

City of Gainesville

*City Hall
200 East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601*



Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 17, 2008

5:30 PM

ADDENDUM

City Hall, Room 16

Community Development Committee

*Commissioner Scherwin Henry, Chair
Commissioner Jack Donovan, Member
Commissioner Craig Lowe, Member*

Persons with disabilities who require assistance to participate in this meeting are requested to notify the Office of Equal Opportunity at 334-5051 or call the TDD phone line at 334-2069 at least two business days in advance.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:37 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Craig Lowe, Jack Donovan and Scherwin Henry

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Approved as Recommended

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

070775. Minutes of December 4, 2007 (B)

RECOMMENDATION *The Community Development Committee approve the minutes of December 4, 2007.*

Approved as Recommended

DISCUSSION OF PENDING REFERRALS

070399. Expansion of the 39th Avenue Garage to Create a Centralized Fleet Management Operation at the Public Works Complex (B)

Fred Murry, Assistant City Manager made the Committee aware that there were two items tonight that the Stephen Foster Neighborhood (SFN) had concerns about: 1) garage expansion; and 2) City Plan Board (CPB) item for the One Stop Homeless Center. He indicated that the CPB would not address the item until the Stephen Foster Neighborhood (SFN) residents completed the CDC meeting. He stated that the CDC directed staff to hold the present meeting at 5:30 PM at the request of the SFN citizens so they can attend.

Mr. Murry stated that at the previous meeting, staff was asked to bring back a matrix table developed with input from the SFN. He noted, however, that the SFN would be providing their own information regarding particular sites. He stated that staff has provided responses to the questions regarding the facility, as well as issues related to areas that were impacted by the Koppers site. He explained that the CDC also asked for information regarding the Traffic Management System and potential expansion of the facilities, and those responses are attached to the agenda packet. He stated that the noise consultant report was not received until Tuesday, so it was too late to be included in the packet. He noted that the noise consultant was present to make a report. He stated that the noise consultant's report is a second report that was

requested by the CDC to determine the impact of moving the facility to the east side.

Mr. Murry stated that the CDC requested that staff develop viable options. The options are listed as Option A, Option A1, Option B, and Option C. He explained that Option A is the existing Public Works Facility on the eastside, with 10 acres, at the cost of \$2,080,000 for the wall, \$4,250,000 for the construction of the facility, and \$203,420 for recurring costs. He noted that the total would be \$6,533,420. He stated the advantage of the existing site is that it is owned by the City but the noise issue would require mitigation.

Option A1 is the existing Public Works Facility on the eastside, with 10 acres, a cost of \$80,000 for the wall, \$2,500,000 to relocate the materials/handling storage area, \$4,250,000 for the construction of the facility, and \$203,420 for recurring costs which total \$7,033,420. He stated that it will have to be mitigated by the neighbor's noise issue, and would provide additional recycling and office space for the Public Works Facility. He stated that there may be other mitigation costs which are not readily available to identify. If the Committee recommends Option A1 there will be some phasing in of moving the materials storage area because that money is not budgeted.

Rob Lilkendey, Consultant of Siebein Associates Inc, presented the second part of the noise study for the proposed relocation and expansion of the Fleet Maintenance Facility (attached). He stated that previously, Siebein Associates Inc. had given a presentation for residents to the east and south of the site, and the CDC asked for a second study to address the residents to the north and east. He pointed out locations where meters were placed during Christmas break. Christmas break was chosen in order to obtain ambient sound level measurements when the facility was not in operation. He stated the method was to go to the facility and take measurements of as many noise sources that they could, especially ones that were most likely to impact the neighborhood. He explained that the data was logged into a computer model that calculated the sound level at different distances with regard to vegetative cover, barrier walls, and buildings. He stated that based on the measurements and the noise ordinance requirements, the U-shaped building needed to be shifted over one bay to the west to meet the noise ordinance. Also in the scheme is a set of buildings and a proposed wall for sound that might leak out around that building. He noted that a second and third wall would be recommended only if operations would take place back behind the building. He explained that the wall would protect the citizens and meet the noise ordinance to the east and to the north. He indicated that there was about 700 feet separation to west and south so no additional walls would be required. He noted that there would also be an additional building to act as an additional buffer.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that the second scheme is an L-shaped building which would be shifted and would require a wall because of the distance. He noted, however, if that building were shifted in another direction a wall would not be mandatory. He explained that all data was noise sources for operations outdoors. He recommended that all uses approaching 61db only be used during the daytime.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that they looked at an excavation site further to the south, and in

order to meet the noise ordinance, he recommended a 30-foot high wall or barrier/berm at least at all times 16 feet above the top of the exhaust stack on the equipment that is being used. He explained that it should be a minimum of 150-foot distance from the road with a 100-150-foot tree buffer also on both sides. He stated that if the excavation site was moved to another location, it was not necessary to have a wall or berm.

Mr. Lilkendey summarized by saying that a typical daytime activity would meet sound level requirements if the facility was relocated to a point 600 feet from the west property line, and approximately 600 feet to the southwest property line, and 600 feet from the point of noise ordinance enforcement to the east. He noted that sound level activities would meet sound level requirements if the berm/wall combination is 16 feet above the top of the excavation site. He recommended administrative control throughout the day to make sure that the sounds are kept to a minimum. He stated that most of the vehicle repair activities that occur during the same time must occur indoors to meet the noise ordinance. He indicated that all measurements taken for the computer model were based on the equipment and tasks that occurred outdoors. He stated that the facility would be large, and a number of activities would be moved indoors, therefore the noise would actually be reduced another 10-20db depending on whether the doors were open or closed. He stated that the testing of police sirens would exceed the noise ordinance at all times, but the City is planning on testing those sirens inside. He noted that the nearest location to the east would have a little more sound because cars would drive by.

Commissioner Donovan asked if the consultant checked the area to the east and north for sound, and would it be higher if they measured the ambience during a regular weekday.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that they had checked the sound to the east and north, and that the noise would be higher because there would be increased traffic during the day and the facility would be operating.

Larry Abbott, Facilities Manager stated that the total measurement of the property from east to west that constitutes the storage area is 460 feet wide by 600 feet long. Of those 460 feet, there are probably 350 feet that would be usable, the other area would still be buffered with trees.

Ms. Susan Fairforest, LCSW asked if the noise study findings include a 30-foot wall to the east, west and north.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that a wall would not be constructed to the north of the creek.

Ms. Fairforest asked if berms and walls were needed if the earthmoving equipment was to be moved to another site.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that the berms and walls toward the excavation site would have to be in place, and there would still be a wall to the north on the eastside. He stated that a building will serve as a noise barrier to the west.

Ms. Fairforest asked how much it would cost for the 30-foot wall, including the walls

to the north and south.

Mr. Murry stated that staff's estimate for the walls will be \$2,080,000, if they remain at the existing facility.

Dr. Parsons asked how the consultant can measure sound when it is not there. He asked if they can be sure with the computer modeling that the noise will be kept under the noise ordinance requirements.

Mr. Lilkendey stated methods and controls have been documented in the literature for 50 years and have been used with great success. He noted that it was not a theoretical endeavor.

A citizen asked why the consultant didn't measure the noise during working hours.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that they measured the ambient sound level without the facility in operation because the facility that is operating now is not the facility that would be operating later. He noted that it would be located in a different place with a different orientation. He stated to take an ambient measurement, which is a background noise measurement, with the facility operating, would make the ambient seem higher. They wanted it to be as low as it really is, or could be, and then project on top of that.

Chair Henry stated that the consultant had no control if people choose to close the doors or keep them open. He noted that the consultant was professional and it was their job to measure the level of sounds that they were requested to measure.

Mr. Lilkendey stated the measurements provided were based on all of the activities that take place outdoors. He stated that when most of the activities move indoors there will be a 10-20db reduction.

A citizen asked about the noise of impact wrenches.

Mr. Lilkendey stated that if an impact wrench makes a noise, and a few seconds later it makes another noise, they are each individual sources, and that they each have their own level, and don't really combine unless they occur at the same point in time.

Ms. Jennifer Muir, SFN resident asked if the 460 feet was for the garage alone.

Mr. Abbott stated that he was referring to the area across the creek--from chain link to chain link. He was only referring to the southern part across the creek (the width).

Chair Henry asked how much it would cost for the wall to the east.

Mr. Milton Reid, General Services Director stated that it would cost \$80,000 because the new proposal does not need a continuous wall.

Chair Henry asked about the timeframe for phasing in.

Mr. Murry stated that it could take up to 24 months from the time of issuance of the permit.

Commissioner Lowe asked about purchasing the properties in order to relocate.

Mr. Murry stated that another option would be to move the materials storage area.

Commissioner Donovan asked how many acres are at the current materials storage area, and what is the cost per/acre that was estimated.

Mr. Reid stated that approximately 10 acres exist at the materials storage area, and \$170,000/acre is used for the land cost.

Mr. Murry discussed Option B to relocate to Northwest 53rd Avenue & North Main Street. He explained that the site has 13 acres and would require \$2,300,000 for land acquisition, \$195,000 for land clearing/demolition, costs for technical studies (wetlands on the property, and other types of issues), \$8,714,000 for construction, and \$279,973 for recurring costs which total \$11,488,973. He stated that there is a potential impact to the Traffic Management System because there is existing infrastructure on the site. He indicated that Option B is cost-prohibited and the City doesn't have that much budgeted.

Chair Henry asked staff to define recurring costs.

Mr. Murry stated that recurring costs are costs incurred when staff travels back and forth to the various facilities.

Commissioner Lowe asked what are the differences between Option A and Option A1, and if the City has budgeted for Option A.

Mr. Murry stated that the City had \$4,250,000, and the \$2,080,000 for the mitigation cost is not budgeted. He explained that the City would have to phase in the mitigation cost which would be the construction of the wall. He stated that \$2,500,000 for the transitional cost and \$2,000,000 for the wall would be different in Option A and Option A1. He indicated that if the City relocates that area, it would hopefully resolve some of the communities concerns regarding the recycling.

Commissioner Lowe asked if the materials storage area could be used by the City for some less noisy-type of operations, like an office complex or other future needs.

Commissioner Donovan asked if the City builds the exact same building, why does it cost more than the current site.

Mr. Reid stated that the City wouldn't build the exact building, it would build a brand new garage to accommodate both GRU and General Government. He noted that, in addition, the City would build a new fuel site, new car and truck wash, and a new bay. He explained that it will double the cost of the garage that existed now, because it would replace the current garage.

Don Hambidge Assistant Public Works Director, stated that the activities that take place on the existing Public Works Facility are mosquito control, traffic operations, sign/signal maintenance, operations staff, general services, street general services,

fleet management, parks and recreation offices, and a plant nursery. He stated that the Traffic Management System is \$9,000,000 and there is a time certain to use that money or the City will lose \$4,500,000. He stated that the dollars were approved quickly because the City had the facilities in place.

Mr. Murry stated that if the entire facility moves it could jeopardize not only \$9,000,000, but \$18,000,000 that the City has for traffic improvements.

Chair Henry stated that the Committee needed to look at the total picture. He pointed out that it involved not just the transfer of the Fleet Maintenance Facility, but that it would have a ripple effect. He stated that the neighborhood is concerned if the City moves the materials storage area to the south without some type of barrier because it will stir up particles in the air and intrude into the neighborhood.

Mr. Hambidge stated that the materials storage area is not constantly being used. There is activity there twice a week for approximately 5-6 hours/week.

Chair Henry asked if staff had a location in mind to move the materials storage area.

Stu Pearson, Public Works Engineering Manager stated that staff had looked at three sites which are: 1) the GRU site which is not suitable because only 7 acres were available; 2) the PJ Hawes Trust site which is not suitable because most of the area is in the floodplain; and 3) the PJ Hawes Trust site located on Northeast 15th Street, just north of the intersection of 39th Avenue. This site would be a 38-acre portion of a 185 acre parcel and a 500-600 buffer around the work area for noise accumulation area, available at a cost of \$1,800,000. He noted that figure covered access preparation for \$1,500,000 and a little over \$1,000,000 for land acquisition.

Mr. Reid stated that the \$2,500,000 for transition costs is assuming that the site will be relocated to a City-owned facility.

Chair Henry stated that it is important to have a target area to relocate the materials storage area so the neighborhood could rest assured that the City can get this done within 24 months.

Mr. Murry stated that the City would have to locate a target area at an accelerated pace if that was the direction from the Committee. He noted that there were some details to be dealt with, but from the time of the building permit it would be 24 months. He noted that the item would go to the City Commission in February, and back to the Development Review Board after that. During that phase, staff would have time to look at potential sites.

Ms. Fairforest asked about Item No. 9 under the responses. She pointed out that if the sale of the Public Works Facility (\$5,600,000) is added to the estimated total cost to expand the Public Works Facility (\$6,533,420) then the actual total cost for the expansion would be \$12,133,420. She stated the City will lose \$5,600,000 if it sold the land, plus the property taxes generated by developing the land which would greatly reduce the value of the property in the SFN. She stated that the existing building at the compound could be sold avoiding demolition costs.

Mr. Reid stated the plans for the \$5,600,000 is for the 33 acres at the Public Works Facility. He noted that Option 1 assumes the additional acreage for expansion. He stated the City already owns the property, and that they would not be selling the additional 3-4 acres, so adding the \$5,600,000 for the cost of the expansion would not be appropriate.

Mr. Murry stated that the Public Works Facility (\$5,600,000) represents moving the entire complex. The price of building a new Public Works Complex is about \$37,000,000.

Mr. Murry stated that the noise generated by the sirens is not an issue because the City will have a policy in place. The Koppers issues are up for discussion at the City Commission level.

Chair Henry asked if staff would look into any grants that would be offered through the environmental area to assist in moving the materials/handling storage area.

Ms. Muir stated that there are 530 City-owned properties that are available and are larger than the Public Works site. She pointed out that there are other options than just the three sites. She stated that there are 100's of acres located near Deerhaven.

Dr. Jimmy Harnsberger gave a Powerpoint presentation and summarized three options for the CDC to consider to the City Commission at their special meeting scheduled for February 18, 2008 (attached).

Commissioner Donovan asked if staff had a response to the Powerpoint presentation from the SFN.

Mr. Murry stated that they just heard the presentation that night. He noted that construction costs were not included in the presentation. He stated that, with regards to recurring costs -- the further away from the Public Works Compound, costs would rise and efficiencies will be lost. He stated that the GRU site downtown is already slated for redevelopment under the CRA, and needs to be relocated by 2010.

Commissioner Lowe asked if it would be possible to have some kind of incentive for the GRU land site.

Mr. Murry mentioned that any sale of the GRU site might have to go back into the GRU fund.

Mr. Reid stated that if the City doesn't consolidate they will lose the efficiencies that were adopted in the last budget. He stated that the further the City moves from either of the major users (i.e., GRU, Public Works), the higher the recurring costs. He noted that those annual costs are for fuel, depreciation of vehicles, and lost time for personal.

Chair Henry recommended that the Committee approve Option A1. He stated that he hoped the City expeditiously continues to explore (removing the maintenance clean-up of the storage materials site) sites, and work with the SFN to identify an appropriate and compatible alternative site to properly locate the industrial

operations. He stated that it would mitigate most of the health issues and reduce a good percentage of the noise.

Dr. Harnsberger stated that the City didn't have to disrupt any of the compatible uses that now exist on the parcel. He stated that if the City is going to buy land to locate a GRU garage on the site, then it should see if it could find money to consolidate.

Commissioner Lowe stated that perspectives changed inside the SFN. He indicated that when he drove around the neighborhood, it appeared that the noises were coming from the materials handling and storage area. He stated that he is aware of three vehicle maintenance facilities that adjoin the Duckpond Neighborhood. He stated that he hadn't received complaints about the garages near the Duckpond Neighborhood, and with the distance of the Fleet Maintenance Facility in relation to the SFN he feels like the big problem is the materials storage handling area. He stated that he concurs with Commissioner Henry in that the City needs to focus on the materials storage handling area.

Commissioner Donovan would like staff to review the comparative costs of Options 2 & 3 of the SFN presentation to Option A1.

Mr. Reid Rivers, Electrical Engineering Manager stated that GRU has not begun the permitting process. The property on North Main that GRU is attempting to develop is still in the very early stages of determining the developability of the property. He stated that they have received a report that some of the wetlands delineation is worse than the original master plan shows, and that some of the acreage is not available because of the wetlands on the site. He stated that he hopes to start the permitting process within the next month and this should take approximately 15 months, and at the same time, parallel to the development phase and produce working drawings. He stated that construction would begin in the spring of 2009, and that the City would be looking at the end of 2010 before GRU has full occupancy of the site.

Ms. Parsons asked the CDC to look at the DRB presentation so that they become aware of what the problems are. She stated the presentation is quite extensive and clearly documented and that the CDC is overlooking the presentation. She stated that she has asked a number of times for the CDC to look at this presentation so they can make an educated decision before they make any recommendations.

Ms. Muir stated that when the City relocates the materials handling storage area they should think about the future, so that there is enough acreage for additions. She asked for the CDC to use City-owned properties because they are free and would not cost the City any money.

Dr. Harnsberger stated that a way to move this item forward is to recommend Option 1A from the City staff recommendations and Options 2 & 3 from the Stephen Foster Neighborhood recommendations for discussion by the City Commission.

A citizen spoke about the wetlands issue. He mentioned that the activities on the southern parcel are in violation of the St. John's Water Management District guidelines. He stated that the retention ponds that exist on the facility are inadequate for the amount of impervious area and any increase in the impervious surface is

going to demand more space for the retention.

Commissioner Lowe recommended that the City ask for an analysis of what further modifications can be made to further protect the creeks such as additional setbacks over and above what there is now to allow for natural vegetation to regenerate and to provide more of a buffer for the stream.

RECOMMENDATION *The CDC to the City Commission: 1) The CDC recommends Option A1 from the City staff recommendations; and 2) Receive additional information for consideration for Options 2 and 3 from the Stephen Foster Neighborhood recommendations.*

Approved as Recommended

070399_200709131300.pdf
070399_200711051800.pdf
070399_20080117.pdf
070399a_20080117.pdf
070399b_20080117.doc
070399c_20080117.doc.pdf
070399d_20080117.doc.pdf
Citizen Comment.pdf

CITIZEN COMMENT - Recommendation from Robert Pearce (B)

Robert Pearce, SFN resident, spoke to the PS zoning matter, he read into record his concerns and recommendations. He stated that it was City staff's opinion that a motor vehicle repair facility is a permitted use. He stated that he and his neighbors completely disagree with that assumption and that would be a primary argument against the placement of a consolidated repair facility on the Public Works Compound parcel. He stated that he was speaking for himself and not the SFN.

CITIZEN COMMENT - Comments from the SFN Protection Group Regarding Robert Pearce's Recommendation

Ms. Fairforest, referring to Mr. Pearce's statement, pointed out that what was read into the record was different than what was written. She noted that Mr. Pearce left the word "satisfactorily" out each time, and that it is not satisfactorily to the neighbors.

Mr. Ronald Hodill, SFN resident read into the record a letter from the SFN Protection Group (attached). He stated that the SFN provided a letter to Mr. Murry on January 15, 2007, objecting to Mr. Pearce's letters of January 6th and January 11th. He also stated that the SFN objected to Mr. Pearce's sentence in the last paragraph.

NEXT MEETING DATE

February 14, 2008 1:30 PM

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 PM.