one would influence the plant selection. Mr. Hargraves stated that the design is a collaborative effort by Blueprint, the City, and FDOT and would utilize native plants.

Henree Martin moved option one; Darryl Jones seconded the motion.

Option 1: Authorize Blueprint 2000 to advance fund FDOT for the implementation of the Bold Initiative in the Capital Circle Southeast Project from Woodville Highway to Tram Road (E-2) and accept the repayment of the advance funding in fiscal year 2017. The funding source is the E-2 project, and if additional dollars are needed, the source will be unallocated funds. In fiscal year 2017, the repayment from FDOT will be deposited into Blueprint 2000's unallocated funds.

The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7: Adoption of the FY 2015 Blueprint Operating Budget and Resolution No. 2014-XX

Autumn Calder stated that the item did not require a vote but was to serve as an update for the CAC. The budget would be adopted by the IA at the September 15, 2014 meeting. She spoke of the refinements made to operating costs, as outlined in the agenda item.

Item #8: Proposed FY 2015-2019 Blueprint Capital Improvement Plan and FYY 2015-2020 Net Sales Tax Allocation Plan

Autumn Calder stated that the item did not require a vote but was to serve as an update for the CAC. The budget would be adopted by the IA at the September 15, 2014 meeting. She spoke of the change to capital budget, as noted in the agenda modification.

Terrance Hinson requested clarification of the line items for Landbank. Shelonda Meeks stated that it was initially established to allow Blueprint to purchase land from willing sellers ahead of the project schedule for right of way acquisition. It was also used to purchase sensitive land for preservation efforts or on behalf of other agencies, such as the County.

Kent Wimmer referenced a recent ARC meeting and proposed the acquisition of the failed residential tracks of the Falls Chase development to protect the watershed and greenway corridor. Jim Stevenson stated that the preserving the shoreline of the lake would protect water quality. He felt it was worth exploring. Henree Martin stated that she felt that the lake portion was the piece to preserve. She questioned Mr. Wimmer was referring to the shoreline area. Mr. Wimmer stated that the shoreline was protected by conservation easement in earlier transactions. He referenced the upland area. Autumn Calder stated that Lake Lafayette was certainly a priority area for Blueprint. She requested that interested parties call or email her with the information for further research.

Items From Members Of The Committee

David Jones requested that the CAC take up the unfinished business of a universally accessible field at Centennial Field in Cascades Park. Previous motions and recommendations to the IA had not been followed up on. He wanted to pursue them and ensure that a motion was presented to the IA in September concerning the project.

He summarized the three year history of his request and stated that it had been stalled, delayed, postponed, and neglected for the whole time. Cascades Park was close to completion, money had been shifted between projects, and assurances had been given by Blueprint management that funding was available for the accessible and inclusive proposal. He stated that he hoped for the promised follow up report by Wayne Tedder at the current meeting so that he could be prepared for the September IA meeting.

Mr. Jones reiterated the benefits of including an accessible and inclusive play area in Cascades Park, as outlined in the email distributed to Committee members (a copy of the email is on file at the Blueprint office). Dale Landry expresses his frustration that two years later the CAC and Blueprint were still discussing this without any action haven been taken.

Charles Hargraves stated that funds were available but not allocated to a Centennial Field project. The direction from the IA was to return with a status report after one year of "wearing the park." Mr. Jones interjected that the one year timeframe was new and did not come from the IA at the meeting. Their direction was for staff to report at the following Board meeting. Mr. Jones listed the reasons he had been given by Mr. Tedder as to why Mr. Jones' proposal could not be addressed.

Darryl Jones questioned if there was an original and approved motion from the CAC for a recommendation to the IA. Several members confirmed that there was. Mr. Darryl Jones continued, with that accomplishment, it was at the point for funding to be applied. In his

opinion, the IA needed to be reminded of the motion by the CAC and have it put into action.

Henree Martin stated that she did not think it benefited the CAC to discuss it further because it was an IA decision. Mr. David Jones was an incredible advocate for his cause however, the CAC did not have the authority to implement it.

Mr. Darryl Jones questioned if the CAC had the authority to agenda items for the IA. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was an advisory committee and previous discussions centered a letter, written by the Chair, to the IA. Mr. Darryl Jones continued that an item added to the IA agenda at the request of the CAC would allow for full discussion without the 3-minute time constraint for public speakers. The item would serve to share the history of and support for it by the CAC and community. As well as remind them of the 2.5 years of discussions, promises, and applicable dollars encumbered for the completion of the project.

Ms. Martin stated that she had no objection to the proposal by Mr. David Jones. She was concerned for the safety of children playing near Bloxham and Monroe streets. There was nothing in place to prevent children from running out into the street. There was general discussion of the layout of the park, landscaping, low fencing, and open access to both streets. The closest being the entrance off Bloxham Street. Mr. Jones stated that someone with City staff added chalked lines and bases to the area months back. If safety was the concern it was already an issue having those in place. Mr. Martin stated that because it was not well defined it did not attract many children. She felt that would not be the case with Mr. Jones proposal. She felt that it would attract people to the area. Mr. Martin stated that if some way could not be found to limit the accessibility it would be cause for worry.

Terrance Hinson questioned if anyone had observed who was using the space and for what purposes. Ms. Martin stated that in all the time she spent out there she did not think it as being used much because it had no personality. It was the most boring looking place in the park. Autumn Calder stated that it had been used for company picnics with the space reserved through Parks and Recreation. It got the most use in the late afternoon because it was one of the only shady area, compared to the openness of most of the space. Furthermore, she personally used it for her four-year olds birthday party in July; using the baseball diamond for a t-ball game. Mr. David Jones stated that such activity was the purpose of the space. Moreover, he understood that safety was a concern.

Regarding safety, Ms. Martin stated that she felt it would be ideal if there was a barrier that adults could walk around but children could not. Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint could address those types of design details if directed to by the IA or IMC. Furthermore, as he understood it, the purpose of the status report requested by the IA was to address the concerns raised by Parks and Recreation about using the space for more than a commemoration area.

Dale Landry stated that the next step would be a letter from the Chair of the CAC and an agenda item to the IA. As a Citizens Advisory Committee they were speaking out about the issue on behalf of a segment of the population that elected the commissioners. He questioned how much money was spent in the creation of Cascades Park. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was upwards of \$30,000,000. Mr. Landry questioned how much the proposal by Mr. Jones was estimated to be. Mr. Hargraves' response was difficult to hear on the recording. However, previous estimates

were approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Landry stated that it was a small area of the park and miniscule percentage of cost to make a universally accessible play area. The message needed to be clearly conveyed to the IA.

Mr. Hinson stated that he was not at the meeting where the CAC voted unanimously to support Mr. David Jones' proposal. He probably would not have voted for it because he thought that the space would be more appealing to more people, community wide, as open green space. He felt more people would use for a variety of purposes if left vacant. Rather than the designated space of a baseball diamond. He stated that he supported the idea of a commemoration. It was the only flat green space in the park. He felt it important to preserve it for a variety of activity that the majority of the community could use.

Mr. David Jones stated that 30-40% of the population could not be eliminated because they were not the majority. Picnics and gatherings could still be held there and on a universally accessible surface, a person with disabilities could join in. A grass field was not an accessible field for the mobility impaired.

Darryl Jones stated that while he brought no level of expertise to serve Mr. David Jones constituencies. He thought that if the discussion centered on creating space designed specifically to meet the needs of the target population while simultaneously providing an historic emblem for what the park once was would be a win-win. He felt that it was an opportunity to make a wonderful park more excellent. He did not understand why Blueprint, the City, or County would not want to make that type of investment especially when it was such a small dollar amount.

Henree Martin moved to have staff create an agenda item regarding Centennial Field to be properly discussed by the IA; Furthermore, for staff to develop design concepts for safety improvements at South Monroe Street and Bloxham Street. The safety component was critical because the site was not intended for a playground and as it was, she did not feel that play should be encouraged there. **Dale Landry seconded the motion.**

Ms. Calder stated that she would need to check the bylaws to confirm that the CAC could agenda items for the IA. Mr. Hargraves stated that he agreed to that as long as was within the bylaws and management allowed it. Ms. Martin requested that it be as soon as possible.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Darryl Jones stated that while it would be ideal to have it on the September 15, 2014 agenda, it might be better to have a well prepared presentation for the February 2015 meeting. He was of the opinion that in citizen committees that it was moments like what was before the CAC, where citizens were able to articulate a legacy and body of work. Mr. Darryl Jones stated that he understood that Mr. David Jones's time on the CAC would be ending in November 2014. He felt that, by virtue of the recommendations from the CAC that the expectation for those who remained on the committee would be to see that the agenda item and presentation occurred in February 2015.

David Jones stated that whether staff had the agenda prepared for the September 15, 2014

meeting or not, he would present it, along with as many people as he could find to speak in favor of it as well. Dale Landry requested that staff to please try to include it for the September IA because it had been discussed at their level for 2.5 years.

Dale Landry stated that he thought that the CAC should do something to memorialize Ron Pease. He requested that staff talk to the Pease family to see what they felt would be appropriate. **Mr. Landry moved that a tree be planted, not simply a brick, to support the living memory of Mr. Pease. Mr. Darryl Jones seconded the motion and offered the friendly amendment that the Pease family be invited to the planting. Mr. Landry was amenable to the amendment.**

Charles Hargraves requested clarification on funding. Did the maker of the motion suggest it come from sales tax dollars or from within the CAC? Mr. Landry stated that staff could bring a response back to the CAC on that. Ms. Calder stated that following Mr. Pease's passing, staff requested donations toward something for him and received approximately \$30. It was still at Blueprint and a start toward something larger. Ms. Calder stated that tree donations ranged from \$150 to \$300. There could be an opportunity to have a planting ceremony. However, other tree "donations" were chosen from previously planted trees and adding a plaque.

There was additional discussion between the maker of the motion and the second. The outcome was that a new tree or a memorial marker placed at an existing tree was not as important as the invitation to the family and their involvement. Also, to allow the family to select the type of tree.

The vote passed unanimously.

Regarding other accessibility issues, Mr. David Jones requested a status update on the curb cut at the parking lot south of the FDOT building. Autumn Calder stated that the primary purpose of it was to allow for access during ticketed events. During the three events that were held there, that lot was not used for handicap accessible parking. She felt that it was worth looking into and to ensure that the spaces were utilized for that purpose. Also that neither Parks and Recreation nor the County wanted to change the location of those spaces. One point made by them was that during events, staff or law enforcement was always available to direct people safely to the driveway and intersection.

Mr. David Jones stated that whether or not a handicapped spot was marked the need for accessible right of way was there. Furthermore, mobility impaired people could park anywhere. There was no requirement that they only park in designated spaces. As it was designed, however, people had to travel in the street beyond the barrier to reach an access point. Charles Hargraves stated that Blueprint had met with the Facilities Manager of FDOT to discuss options. That extension was included in the discussions and JPA between FDOT and the City for tree replacement.

Mr. David Jones further stated that the same issue was relevant at the parking area at the northeast part of the park. Mr. Hargraves stated that primary purpose of the indicated parking lot

was to serve FDOT. It served as park parking after business hours. He stated that there was concern that if the curb cut was added and the lot was made accessible, that it would convey the message that anyone could park there.

Mr. David Jones clarified that he was referring not only the parking lot but also to the on street parking on Suwannee Street that had no access for mobility impaired people. Anyone parking there had to walk or take the wheelchair in the street, to the end of the roadway, to reach a curb cut and access point. Mr. Hargraves asked if Mr. Jones concern was that people who parked in spaces on Suwannee Street would be exiting their vehicle into traffic. Mr. David Jones reiterated that people with disabilities were not required to park in handicap spaces. The majority of people were accustomed to parking where they could because there were always far fewer handicap spaces than were needed. His primary concern was that once out of the vehicle, the closest curb cut for ADA access was at the end of the street. The person with mobility issues would have to walk or roll a wheelchair in the street, negotiating traffic, to reach that point. They could not access the sidewalk at the vehicle like a person without mobility issues could. They would have to navigate traffic, dodging cars, to get to a point where they could move onto the sidewalk. Mr. David Jones stated that he was not requesting another designated handicap spot, just a way for people to safely get onto the sidewalk.

Mr. David Jones stated that his third concern was that there was no representation of the 1990 ADA law passing. It was one of the most significant civil rights laws and there was no mention of it in that historical sequence. Mr. Hargraves stated that the History Fence plaques were directly related to the City of Tallahassee. Mr. David Jones stated that it passed nationally and therefore effected the City of Tallahassee and why there were having the discussion they were having that day. He felt it was an oversight that could be easily fixed.

Mr. Hargraves disagreed, stating that it was not an oversight. The History Fence markers were to memorialize events that were specific to Tallahassee. Going the route suggested by Mr. David Jones opened the door to any number of inclusions, for example the Clean Water Act of the 1970's. Mr. David Jones submitted that Tallahassee was national and that the passing of the ADA law was as much a milestone for the city as any other mentioned. For the record, he requested that staff explore the completion of the fence with the recognition and inclusion of the ADA law of 1990.

Dale Landry supported Mr. David Jones position on the significance of the law. He requested that the design of the historical timeline be clarified. When speaking about significant acts that happen for and to people the NAACP would always take the position of support for those groups whether local or national.

Information Items - continued

Item #1: Project Updates - continued

Charles Hargraves and Autumn Calder continued with updates on the active projects.

Regarding the Connector Bridge, Kent Wimmer questioned if there was any flexibility from FDOT regarding reclassification. Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint would be meeting with FDOT and Figg, the designers of the bridge, to discuss that.

Jim Stevenson, questioned the design of the bridge. Mr. Hargraves stated that it was an innovative design from a world class bridge firm that was vetted through a charrette process with more than 100 people involved.

Regarding Capital Circle Southwest, W1, Kent Wimmer asked what kind of mitigation was Blueprint or FDOT doing for taking 4F property. Mr. Hargraves stated that Blueprint, the City, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) addressed that issue in the reduced right of way footprint, from Blueprint's typical 230-foot to only 180-feet. Between that and the addition of the multi-use trail, FHWA were satisfied that it met the recreational components necessary.

Jim Stevenson asked about access to Lake Cascade from Capital Circle Northwest/Southwest, N2. Mr. Hargraves stated that the curb could not be eliminated. However Blueprint was working with the Engineer of Record on the option of a mountable curb at that location. All factors would be considered and if it could be safely accommodated, he wanted to include it.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:46 pm.