

Blueprint 2000 CAC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 7, 2013

Blueprint 2000 Office

2727 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 200

Richard Drew called the meeting to order at 4:34 pm.

Committee Members present:

Richard Drew	David Jones
Christic Henry	Dale Landry
Chris Klena	Terence Hinson
Ron Pease	Kent Wimmer
Tom O'Steen	Henree Martin

Guests/Presenters/Staff:

Wayne Tedder	Marek Romanowski
Charles Hargraves	Patrice Hanulak
Dave Snyder	Shawn Kalbli
Autumn Calder	Alisha Wetherell
Angela Ivy	Gabe Menendez
Susan Emmanuel	Harry Reed
Shelonda Meeks	Paco de la Fuente
Ray Youmans	Steve Shafer
Margie Quillman	

Agenda Modifications

M1: CAC Meeting Minutes (September 6, 2012)

Autumn Calder stated that the CAC minutes from September 6, 2012 needed to be added to Consent Items. Item replicated on the Consent Agenda.

M2: Election of CAC Vice-Chairperson

Autumn Calder stated that typically the Vice Chair was elected at the December meeting; however it was cancelled so it was carried forward. Item replicated on the Presentation Agenda.

Richard Drew stated that information items would be delayed until later in the meeting to ensure the quorum was present for items that required a decision or vote. Also, he stated that he understood there were issues in getting the agenda out; however as of that afternoon, he still had not received one in the mail. He knew they were mailed and that some were received; fortunately he met with Ms. Calder however for others it could be problematic especially given the nature of items on that particular agenda. He encouraged staff to make every effort to get the agenda out at least a week ahead of the meeting.

Wayne Tedder stated that he accepted responsibility for the delay with the agenda. He was working on items for the City and County for the sales tax extension and did not have the opportunity to review the agenda material when they were complete. Other members offered the days in which they received it in the mail. Kent Wimmer suggested that it be posted to the website as well as mailed.

Information Items

Item #1: Sales Tax Committee Update

Item #2: Manuel Diaz Donation Recognition

Item #3: Franklin Boulevard

Consent Items

Item #4: CAC Meeting Minutes (January 22, 2013)

M1: CAC Meeting Minutes (September 6, 2012)

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

Presentations/Discussion

M2: Election of CAC Vice-Chairperson

Henree Martin nominated Terrance Hinson; Christic Henry seconded the nomination. It passed unanimously.

Item #5: FHWA Payment Approval Delegation

Marek Romanowski briefly spoke to the agenda material. Richard Drew read staff recommendation: Authorize the Blueprint 2000 Staff Director to approve payments that FHWA has reviewed and agreed to pay for.

Kent Wimmer moved approval; Tom O'Steen seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #6: Capital Circle Southeast Allocation for Monumentation

Marek Romanowski briefly spoke to the agenda material. Ron Pease asked if this was a change in structure or if there was a reason that necessitated the request. Dave Snyder stated that it was a standard requirement of FDOT to accept the right of way. The same process occurred in prior projects. Staff recommended action: Authorize \$15,000.00 for preparation of the monumentation map. The funding source is unallocated funds from FY12.

Henree Martin moved approval; David Jones seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Item #7: Connector Bridge

Richard Drew recused himself from the vote because of this connection to the owner of the

design firm. Terrance Hinson facilitated the item. Gary Phillips gave a brief presentation on the agenda material. Kent Wimmer voiced his concerns about the trail crossing the parking lot, north of the railroad at the City Electric Building substation.

Mr. Drew questioned how people could be deterred or prevented from crossing South Monroe Street itself, rather than using the pedestrian bridge. Gabe Menendez stated that it would be difficult to prevent and some people would do it no matter what they did. It was possible that the City would need to install an at-grade crossing in the future if it became an issue.

There was discussion about the parking between the park and the motorsport business. Mr. Tedder stated that Blueprint would "formalize" the parking area; it would be available for both park and business users. Furthermore, the long-term vision planned unit development, that the City Commission approved, was to create a coffee or ice cream shop on the north side of the building, adjacent to the parking lot and park. Mr. Tedder noted that the business owner had cleaned up much of the area however they would not be investing significant money in the property until they were beyond the legal hurdles of the business transition.

Henree Martin questioned if it was appropriate to **move approval of the recommended option at the \$3M**. Mr. Tedder confirmed because it was the amount currently allocated. **Tom O'Steen seconded the motion.**

Ron Pease noted that it was substantially different from what was presented at the last meeting. He questioned what, if any, was the potential downside. Mr. Tedder stated that timing was not delayed, because of the boxed culvert work on Segment 3A, the cost was reduced by removing the stairwells and retaining walls; he did not think there was a downside. Mr. Pease asked if the current design approach had been considered previously. Alisha Wetherell stated that the two items that steered Kimley Horn away from the current proposed design were (1) the ADA accessible route was substantially longer, approximately 300-feet, and (2) the landfill cut. They wanted to avoid potentially contaminated soil and delays from EPA. Mr. Pease stated that the redesign was an example of the positive side of the committees and advisory groups reviewing and questioning the proposed concepts. Mr. Tedder agreed.

Staff recommendation: Authorize the advertisement for Construction Service for the Capital Cascades Connector Bridge Project at a cost not to exceed, the amount currently allocated, which included 20% for CEI services, post design service and project contingency. Authorize the IMC to advertise, negotiate, and award a contract with the selected construction firm and if negotiations were unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.

The motion passed unanimously; less Richard Drew's vote.

Construction was scheduled to begin in August 2013.

Public Hearing – 5:00 PM

Item #9: Cascades Park

There were no citizens to speak for the public hearing.

Autumn Calder, Dave Snyder, and Wayne Tedder gave brief presentations on various components of the agenda material. In a discussion about the ample parking available in the surrounding parking garages, Henree Martin questioned if parking would be paid or free. Mr. Tedder stated that it would be free. Mr. Hinson questioned if it would be monitored parking. Mr. Tedder stated that was a detail that would need to be figured out once the park was open. Mr. Snyder reiterated that there were approximately 80 parking spaces that were dedicated solely to the park. Meaning they were not utilized for state workers during the typical work day.

Regarding the sound study, Richard Drew questioned if options other than a wall were considered; such as vegetation, the presence of attendees, or redirecting the speakers toward the stage. Mr. Tedder stated that the sound engineer evaluated all options with little improvement overall and in some cases, redirecting the speakers, was a significant increase to the cost. The two best ways of reducing the overall sound from the amphitheater were walls or covering the seating area. Ms. Martin stated that enclosed it defeated the purpose of the outdoor amphitheater.

Mr. Hinson questioned how 2,500 (to 4,000) people (the attendees of events) would impact the sound levels. Mr. Tedder stated that the basis of the study was specifically on the sound levels projected from local or touring event sound systems. Mr. Hinson stated that the measurements could be conservative because the noise from a crowd who was excitedly enjoying a show would be a variable. Mr. Tedder agreed.

Tom O'Steen stated he would cut to the chase, in his opinion there was a problem Blueprint had invested considerable time and money in an amphitheater that would create substantial damages to the adjacent neighborhoods. Mr. Tedder stated that there were still options available; Blueprint, the City, and County were working with the neighborhood. Furthermore, while it was not the most vocal group, many of the residents of the neighborhoods were thrilled with the addition of the amphitheater; they were ready for it. The City and County were drafting an Interlocal Agreement that would limit the number events, hours of operation, etc. The direction from the IMC and IA was to move forward with ticketed events. Blueprint was mindful of the issue and working with the neighborhood however, the sound could carry for a mile or more. The residents could hear activity from FSU, FAMU, Leon High School, etc. it was part of living in an urban area.

To give the CAC members a point of reference for dBA numbers, Mr. Hargraves noted that the average sound of the current meeting was 69 dBA and had peaked at 91 dBA. That was the sound range that would be audible in resident's yard. There was some discussion of the train and that it was greater than 80 dBA. Mr. Drew stated that it sounded like it was progressing; Blueprint was working with the residents to develop compromises.

Christic Henry stated, regarding impacts to the neighborhoods and based on her conversations with residents, she felt that more than a noise issue it was an issue with perception. The residents did not know what to anticipate from the events: people, traffic, and ancillary activities. She was not sure how to address that because while Blueprint was addressing the sound issues, they could not predict how it would be during an event. She thought the conversation should be about how similar venues impacted other areas and what it looked like post-event. What alternative was there, at that point, she questioned. No one would "pull the plug" on the park.

Mr. O'Steen agreed with Ms. Henry. He stated that before Blueprint spent another \$2M on electrical and lighting for the amphitheater he hoped a lighting consultant had been or would be engaged to go through the same type of analysis. He understood the aspects of living in an urbanized area. However the original concept was for a passive park; over time it had evolved into a grander vision. He thought most people were pleased with that however, to that point, he hated to think that they had created something that would damage an historical neighborhood. He wanted that neighborhood to be as vibrant and attractive as ever.

Ms. Martin questioned if the sound and lighting issues would make the park unattractive and discourage use. It seemed that the only option was to move forward with light and sound systems to attract performers with a regional draw for ticketed events.

Kent Wimmer moved the staff recommendation: Amend the FY2013 Capital Budget for Cascades Park as follows:

1. Project Funding and Contingency	=\$2,500,000.00
2. Option C (Complete Amphitheater Package)	=<u>\$2,378,676.09</u>
TOTAL	=<u>\$4,878,676.09</u>

Henree Martin seconded the motion.

Ms. Henry questioned if funding the requested items was necessary to maintain the current construction schedule. Mr. Tedder confirmed that it was. If there were any delays it would cost Blueprint additional money and delay opening of the park. Ms. Henry was curious if Mr. Tedder had received any requests to delay making a decision on the item. Mr. Tedder stated that one person did however most people realized that it was better to work with hours of operation, noise levels, etc.

Mr. Hinson stated that he supported moving it forward with involvement of the neighborhoods. Also though, he requested that Mr. Tedder pursue what impact crowd noise would have on the overall dBA of events. Mr. Tedder stated that he would even if there was an additional cost. He wanted public involvement and wanted it done correctly from the beginning.

Mr. Wimmer stated that one reason he moved approval was that Tallahassee needed a facility that had the infrastructure that would keep the economic development community happy. It would also generate income for Parks and Recreation that could go toward maintenance. Ms. Henry understood Mr. Wimmer's point, however, she stated, it came back to perception; the reality of what was at Cascades Park was different from what was sold to voters on a ballot. She would feel better if there was some type of "release" from the neighborhoods to the effect of them recognizing that a significant amount of money had been spent to arrive at that point and

that the City and County would continue to do their due diligence moving forward. Ms. Henry knew they had and would continue to do so; her point however was to public perspective. Mr. Tedder stated that outside of one person, none of the residents had requested Blueprint stop or delay construction of the project.

Mr. Wimmer stated that significant value was being added to the neighborhood have the best park within 100 miles in walking distance. Mr. Drew stated that too was perspective and cited his own experience of living behind a drive-in theater.

Ron Pease requested Mr. Tedder provide his personal recommendation and the rationale behind it. Mr. Tedder stated that Option C was in alignment with the guidance from the IA; those were his marching orders if you will. In his personal opinion he supported Option C because the City and County Commissioners would have ultimate control over the programming; as long as it was in their purview. They would continue to work with the neighborhoods. It would be much more difficult and costly to retrofit the amphitheater than to move forward in the beginning.

The motion passed 6/1 with Christic Henry passing the dissenting vote.

Mr. Pease stressed the importance of the vote just taken. There were many issues that in retrospect were of concern to him and perhaps should have anticipated them. What concerned him most however was Mr. Tedder's comment, that he received his "marching orders." That caused Mr. Pease to question the parameters of the freedom and responsibility of the CAC to do the best they could to represent their constituent groups.

Presentations/Discussion – continued

Item #8: Capital Cascades Trail Segment 3

With some members needing to leave, the CAC would lose a quorum. Therefore **Kent Wimmer moved staff recommendation: Authorize the advertisement for Construction Services for the Capital Cascades Trail – Segments 3B and 3C at a cost not to exceed (amount to be provided) which includes CEI services, post design services and project contingency.**

- 1. Authorize the Intergovernmental Management Committee to advertise, negotiate and award a contract with the selected construction firm and if negotiations are unsuccessful be authorized to move to the next firm in sequence.**

Henree Martin seconded the motion.

Mr. Wimmer confirmed that the amount was \$12,137,370.00. Mr. Tedder stated that was the current allocated amount. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Gary Phillips gave a brief update of the agenda material. Sean Kalbli with Wood and Partners gave a presentation on the design of Segment 3. Kent Wimmer stated that the whole corridor choked at Adams Street. He questioned how pedestrians would cross Adams. Mr. Kalbli stated that he was asked to review that earlier that day. They had just begun review of the design file from KHA of where the bridge connector tied in. Wood and Partners design stopped at Van Buren; they would be exploring that block.

Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

Items From Members Of The Committee

There were none.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:51 pm.