Welcome to the City of Winter Park City Commission meeting. The agenda for regularly scheduled Commission meetings is posted in City Hall the Tuesday before the meeting. Agendas and all backup material supporting each agenda item are available in the City Clerk’s office or on the city’s website at cityofwinterpark.org.

Meeting Procedures

Persons desiring to address the Commission MUST fill out and provide to the City Clerk a yellow “Request to Speak” form located by the door. After being recognized by the Mayor, persons are asked to come forward and speak from the podium, state their name and address, and direct all remarks to the Commission as a body and not to individual members of the Commission, staff or audience.

Citizen comments at 5 p.m. and each section of the agenda where public comment is allowed are limited to three (3) minutes. The yellow light indicator will remind you that you have one (1) minute left. Large groups are asked to name a spokesperson. This period of time is for comments and not for questions directed to the Commission or staff for immediate answer. Questions directed to the City Commission will be referred to staff and should be answered by staff within a reasonable period of time following the date of the meeting. Order and decorum will be preserved at all meetings. Personal, impertinent or slanderous remarks are not permitted. Thank you for participating in your city government.

Agenda

1 Meeting Called to Order

2 Invocation          Pastor Weaver Blondin, Mt. Moriah Missionary Baptist Church
                      Pledge of Allegiance

3 Approval of Agenda

4 Citizens Budget Comments

5 Mayor’s Report

6 City Manager’s Report

*Projected Time
*Subject to change

5 minutes
### City Attorney’s Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Non-Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


10 minutes

### Citizen Comments

* 5 p.m. or soon thereafter

(If the meeting ends earlier than 5:00 p.m., the citizen comments will be at the end of the meeting)

(Three (3) minutes are allowed for each speaker; not to exceed a total of 30 minutes for this portion of the meeting)

### Consent Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### a. Approve the minutes of July 25, 2016.

5 minutes

#### b. Approve PR160307 to Electric Supply of Tampa: Inventory items for electric utility to continue undergrounding projects (wire and transformers)

#### c. Approve Amendment #1 of the August 13, 2015, Quiet Zone Improvement Agreement between the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the City of Winter Park (CWP), adding $987,313 in funding by FDOT to the Quiet Zone Project with no additional funding match required from the City.

#### d. Approve the execution of the Interlocal Agreement between Seminole County and the City of Winter Park for Tanglewood Canal Drainage Improvements.

#### e. Approve the temporary fee schedule for the Winter Park Golf Course.

### Action Items Requiring Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### a. Guidelines for City Proclamations

15 minutes

#### b. Permitting process for public awareness campaigns

15 minutes

#### c. Petitioner’s Committee certificate of insufficiency

15 minutes

### Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### a. Ordinance – Granting the petition of the Ravaudage Community Development District and dissolving the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD) pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes (2)

5 minutes

### City Commission Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Projected Time</th>
<th>*Subject to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### a. Commissioner Seidel

#### b. Commissioner Sprinkel

#### c. Commissioner Cooper

#### d. Commissioner Weldon

#### e. Mayor Leary

10 minutes total
appeals & assistance

“If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.” (F. S. 286.0105).

“Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk’s Office (407-599-3277) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.”
Below are issues of interest to the Commission and community that are currently being worked on by staff, but do not currently require action on the Commission agenda. These items are being tracked to provide the Commission and community the most up to date information regarding the status of the various issues. The City Manager will be happy to answer questions or provide additional updates at the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>issue</th>
<th>update</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad crossing update</td>
<td>Four of Winter Park’s street crossings are included in FDOT’s CIP for installing concrete panels. N. Denning Drive crossing is completed. The remaining crossing improvements are to be completed by August 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Baptist Church Project</td>
<td>Previously the Pastor had agreed to obtain assistance of a designer to improve the architectural appearance of the buildings. The City Attorney will be reporting on this item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Park restrooms</td>
<td>Both are under construction. Both the soccer field restroom and the baseball field restroom should be completed by the end of 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cady Way Pool locker rooms</td>
<td>City is currently finalizing cost estimate to add hot water to the restroom/showers and is investigating various levels of locker room enhancements including fully enclosing and conditioning the space (currently unconditioned). Options including cost estimates will be finalized by end of August.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
<td>Staff is updating the data, inventory and analysis for each element. The update is due to the Department of Economic Opportunity by February 1, 2017. Schedule is available at <a href="http://www.cityofwinterpark.org/comp-plan">www.cityofwinterpark.org/comp-plan</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole County Drainage Ditch</td>
<td>Perform flood study for the contributing Seminole County and Winter Park drainage basins. Execute joint participation agreement by August 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once projects have been resolved, they will remain on the list for one additional meeting to share the resolution with the public and then be removed.
General Fund

Nine months into the fiscal year General Fund revenues appear to be on track with annual budget projections. A few items of note include:

1. Most property tax revenues have already been received. We do anticipate receiving enough over the next three months to equal or exceed the budget projection.
2. The communications services tax continues to decline. Even though we budgeted $132,000 less than the prior year, it is looking like we will be short of our FY 2016 projection by about $175,000.
3. Business taxes are renewed each October 1. Some additional revenue will be realized over the remainder of the fiscal year but the largest amount has already been received.
4. Building permit revenues are looking good in comparison to the current year budget and will likely exceed it by at least $200,000.
5. After a decrease in the prior year, red light traffic camera revenue is on track to be back at the fiscal 2014 level and will likely exceed the budget projection by $250,000.
6. Miscellaneous revenue is largely made up of investment earnings which reflect market value swings in the City’s investment portfolio. These values tend to bounce around quite a bit but were looking favorable overall for the first six months. The City follows a buy and hold investment strategy in which the swings neither benefit nor harm the City as the Treasury and Agency securities invested in are paid off at par when the investment matures.
7. Electric franchise fee equivalent revenues from the City’s electric utility will likely be about $75,000 short of the budget estimate due to lower fuel costs.
8. There are several large uses of reserves planned for FY 2016. Budgeted uses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of bowling alley property</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course renovation</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showalter Field improvements</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding for thicker cool play turf at Showalter Field</td>
<td>$38,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of building permit reserves to purchase of new computer system</td>
<td>$133,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 purchase orders re-appropriated to FY 2016</td>
<td>$384,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total planned uses of reserves</td>
<td>$3,836,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departmental expenditures are in line with budgetary expectations. Operating transfers out include the City’s transfer to the CRA for tax increment revenue. This payment is
required to be made by December 31. Transfers out will be exactly equal to the budget at the end of the fiscal year. Also, the full $1,900,000 for the purchase of the bowling alley property has already been transferred to the Capital Projects Fund.

Community Redevelopment Agency Fund
The CRA was credited with the annual tax increment revenue from both the City and County in December. The County portion is on the Intergovernmental revenue line item and the City portion is reflected in the Operating Transfers In.

Charges for services revenue is primarily associated with the ice rink.

Miscellaneous revenue includes the first of fourteen annual $30,000 payments related to the Heritage Park property (formerly State Office Building).

Transfers out includes $1,000,000 from CRA reserves for the purchase of the bowling alley property.

Water and Sewer Fund
The bottom line reflects a positive $1,347,507 and debt service coverage is projected to be a strong 1.89 for the fiscal year.

Electric Services Fund
Electric kWh sales are ahead of forecast by about 2%.

Our fuel over-recovery for the first nine months of the fiscal year is about $400,000. Fuel cost recovery rates were reduced November 1 and again on February 1 in an effort to return some of that to the customers. The June 30 financial report was prepared assuming we will break even for the fiscal year.

The bottom line for the first nine months is a deficit of $97,441. Spending on undergrounding appears to be on track to total approximately $2,500,000 for FY 2016. Savings here combined with those from the reorganization of electric operations are anticipated to bring our cash position at fiscal year-end close to zero. Staff still anticipates completing at least five miles of undergrounding work in FY 2016.

Debt service coverage is forecast at 2.34.

Investment Report
This two page report summarizes the City’s cash and investment holdings as of June 30, 2016. The overall portfolio has a blended rate of return of 1.27% and the average maturity of the long-term investment securities held was 4.46 years. All investment holdings were within the parameters of the City’s current Investment Policy as of June 30, 2016.
## The City of Winter Park, Florida
### Monthly Financial Report - Budget vs. Actual
### General Fund
### Fiscal YTD June 30, 2016 and 2015
### 75% of the Fiscal Year Lapsed

### General Fund Fiscal YTD June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$17,386,080</td>
<td>$17,927,507</td>
<td>$13,445,630</td>
<td>$16,231,363</td>
<td>$16,489,478</td>
<td>$12,367,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
<td>680,834</td>
<td>1,181,603</td>
<td>866,202</td>
<td>855,029</td>
<td>1,122,850</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Taxes</td>
<td>4,743,633</td>
<td>6,680,726</td>
<td>5,010,545</td>
<td>4,397,944</td>
<td>6,728,400</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Taxes</td>
<td>478,316</td>
<td>494,975</td>
<td>107,685</td>
<td>492,984</td>
<td>481,500</td>
<td>131,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>1,810,000</td>
<td>1,810,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,848,000</td>
<td>1,848,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Licenses &amp; Permits</td>
<td>32,495</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>14,011</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>5,312,128</td>
<td>7,145,937</td>
<td>5,359,453</td>
<td>5,301,287</td>
<td>6,758,307</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>4,269,463</td>
<td>5,604,608</td>
<td>6,680,726</td>
<td>4,397,944</td>
<td>6,728,400</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and Forfeitures</td>
<td>936,117</td>
<td>937,797</td>
<td>703,348</td>
<td>649,411</td>
<td>1,300,100</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,602,860</td>
<td>245,632</td>
<td>1,357,228</td>
<td>157,286</td>
<td>245,632</td>
<td>129,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>36,267,147</td>
<td>44,140,137</td>
<td>34,933,108</td>
<td>32,313,103</td>
<td>32,313,103</td>
<td>2,620,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>166,745</td>
<td>186,430</td>
<td>19,685</td>
<td>166,430</td>
<td>186,430</td>
<td>19,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services - Other</td>
<td>1,521,728</td>
<td>1,585,051</td>
<td>63,323</td>
<td>1,422,250</td>
<td>1,422,250</td>
<td>100,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Management</td>
<td>311,127</td>
<td>358,748</td>
<td>47,621</td>
<td>311,127</td>
<td>358,748</td>
<td>47,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>194,702</td>
<td>223,783</td>
<td>29,081</td>
<td>194,702</td>
<td>223,783</td>
<td>29,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Dept.</td>
<td>3,368,509</td>
<td>4,220,964</td>
<td>852,455</td>
<td>3,368,509</td>
<td>4,220,964</td>
<td>852,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>962,139</td>
<td>1,236,927</td>
<td>274,788</td>
<td>962,139</td>
<td>1,236,927</td>
<td>274,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>633,056</td>
<td>886,496</td>
<td>253,440</td>
<td>633,056</td>
<td>886,496</td>
<td>253,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>268,936</td>
<td>351,944</td>
<td>83,008</td>
<td>268,936</td>
<td>351,944</td>
<td>83,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>187,867</td>
<td>279,527</td>
<td>91,660</td>
<td>187,867</td>
<td>279,527</td>
<td>91,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>876,273</td>
<td>1,213,538</td>
<td>337,265</td>
<td>876,273</td>
<td>1,213,538</td>
<td>337,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>5,365,253</td>
<td>7,397,414</td>
<td>2,032,161</td>
<td>5,365,253</td>
<td>7,397,414</td>
<td>2,032,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance from Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating transfers in</td>
<td>6,471,600</td>
<td>8,871,531</td>
<td>2,400,931</td>
<td>6,471,600</td>
<td>8,871,531</td>
<td>2,400,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating transfers out</td>
<td>(5,970,827)</td>
<td>(4,904,457)</td>
<td>(1,066,370)</td>
<td>(5,970,827)</td>
<td>(4,904,457)</td>
<td>(1,066,370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Financing Sources/(Uses)</td>
<td>500,773</td>
<td>3,967,074</td>
<td>3,467,001</td>
<td>500,773</td>
<td>3,967,074</td>
<td>3,467,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As adjusted through June 30, 2016

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Actual YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Variance from Budget YTD June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Variance from Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal YTD June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$ 1,550,967</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>161,985</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>56,553</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,769,505</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
<td>731,227</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>1,298,241</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>2,079,468</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over/(Under Expenditures)</td>
<td>(309,963)</td>
<td>124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating transfers in</td>
<td>1,435,305</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating transfers out</td>
<td>(1,042,986)</td>
<td>132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Financing Sources/(Uses)</td>
<td>392,319</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As adjusted through June 30, 2016
## Operating Performance:

### Water and Irrigation Sales (in thousands of gallons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer - inside city limits</strong></td>
<td>754,862</td>
<td>996,295</td>
<td>975,866</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>727,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer - outside city limits</strong></td>
<td>652,876</td>
<td>868,678</td>
<td>866,331</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>638,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water - inside city limits</strong></td>
<td>1,139,264</td>
<td>1,503,513</td>
<td>1,423,463</td>
<td>80,050</td>
<td>1,063,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation - Inside City</strong></td>
<td>416,208</td>
<td>552,811</td>
<td>550,217</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>402,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water - outside city limits</strong></td>
<td>893,412</td>
<td>1,183,219</td>
<td>1,216,104</td>
<td>(32,885)</td>
<td>899,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation - Outside City</strong></td>
<td>416,208</td>
<td>552,811</td>
<td>550,217</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>402,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,940,765</td>
<td>5,215,887</td>
<td>5,140,754</td>
<td>75,133</td>
<td>3,809,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer - inside city limits</strong></td>
<td>4,775,552</td>
<td>6,367,403</td>
<td>6,061,843</td>
<td>305,560</td>
<td>4,483,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer - outside city limits</strong></td>
<td>5,058,142</td>
<td>6,744,189</td>
<td>6,658,009</td>
<td>86,180</td>
<td>4,833,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water - inside city limits</strong></td>
<td>6,411,347</td>
<td>8,548,463</td>
<td>8,471,951</td>
<td>76,512</td>
<td>6,330,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water - outside city limits</strong></td>
<td>4,176,785</td>
<td>5,569,047</td>
<td>5,743,337</td>
<td>(174,290)</td>
<td>4,275,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,059,326</td>
<td>1,412,435</td>
<td>1,295,668</td>
<td>116,767</td>
<td>1,037,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>21,481,152</td>
<td>28,641,536</td>
<td>28,230,808</td>
<td>410,728</td>
<td>20,961,094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General and administration</strong></td>
<td>1,242,869</td>
<td>1,657,159</td>
<td>2,049,203</td>
<td>392,044</td>
<td>1,177,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>8,052,071</td>
<td>11,783,519</td>
<td>12,239,899</td>
<td>456,380</td>
<td>7,864,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor costs capitalized</strong></td>
<td>374,184</td>
<td>498,912</td>
<td>498,912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>377,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater treatment by other agencies</strong></td>
<td>3,123,889</td>
<td>4,165,185</td>
<td>3,958,280</td>
<td>(206,905)</td>
<td>2,748,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>12,793,013</td>
<td>18,104,775</td>
<td>18,746,294</td>
<td>641,519</td>
<td>12,167,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Income (Loss):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>8,688,139</td>
<td>10,536,761</td>
<td>9,484,514</td>
<td>1,052,247</td>
<td>8,794,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Sources (Uses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment earnings</strong></td>
<td>115,676</td>
<td>154,235</td>
<td>198,700</td>
<td>(44,465)</td>
<td>274,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous revenue</strong></td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>77,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to Renewal and Replacement Fund</strong></td>
<td>1,254,526</td>
<td>(1,672,701)</td>
<td>(1,672,701)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,235,351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to General Fund</strong></td>
<td>(1,644,779)</td>
<td>(2,193,039)</td>
<td>(2,193,038)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1,565,175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer for Organizational Support</strong></td>
<td>(50,179)</td>
<td>(66,905)</td>
<td>(66,905)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(45,635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to Capital Projects Fund</strong></td>
<td>(71,250)</td>
<td>(95,000)</td>
<td>(95,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(422,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt service sinking fund deposits</strong></td>
<td>(4,443,514)</td>
<td>(5,924,930)</td>
<td>(5,827,930)</td>
<td>(97,000)</td>
<td>(4,441,131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other sources (uses)</strong></td>
<td>(7,340,632)</td>
<td>(9,790,400)</td>
<td>(9,651,874)</td>
<td>(138,526)</td>
<td>(7,358,089)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Increase (Decrease) in Funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 YTD</th>
<th>FY 2016 Annualized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
<th>Projected Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015 in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase (decrease) in funds</strong></td>
<td>$1,347,507</td>
<td>$746,362</td>
<td>($167,360)</td>
<td>$913,722</td>
<td>$1,435,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Debt Service Coverage:

1.89
### Technical Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY'16 YTD</th>
<th>FY'16 Annualized</th>
<th>FY'16 Budget</th>
<th>FY'15 Budget</th>
<th>FY'14 Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306,828,495</td>
<td>436,269,721</td>
<td>426,504,060</td>
<td>9,765,661</td>
<td>428,482,496</td>
<td>425,342,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>0.1047</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317,076,501</td>
<td>450,969,280</td>
<td>448,951,642</td>
<td>2,017,638</td>
<td>447,757,800</td>
<td>445,526,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0552</td>
<td>0.0538</td>
<td>0.0571</td>
<td>0.0571</td>
<td>0.0563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.77%</td>
<td>96.74%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.70%</td>
<td>95.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Statement

**Electric Sales:**

- **Fuel**
  - FY'16: 10,300,121
  - FY'14: 14,061,449
  - FY'15: 15,197,553
  - Variance: (1,136,104)
- **Non-Fuel**
  - FY'16: 22,244,231
  - FY'14: 31,628,368
  - FY'15: 31,105,642
  - Variance: 522,726

**Other Operating Revenues**

- FY'16: 235,643
- FY'14: 314,191
- FY'15: 357,000

**Total Operating Revenues**

- FY'16: 32,779,995
- FY'14: 46,004,008
- FY'15: 46,660,195

**Operating Expenses:**

- **General and Administrative**
  - FY'16: 1,110,249
  - FY'14: 1,480,332
  - FY'15: 1,176,351
  - Variance: (303,981)
- **Operating Expenses**
  - FY'16: 5,335,054
  - FY'14: 7,113,405
  - FY'15: 6,876,749
  - Variance: 236,656
- **Purchased Power**
  - **Fuel**
    - FY'16: 9,886,605
    - FY'14: 14,061,449
    - FY'15: 15,197,553
    - Variance: 1,136,104
  - **Non-Fuel**
    - FY'16: 6,251,559
    - FY'14: 8,891,422
    - FY'15: 8,348,952
    - Variance: (542,470)
- **Transmission Power Cost**
  - FY'16: 2,246,945
  - FY'14: 2,995,927
  - FY'15: 3,345,582
  - Variance: 349,655

**Total Operating Expenses**

- FY'16: 24,830,412
- FY'14: 34,542,536
- FY'15: 34,945,187

**Operating Income (Loss)**

- FY'16: 7,949,583
- FY'14: 11,461,472
- FY'15: 11,715,008

**Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses):**

- **State Funding for Fairbanks Distribution Lines**
  - FY'16: 3,077,000
  - FY'14: 3,077,000
- **Undergrounding Fairbanks Distribution Lines**
  - FY'16: (3,077,000)
  - FY'14: (3,077,000)
- **Investment Earnings (net of interest paid on interfund borrowings)**
  - FY'16: 41,506
  - FY'14: 55,341
- **Principal on Debt**
  - FY'16: (1,552,500)
  - FY'14: (2,070,000)
- **Interest on Debt**
  - FY'16: (2,149,456)
  - FY'14: (2,858,204)
- **Miscellaneous Revenue**
  - FY'16: 16,493
  - FY'14: 16,493
- **Proceeds from Sale of Assets**
  - FY'16: 30,061
  - FY'14: 40,081
- **Routine Capital**
  - FY'16: (1,457,865)
  - FY'14: (1,943,200)
- **Undergrounding of Power Lines**
  - FY'16: (1,774,363)
  - FY'14: (2,500,000)
- **Contributions in Aid of Construction**
  - FY'16: 687,384
  - FY'14: 916,512
- **Residential Underground Conversions**
  - FY'16: 75,624
  - FY'14: 100,832
- **Capital Contributions for Plug-In Program**
  - FY'16: 51,968
  - FY'14: 69,291

**Total Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses)**

- FY'16: (6,031,148)
- FY'14: (8,173,474)
WINTER PARK ELECTRIC UTILITY METRICS
June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY'16 YTD</th>
<th>FY'16 Annualized</th>
<th>FY'16 Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY'15</th>
<th>FY'14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income (Loss) Before Operating Transfers</td>
<td>1,918,435</td>
<td>3,287,998</td>
<td>2,480,566</td>
<td>807,432</td>
<td>2,119,797</td>
<td>2,503,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Transfers In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to General Fund</td>
<td>(1,797,202)</td>
<td>(2,555,385)</td>
<td>(2,639,000)</td>
<td>83,615</td>
<td>(2,582,126)</td>
<td>(2,652,117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers for organizational support</td>
<td>(87,596)</td>
<td>(116,795)</td>
<td>(116,795)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(109,604)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to capital projects</td>
<td>(131,078)</td>
<td>(174,771)</td>
<td>(174,771)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,187,271)</td>
<td>(37,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Transfers</td>
<td>(2,015,876)</td>
<td>(2,846,950)</td>
<td>(2,930,566)</td>
<td>83,616</td>
<td>(3,879,001)</td>
<td>(2,689,617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Working Capital</td>
<td>(97,441)</td>
<td>441,048</td>
<td>(450,000)</td>
<td>891,048</td>
<td>(1,759,204)</td>
<td>(186,607)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Financial Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY'16</th>
<th>FY'15</th>
<th>FY'14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Rate Bonds Outstanding</td>
<td>67,010,000</td>
<td>69,065,000</td>
<td>64,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction Rate Bonds Outstanding</td>
<td>1,205,000</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
<td>7,445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bonds Outstanding</td>
<td>68,215,000</td>
<td>70,285,000</td>
<td>72,195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Retired</td>
<td>2,070,000</td>
<td>2,070,000</td>
<td>1,735,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Owed on Advance from General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance</td>
<td>(1,142,017)</td>
<td>(916,075)</td>
<td>3,530,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
Fiscal Years run from October to September; FY'15 is 10/1/14 to 9/30/15
SAIDI is System Average Interruption Duration Index (12-month rolling sum)
MAIFI is Momentary Average Interruption Frequency Index (12-month rolling sum)
### Cash and Investment Portfolio (excluding pension funds and bond proceeds)

#### 30-Jun-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuer CUSIP</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Price</th>
<th>Coupon Rate</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>4,222,324</td>
<td>4,222,324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeacoastBank</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1,160,931</td>
<td>1,160,931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Fund</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2,738,708</td>
<td>2,738,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>100,900</td>
<td>100,900</td>
<td>100,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Administration (SBA)</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>19,106</td>
<td>19,106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total short-term funds: $8,241,069 $8,241,299 15.34%**

### Long-term investments:

#### US Treasury Note Investments (backed by full faith and credit of the United States Government):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US TREASURY NOTES 912828K66</th>
<th>09/09/15</th>
<th>1,000,000</th>
<th>100.004</th>
<th>0.50%</th>
<th>968,750</th>
<th>1,000,040</th>
<th>04/30/17</th>
<th>AAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES 912828J4A</td>
<td>02/07/13</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100.082</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>992,580</td>
<td>1,000,820</td>
<td>04/30/18</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES 912828P53</td>
<td>06/27/16</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100.211</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>02/15/19</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES 912828TR1</td>
<td>02/23/16</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100.766</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>992,500</td>
<td>1,007,660</td>
<td>09/30/19</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES 912828L32</td>
<td>09/09/15</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>101.852</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>992,500</td>
<td>1,018,520</td>
<td>08/31/20</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES 912828G53</td>
<td>09/09/15</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>104.156</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>1,002,188</td>
<td>1,041,560</td>
<td>11/30/21</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total US Treasury Note Investments $8,000,000 $7,978,518 $8,076,650 15.04% 17.76%**

#### Government National Mortgage Investments (backed by full faith and credit of the United States Government):

| GNMA II ARM PASS THRU POOL 825B 36202KE76 | 05/04/99 | 490,000 | 101.948 | 1.75% | 1,813 | 1,849 | 08/20/23 |
|---------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| GNMA PASS THRU POOL 372004 36204G098 | 02/21/08 | 1,730,000 | 114.414 | 6.50% | 38,496 | 44,045 | 01/15/24 |
| GNMA PASS THRU POOL AD1605 36180CYA1 | 02/01/13 | 1,000,000 | 102.347 | 2.00% | 701,442 | 717,905 | 01/15/28 |
| GNMA II PASS THRU POOL 2562 36202CC30 | 02/08/01 | 2,500,000 | 114.365 | 6.00% | 701,442 | 717,905 | 01/15/28 |
| GNMA PASS THRU POOL 407581 36201NAX3 | 02/11/99 | 500,000 | 115.604 | 6.00% | 14,212 | 16,430 | 01/15/29 |
| GNMA II PASS THRU POOL 2796 36202C92 | 02/09/01 | 2,000,000 | 113.976 | 6.50% | 19,340 | 22,043 | 08/20/29 |
| GNMA II PASS THRU POOL 2997 36202DKJ9 | 01/31/01 | 1,717,305 | 114.888 | 6.50% | 7,146 | 8,210 | 11/20/30 |
| GNMA PASS THRU POOL 574674 36200WMX6 | 03/27/08 | 1,700,000 | 112.332 | 5.00% | 69,640 | 78,228 | 04/15/34 |
| GNMA II PASS THRU POOL 3839 36202EQ98 | 01/30/08 | 1,000,000 | 107.680 | 4.50% | 139,793 | 150,561 | 04/20/36 |
| GNMA II PASS THRU POOL 4071 36202EQ98 | 01/18/08 | 1,000,000 | 109.615 | 5.00% | 80,677 | 88,435 | 01/20/38 |
| GNMA 09-9 TA REMIC MULTICLASS CMO 38374TH4 | 03/17/09 | 1,000,000 | 104.086 | 4.50% | 87,694 | 91,277 | 08/20/38 |
| GNMA 10-31 AP REMIC MULTICLASS CMO 38376XL59 | 04/12/10 | 1,000,000 | 104.263 | 4.00% | 241,191 | 251,473 | 08/20/38 |
| GNMA PASS THRU POOL 702275 36206V202 | 05/10/10 | 1,015,000 | 107.597 | 4.00% | 524,600 | 564,551 | 07/15/39 |
| GNMA 13-28 DE REMIC MULTICLASS CMO 38378FWC1 | 02/09/13 | 1,000,000 | 98,498 | 1.75% | 690,874 | 690,497 | 12/20/42 |
| GNMA 13-42 DE REMIC MULTICLASS CMO 38378JFT4 | 03/13/13 | 1,000,000 | 99,927 | 1.75% | 301,763 | 301,543 | 01/20/43 |

**Total Government National Mortgage Investments $18,652,305 $2,952,700 $3,055,790 5.69% 6.72%**

#### Agencies which are non-full faith and credit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Farm Credit Investments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT 3133EC7L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT 3133ECMV0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT 3133ECY18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Farm Credit Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Banks Investments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Banks Investments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK INVESTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Mortgage Investments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE INVESTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal National Mortgage Association Investments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION INVESTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Instrumentalities (United States Government Agencies which are non-full faith and credit):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Long-Term Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Short-Term Funds and Long-Term Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Portfolio Rate of Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Maturity (in years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting of the Winter Park City Commission was called to order by Mayor Steve Leary, at 3:30 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida. The invocation was provided by Reverend Leslie McCarrick, Winter Park Christian Church, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present:  
Mayor Steve Leary  
Commissioner Greg Seidel  
Commissioner Sarah Sprinkel  
Commissioner Carolyn Cooper  
Commissioner Pete Weldon

Also present:  
City Manager Randy Knight  
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham  
City Attorney Kurt Ardaman

Approval of the agenda

Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Cooper and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Citizen Budget Comments:

Joe Terranova, 151 N. Virginia Avenue, complimented City staff on the budget. He requested that funds for trees be increased as well as reviewing the right-of-way restrictions concerning planting of trees.

Mayor’s Report

a. Recognition – Summer Youth Enrichment Program providers and participants

Laura Neudorffer, Redevelopment Coordinator thanked the following program providers: Peter Schreyer, Crealde School of Art; Ruth Edwards, Winter Park Public Library; Cathleen Daus, Parks & Recreation Department; Ronnie Moore, Parks & Recreation Department; Robynn Demar, Welbourne Ave Nursery & Kindergarten; Jackie Brito, Rollins College; Tres Loch, Rollins College; and Linda Puritz, Rollins College.

Ms. Neudorffer distributed the certificates of achievement and congratulated the following students in the program: Kobe Sipp, Destiny Walton, Jordan Jenkins, Madison Weil, Tenisha Venegas, Harry Barnikel, Wendy Parra, Calyx Walls, Daniel Hughley, and Desiree Haney-Brown.

b. Check presentation – David Rider, YMCA

David Rider, YMCA presented a check for $70,000 to the City to help pay for the geothermal pool heater at Cady Way.
City Manager’s Report

Commissioner Sprinkel asked about the status of the portables at the New Hope Baptist Church.

Building Director George Wiggins explained they were provided a contact who is preparing to meet with the Planning Department to bring back a presentation to the Commission as to what actions they can take to do whatever is necessary to make it presentable to the community and take whatever actions the Commission directs them to do. He explained since this was a conditional use, it needs to come back to the Commission. Commissioner Sprinkel expressed the need to expedite and resolve this. Mr. Wiggins explained the conditional use expired and that they have already met all the exterior building permit requirements. There was a general consensus that the City Manager and City Attorney pursue an investigation of alternatives available to the Commission through legal procedure to address the issue.

City Attorney’s Report

City Attorney Ardaman addressed the bond validation lawsuit in that bond counsel has coordinated with the State Attorney and are attempting to set a date for the trial that we hope to know this week.

City Attorney Ardaman addressed the drone ordinance and an attorney general opinion issued last week that gives cities authority with respect to that matter and that there are numerous cities around the state that taking action on this. He stated they hope to have a more comprehensive approach to come back to the Commission.

Non-Action Item

No items.

Consent Agenda

a. Approve the minutes of July 11, 2016. **Pulled for discussion. See below.**
b. Approve the following contracts:
   1. Piggyback contract with Fastenal, TCPN Contract No. R142101 – MRO Equipment, Supplies & Related Items/Service; and authorize the Mayor to execute contract.
   3. Piggyback contract with HD Supply Waterworks, Water/Wastewater Material Alliance Extension Agreement No. 895; and authorize the Mayor to execute contract.
c. Approve the policy change regarding the special event banner program to include companies over 75 years old and have demonstrated community value as a special event.

Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve Consent Agenda items ‘b’ and ‘c’; seconded by Commissioner Weldon and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote. No public comments were made.

Consent Agenda item ‘a’ – Minutes of July 11, 2016

After clarification that the minutes on page 8, paragraph 4 were amended per the request of Commissioners Cooper and Weldon, motion made by Commissioner Cooper to approve Consent Agenda item ‘a’, seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Action Items Requiring Discussion

a. Set tentative millage rate and budget discussion

City Manager Knight explained now is the time that the millage rate is set to send to the tax collector’s office to put out the TRIM bill. He stated that is the notice that goes to taxpayers in August and advertises the public hearing for the budget. He explained the tentative millage of 4.0923 for the operating budget and a debt service millage for the public safety complex bonds of 0.1715. He asked for approval of these two rates. It was pointed out that the operating budget millage has not been raised in nine (9) years.

Motion made by Mayor Leary to approve the two rates of 4.0923 for the operating budget and 0.1715 for the debt service millage; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel.

Motion amended by Commissioner Weldon to request that the Commission agree to send a proposed millage rate to the county appraiser reduced from 4.0923 to 4.00. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion amended by Commissioner Seidel that we look to increase the millage rate by .1 mils to allow ourselves flexibility in the budget conversations. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Sprinkel and Cooper voted yes. Commissioners Seidel and Weldon voted no. The motion carried with a 3-2 vote.
Public Hearings:

a. **Request of Phil Kean Designs, Inc.:** Amend the conditional use approval granted on October 12, 2015 to redevelop the property at 652 West Morse Boulevard in order to develop 10 residential units in lieu of the approved 11 residential units and to modify the approved architectural elements.

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs explained this was tabled at the July 11, 2016 meeting and that this is a continuation of the conditional use request to modify the original approval. He addressed the prior discussion regarding the unit location being adjacent to the park and the new submittal where the buildings will be located one foot away from the City owned park. He stated a sale of the City park property was considered since it is so close to the buildings and that they spoke to the applicant after the last meeting who is interested in acquiring the property that will have to go through the Notice of Disposal (NOD) because it was purchased with assets of the CRA. He stated the NOD would be sent out with the commitment that it would stay zoned Parks and Recreation and sold with a deed restriction that no buildings could be put on the property so it would be valued based on open space as it is today.

He stated in the meantime the applicant will be presenting an alternative to the Commission that moves the buildings back to a 3’ setback away from the City park that allows you to come out of the buildings (if the NOD process does not work out) and use the sidewalk to get around to the back of the property. He stated they can easily do this because all they have to do is shrink the driveway width, normally the minimum width is 24’ and they have 30’ in the back which still provides plenty of room to move the building back to a 3’ setback which should remedy the situation of the buildings being too close.

He stated the plan the Commission is being asked to approve this evening is the plan with a 3’ setback. He stated the Commission is not being asked to approve the development agreement that was in the packet because it included the maintenance provision and they are going to wait on the outcome of the NOD if a prospect for a sale works out. Mr. Briggs explained that any details regarding the installation of a fence around the property would be part of the NOD.

Applicant Jacob Farmer provided a copy of the new site plan showing the 3’ setback and clarified the confusion over the buildings versus the front doors.

**Motion made by Commissioner Weldon to approve staff’s recommendation to approve the amendment to the approved conditional use which still maintains the three original conditions of approval from October 21, 2015; seconded by Commissioner Seidel.** No public comments were made. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.
b. Request of Wekiva Capital Partners, LLC: Conditional use approval to build a seven unit cluster housing project of two story houses of approximately 1,500 square feet in each house at 741 and 751 Minnesota Avenue.

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs explained the unit density being below what they could build. He addressed the location, zoning, and staff’s conditions whereby the Planning and Zoning Board (P&Z) made suggestions that the applicant agreed to incorporate into their plan. He stated they are still discussing the fate of three Cyprus trees with Urban Forestry and whether these can be saved so the landscape plan is not being approved at this time. He stated this has a unanimous approval from the Planning and Zoning Board. Commissioner Seidel asked if they would be allowed to put a gate on their property. The policy regarding gated communities was clarified. Mr. Briggs clarified what will happen with the dumpsters.

Motion made by Mayor Leary to approve the conditional use as presented with conditions set upon it by staff and P&Z, seconded by Commissioner Weldon.

Motion amended by Commissioner Seidel to propose that we specifically exclude the property from having a gate at any time in the future (to separate their property from the street, to essentially function as a gated community); seconded by Commissioner Cooper. It was clarified that this is not allowed by code. Mr. Briggs stated this would be allowed if it were a condominium but they should ask the applicant if they have any plans for that.

Applicant Chris Hughes, Wekiva Capital Partners, LLC explained they do have a gate/decorative fence they are showing but it does not cross the access point; it’s only showing in front of the houses. He stated as proposed now there is no gate through the traffic flow and agreed with the amendment.

Upon a roll call vote on the amendment, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. Commissioner Sprinkel voted no. The motion carried with a 4-1 vote.

Upon a roll call vote on the main motion to approve, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

c. Request of Oppidan Holdings LLC: Conditional use approval to build a one story, Orchard Supply Hardware Retail Store of approximately 32,355 square feet in size on 2.4 acres adjacent to Orlando Avenue between Miller and Indiana Avenues, addressed as 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue.

City Planner Allison McGillis presented the request on behalf of Planning Manager Jeff Briggs who stated he is a tenant of the property seller so he has asked Allison to do the presentation.
Attorney Rebecca Wilson, representing the applicant, provided the background of Orchard Supply, the location, zoning, existing site, surrounding uses, site plan, parking study, residential buffer, enhanced buffer, the architecture looking north and south and the concessions they made. Ms. Wilson addressed a condition of approval that was not included in the packet that they have agreed to that they would like added to the conditions of final conditional use approval: to restrict their delivery hours from 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. She asked for approval subject to the staff conditions with this one additional condition added. The large number of parking spaces was addressed that they did not anticipate ever having any shortage of parking even with seasonal parking times (they would have to get permit approval if that ever did occur in the future).

**Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve the conditional use request with the added condition that the delivery hours be restricted from 9:00-5:00; seconded by Commissioner Weldon.**

The following spoke in favor of approval:
Robert McAdam, 611 Genius Drive
John Greason, 1102 Schultz Avenue and representing their board

Commissioner Seidel stated he spoke with the applicant and the engineer and that he wanted to discuss the art deco building on the corner. He believed it would have been great for the applicant to incorporate this building facade into what they are doing. He also addressed low impact development drainage design and that it would have been nice if the infiltration had been spread out throughout the site so that we would do a better job of recharging the aquifers. He stated what they have done is good but preferred that it be looked at early in the process. He asked staff how we could do this as opposed to when it comes to the Commission. After discussion, staff will review future projects and anything related to water discharge. Mr. Briggs addressed code violation enforcement and infractions. Commissioner Weldon praised the developer for their communications with the residents which made everyone happy and made the job easy for the Commission.

**Upon a roll call vote to approve the conditional use, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.**

d. **AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, GRANTING THE PETITION OF THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND DISSOLVING THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT PURSUANT TO SECTION 190.046(9), FLORIDA STATUTES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; FURTHER, PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE First Reading**

Attorney Ardaman read the ordinance by title. Planning Manager Jeff Briggs explained the request that was a funding mechanism for infrastructure. He clarified that all the infrastructure requirements still remains as conditions of the Planned Development that was granted by Orange County and must be met. Attorney Jan Carpenter representing the CDD, explained the CDD was to provide funding through
bond or tax increment financing and when those methods did not work the developer did not have a use/need for it so the CDD never took on any obligations to build any of the developer’s obligations.

**Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to accept the ordinance on first reading, seconded by Commissioner Seidel.**

Daniel Assael, 1144 Park Green Place, addressed the importance of Ravaudage using the property well and to have an enormous value for the City which he did not believe was happening. He urged the Commission to help make something happen with that property and for the Commission to have some vision.

**Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.**

**City Commission Reports:**

a. **Commissioner Seidel**

1. Asked if there is a plan for YMCA Cady Way locker room improvements and to include it in the budget. This will be added to the City Manager’s Report.
2. He asked about Mead Gardens plan for funding that he wanted to discuss.
3. He asked about any plans with moving forward with the library once we determine the schedule so the residents are informed. City Manager Knight stated once we know the schedule of the lawsuit, decisions will be made whether to push back the closing of the Civic Center into 2017.

b. **Commissioner Sprinkel**

Commissioner Sprinkel reported that she represented Winter Park at the Men's kappa alpha psi fraternity meeting for the Winter Park and Orlando service group national convention that does service projects in community.

c. **Commissioner Cooper**

Commissioner Cooper requested that the comprehensive plan review meetings be included on the normal listing of board meetings. There was a consensus. She also asked that the agenda packets for the boards include the markups for the comprehensive plan changes so residents understand what is being proposed by staff ahead of time and posted on the website. After discussion, staff will include those on the website.

d. **Commissioner Weldon**

1. Commissioner Weldon stated he would like to encourage more public participation in the comprehensive plan update process and to have staff send to all
City boards at the direction of the Commission the chart of the anticipated pro forma CRA unallocated surplus for the next and last 10 years of its existence to see if there are thoughts from board members to share with the Commission. There was a consensus to do this.

2. He also addressed not being sure if it requires any action on the part of the City Attorney because it was clarified that the City sought the permission of Orange County (as was required under the CRA plan and law to borrow the money) to build the Community Center. He stated the idea was to consider whether or not it is possible to potentially bond out some of the CRA increment over the next and last 10 years of its useful life to perhaps fund part of the library/events center/garage project. Attorney Ardaman stated the monies previously approved for the expansion of the Community Center was actually included in the plan. In respect to the library/events center that likely would require an amendment to the plan approved by the County Commission. There was a consensus that the City Attorney will confirm this.

e. Mayor Leary – No report.

Public Comments (items not on the agenda):

Stuart Bogue, 2270 Howard Drive, complimented City staff for the Pulse event held on July 12. He spoke in opposition to the type of buildings being built at Morse and 17/92 and with the light fixtures and sculptures because he did not believe they keep with the character of Winter Park.

Bea Epley, 151 N. Orlando Avenue, disagreed with the aesthetics of the buildings at Morse and 17/92. She asked that something be done with the lamp posts as they do not agree with the architecture of the buildings and is against Winter Park’s character.

Daniel Assael, 1144 Park Green Place, believed that 17/92 should be addressed as Orlando Avenue and should be thought of as a beautiful boulevard.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

__________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

__________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC
Purchases over $75,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Supply of Tampa</td>
<td>PR160307 – Inventory items for Electric Utility to continue undergrounding projects. (wire &amp; transformers)</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget. Amount: $152,930.60</td>
<td>Commission approve PR160307 to Electric Supply of Tampa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes obtained through AURSI.

Approval of contract shall constitute approval for all subsequent purchase orders made against contract
subject

Approval to execute Amendment #1 of the August 13, 2015, Quiet Zone Improvement Agreement between the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the City of Winter Park (CWP), adding $987,313 in funding by the Department (FDOT) to the Quiet Zone (QZ) Project with no additional funding match required from the Agency (CWP).

motion | recommendation

Approve

background

On June 8, 2015, the City Commission approved execution of the FDOT Quiet Zone Agreement allocating no more than $710,900 as the City’s match.

After FDOT bid negotiations, construction costs exceeded the estimates upon which our Agreement was based.

On June 29, 2016, FDOT allocated additional funds of $987,313, with no additional City match-dollars required to complete QZ upgrades at all of the railroad crossings initially listed in Exhibit B of our Agreement.

alternatives | other considerations

N/A

fiscal impact

None
The terms of the original Quiet Zone Improvement Agreement (herein “Original Agreement”) between the STATE OF FLORIDA and the CITY OF WINTER PARK for the Project referred to as Quiet Zones for SunRail within the city limits of Winter Park, executed on August 13, 2015, are hereby amended as follows:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the AGENCY, by Resolution, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit “D”, and made a part hereof, has authorized its officers to execute this Agreement on its behalf; and

WHEREAS, The DEPARTMENT is prepared in accordance with its Adopted Five Year Work Program, to undertake and complete the project described as the design and construction of Quiet Zone Improvements, in Fiscal Year 2016/2017, which project is identified as FM# 436014-1-52-08 (the “Project” or “Quiet Zone Improvements”); and

WHEREAS, in order to accomplish the Quiet Zone Improvements the DEPARTMENT will design and construct the work described in Exhibit “A-1” and “A-2” hereto and the cost for said work will be allocated consistent with Exhibit “B” attached hereto.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived from the joint participation of the Amended Agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. Paragraph 3 of the Original Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and is replaced by the following:

   3. Except for work required on roadways designated as a State Road, the AGENCY shall perform necessary preliminary engineering, prepare any and all design plans, perform the construction, acquire any necessary right of way, provide all necessary engineering supervision, and otherwise perform all other necessary work, for roadway work that is associated with the Quiet Zone Improvement. The AGENCY will conduct roadway work, herein “civil work”, directly associated with and necessary for the Quiet Zone construction. The AGENCY agrees to bear the costs associated with the civil work that is undertaken by the AGENCY. All civil work undertaken and completed by the AGENCY must meet all technical, legal and industry standards to allow the Quiet Zone Improvements to be put into service. All civil work undertaken by the AGENCY shall be completed in accordance with the specific requirements set forth herein below. The DEPARTMENT shall be entitled to be advised of the progress of the Project at reasonable intervals upon request.
2. Paragraph 5 of the Original Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and is replaced by the following:

5. Contribution by the AGENCY of the funds for the Quiet Zone Improvement Project shall be made as follows:

   (A) The Parties agree the estimated total cost of all work required for the Quiet Zone Improvements is $2,313,845.00 (Two Million Three Hundred Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Forty Five Dollars and 00/100), herein “Project Estimate” for the Quiet Zone Improvements. To assist the AGENCY with funding for the Quiet Zone Improvements, the DEPARTMENT is prepared to provide, $1,643,530.00 (One Million Six Hundred Forty Three Thousand Five Hundred Thirty Dollars and No/100). The DEPARTMENT’S performance and obligation to construct the Project is contingent upon an annual appropriation by the Florida Legislature. The parties agree that in the event funds are not appropriated to the DEPARTMENT for the Project, this Agreement may be terminated, which shall be effective upon the DEPARTMENT giving written notice to the AGENCY to that effect. Upon termination of this Agreement, the DEPARTMENT shall return to AGENCY all unexpended AGENCY funds in a reasonable time.

   (B) The AGENCY has previously furnished the DEPARTMENT an advance deposit in the amount of $670,315.00 (Six Hundred Seventy Thousand Three Hundred Fifteen Dollars and No/100). Deposit of the Agency’s funds have been made to the Department of Financial Services, Division of Treasury as Escrow Agent pursuant to the terms of a Three Party Escrow Agreement entered into on August 21, 2015. The DEPARTMENT will utilize the cash deposit from the AGENCY for payment of the cost of the Quiet Zone Improvements as described in Exhibit A hereto.

   (C) The AGENCY will provide roadway construction work associated with and necessitated by the Quiet Zone construction work, herein referred to as “civil work”. The civil work required for each crossing is described in Exhibit “A-2” as “to be constructed by Locals” on said Exhibit. The AGENCY agrees that it, through its construction staff or through a qualified contractor, it will provide for all civil work, including providing maintenance of traffic services concerning the same. The AGENCY shall coordinate construction work to be provided by its construction staff directly with the DEPARTMENT. The DEPARTMENT agrees to coordinate its Project construction activities with the AGENCY and to work in good faith with the AGENCY to generate a reasonable Project construction schedule to incorporate the AGENCY’s construction work under this paragraph. In the event of Project delays, the DEPARTMENT and AGENCY agrees to work in good faith to make scheduling changes (including reasonable time extensions and resequencing of work) to accommodate any Project delays. The AGENCY shall assure that all AGENCY staff and contractors working within the SunRail corridor have full and adequate training, including but not limited to, (Roadway Worker Protection Training,) as determined by the DEPARTMENT to work within the corridor and shall further assure that AGENCY provides Railroad Protective Liability Insurance at the levels described in Exhibit “C” hereto. Additionally, the AGENCY shall provide Commercial General Liability Insurance in the type and amounts also described in Exhibit “C” hereto.

   (D) Both parties further agree that in the event the Quiet Zone Improvements are not constructed or this Agreement is terminated prior to commencement of construction of the Project, the funds provided by the AGENCY for construction of the Quiet Zone Improvements will be returned to the AGENCY in a reasonable time.
(E) If the bid amount for the Quiet Zone Improvements is in excess of the Project Estimate amount, the DEPARTMENT shall provide the AGENCY with an opportunity to reduce the scope of the Project as said scope is described in Exhibit “A-1” and “A-2” so that the bid amount is reduced to an acceptable amount to the AGENCY. Alternatively, the AGENCY may opt out of the Project completely. In the alternative, the AGENCY may also elect to secure additional funding to meet the Project costs and if an additional deposit is necessary, the AGENCY will provide an additional deposit within fourteen (14) calendar days of notification from the DEPARTMENT or prior to posting of the accepted bid, whichever is earlier. Should the AGENCY opt out of the Project, the DEPARTMENT shall refund the AGENCY the full deposit amount in a reasonable time upon receiving written notice by the AGENCY that it is opting out of the Project.

(F) If the accepted bid amount for the Quiet Zone Improvements is less than the advance deposit amount, the DEPARTMENT will refund the amount that the advance deposit exceeds the bid amount if such refund is requested by the AGENCY in writing. The DEPARTMENT shall provide AGENCY the refund in a reasonable time. If the refund is not requested, the excess funds will be returned to the AGENCY at the completion of the Project.

(G) Should Project modifications or changes to bid items occur that increase the costs of the Quiet Zone Improvements, the AGENCY will be notified by the DEPARTMENT accordingly. The AGENCY agrees to provide, without delay, in advance of the Quiet Zone work being performed, adequate funds, not to exceed $40,585.00 (Forty Thousand Five Hundred Eighty Five Dollars and 00/100), to ensure that cash on deposit with the DEPARTMENT is sufficient to fully fund the Quiet Zone Improvements. The DEPARTMENT shall notify the AGENCY as soon as it becomes apparent the actual costs will overrun the award amount; however, failure of the DEPARTMENT to so notify the AGENCY shall not relieve the AGENCY from its obligation to pay for its full participation during the Project and on final accounting as provided herein below. However, should Project modifications or changes to bid items increase the costs in excess of the $40,585.00 (Forty Thousand Five Hundred Eighty Five Dollars and 00/100) and the Local Agency decides not to provide the additional funding, the Scope will be reduced to match the funding available.

H) The DEPARTMENT intends to have its final and complete accounting of all costs incurred in connection with the work performed hereunder within three hundred sixty days (360) of final payment to the Contractor. The DEPARTMENT considers the Project complete when the final payment has been made to the Contractor, not when the construction work is complete. All Project cost records and accounts shall be subject to audit by a representative of the AGENCY for a period of three (3) years after final close out of the Project. The AGENCY will be notified of the final cost of the Quiet Zone Improvements. Both parties agree that in the event the final accounting of total costs for the Quiet Zone Improvements pursuant to the terms of this Agreement is less than the total deposits to date, a refund of the excess plus accrued interest will be made by the DEPARTMENT to the AGENCY. If the final accounting is not performed within three hundred and sixty (360) days, the AGENCY is not relieved from its obligation to pay.

I) In the event the final accounting of total Project costs is greater than the total deposits plus accrued interest to date, the AGENCY will pay the additional amount within forty (40) calendar days from the date of the invoice from the DEPARTMENT. The AGENCY agrees to pay interest at a rate as established pursuant to Florida Statutes, Section 55.03, on any invoice not paid within forty (40) calendar days until the invoice is paid.

J) The DEPARTMENT and the AGENCY agree that the payment shall be an asset of the DEPARTMENT for the cost of the work.
K) Contact Persons:

**Florida Department of Transportation**

Teresa R. Hutson  
Program Coordinator  
719 South Woodland Boulevard, MS 4-520  
De Land, Florida 32720  
PH: (386) 943-5486  
teresa.hutson@dot.state.fl.us

**Agency**

Lena O. Petersen  
Construction Project and Grant Manager  
401 Park Avenue South  
Winter Park, Florida 32789-4386  
PH: (407) 599-3225  
lpetersen@cityofwinterpark.org

3. Exhibit “A”, Scope of Services, is hereby deleted and replaced with Attachment “1” to this Amendment. Attachment “1” includes Exhibits “A-1” and “A-2”.

4. Exhibit “B”, Summary of Estimated Bid Prices for Quiet Zone Improvements”, is hereby deleted and replaced with Attachment #2 to this Amendment.

5. Exhibit “C”, Insurance Requirements, replaces Exhibit “C” Resolution, and is attached hereto as Attachment #3.


7. Except as hereby modified, amended or changed, all of the terms and conditions of the Original Agreement thereto will remain in full force and effect.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused these presents be executed, the day and year first above written.

CITY OF WINTER PARK

By: ____________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: ____________________________

Attest:

By: ____________________________

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: ____________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: ____________________________

Attest:

By: ____________________________

Executive Secretary

Legal Review:

City Attorney: Approved as to Form

Legal Review:

Financial Provisions Approval by Department of Comptroller on:
Attachment “1”

Exhibit “A-1”

Scope of Services
FM#: 436014-1-52-08
Winter Park Quiet Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>622152P</td>
<td>785.08</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Ave/Webster</td>
<td>Remove existing Gate and Cant located in SE Quad. Install 2 new vehicle entrance gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, bells and track number signs. Install 1 new vehicle gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights. Install 2 new vehicle exit gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs. 2 new 8x8 main and 6x6 remote crossing bungalows (remotes not shown in plans), both with XP4 9-slot including 2 GE IXC-20S Personality Modules or approved equal, 2 GE XIP-20B Interface Panels and Mounting Brackets or approved equal, 2 GE XTI-1S Personality Modules or approved equal, and 1 GE VIO-86S Personality Module or approved equal. 40A rectifier for G/B and 360AH batteries. New cable, power, and recorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622153W</td>
<td>785.41</td>
<td>N. New York Ave.</td>
<td>Install 2 new vehicle exit gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in NE and SW quadrants. Install 1 new GE IXC-20S Personality Modules or approved equal, 1 GE XIP-20B Interface Panels and Mounting Brackets or approved equal. Upgrade 20A G/B rectifier to 40A and 360AH batteries. Relocate Ped gates in NE &amp; SW Quad and add gate tip lights. Plans call for rotation of existing entrance gates but not possible on combo units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622154D</td>
<td>785.45</td>
<td>W. Canton Ave.</td>
<td>Install 2 new vehicle exit gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in NW and SE quadrants. Install new 8x8 crossing bungalow, with XP4 9-slot including 2 GE IXC-20S Personality Modules or approved equal, 2 GE XIP-20B Interface Panels and Mounting Brackets or approved equal, 2 GE XTI-1S Personality Modules or approved equal, and 1 GE VIO-86S Personality Module or approved equal. 40A rectifier for G/B and 360AH batteries. 20A rectifier for existing 2 ped gates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622164J</td>
<td>W. Fairbanks Ave.</td>
<td>Install 2 new vehicle exit gates assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in NW and SE quadrants. Relocate existing vehicle gates with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in the SW and NE quadrants. Install 1 new GE IXC-20S Personality Modules or approved equal and 1 GE XIP-20B Interface Panels and Mounting Brackets or approved equal. Upgrade 20A G/B rectifier to 40A and 360AH batteries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622166X</td>
<td>Holt Ave.</td>
<td>Install 2 new vehicle exit gate assembly with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck sign, and track number sign in the SE and NW quadrants. Replace existing track number sign on existing west vehicle gate. Relocate existing vehicle gate with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, Bell and track number signs in the SE quadrant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622165R</td>
<td>S. Pennsylvania Ave.</td>
<td>Install 2 new vehicle exit gate assemblies with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in the SW and NE quadrants. Relocate existing vehicle gates with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, Bell and track number signs in the SE quadrant. Existing 8x8 main and new 8x8 remote crossing bungalows, both with XP4 9-slot including 2 GE IXC-20S Personality Modules or approved equal, 2 GE XIP-20B Interface Panels and Mounting Brackets or approved equal, 2 GE XTI-1S Personality Modules or approved equal, and 1 GE VIO-86S Personality Module or approved equal. 40A rectifier for G/B and 360AH batteries. New cable, power, and recorders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622169T</td>
<td>US 17/92</td>
<td>Install electronic bell on NW quadrant gate assembly (Not shown in plans) Install vehicle exit gate assembly with flashers, gate tip lights, crossbuck signs, and track number signs in the NE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED BID PRICES FOR QUIET ZONE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossing Name</th>
<th>Signal Improvement Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Ave. &amp; Webster Ave.</td>
<td>$562,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New York Ave.</td>
<td>$268,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Ave.</td>
<td>$473,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Ave.</td>
<td>$270,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Ave. &amp; Holt Ave.</td>
<td>$547,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 17-92</td>
<td>$191,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,313,845</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                |                             |
|                                | FDOT Funds                  |
|                                | ($1,643,530)                |
|                                | Prior Local Funds Deposited |
|                                | ($670,315)                  |
| **Total Additional Funds**      | **-$0-**                    |

Attachment “2”

Exhibit “B”

Estimate
FM#: 436014-1-52-08
Attachment “3”

Exhibit “C”

Insurance Requirements

FM#: 436014-1-52-08

QUIET ZONE IMPROVEMENTS

7-13 Insurance.

7-13.1 Workers’ Compensation Insurance: Provide Workers’ Compensation Insurance in accordance with Florida’s Workers’ Compensation law for all employees. If subletting any of the work, ensure that the subcontractor(s) have Workers’ Compensation Insurance for their employees in accordance with Florida’s Workers’ Compensation law. If using “leased employees” or employees obtained through professional employer organizations (“PEO’s”), ensure that such employees are covered by Workers’ Compensation insurance through the PEO’s or other leasing entities. Ensure that any equipment rental agreements that include operators or other personnel who are employees of independent Contractors, sole proprietorships or partners are covered by insurance required under Florida’s Workers’ Compensation law.

7-13.2 Commercial General Liability Insurance: Carry Commercial General Liability insurance providing continuous coverage for all work or operations performed under the Contract. Such insurance shall be no more restrictive than that provided by the latest occurrence form edition of the standard Commercial General Liability Coverage Form (ISO Form CG 00 01) as filed for use in the State of Florida. Cause the Department, the Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission, Volusia County, Seminole County, Orange County, Osceola County, and City of Orlando, each in the State of Florida, to be each made an Additional Insured as to such insurance. Such coverage shall be on an “occurrence” basis and shall include Products/Completed Operations coverage. The coverage afforded to the Department as an Additional Insured shall be primary as to any other available insurance and shall not be more restrictive than the coverage afforded to the Named Insured. The limits of coverage shall not be less than $1,000,000 for each occurrence and not less than a $5,000,000 annual general aggregate, inclusive of amounts provided by an umbrella or excess policy. The limits of coverage described herein shall apply fully to the work or operations performed under the Contract, and may not be shared with or diminished by claims unrelated to the contract. The policy/ies and coverage described herein may be subject to a deductible. Pay all deductibles as required by the policy. No policy/ies or coverage described herein may contain or be subject to a Retention or a Self-Insured Retention. Prior to the
execution of the Contract, and at all renewal periods which occur prior to final acceptance of the work, the Department shall be provided with an ACORD Certificate of Liability Insurance reflecting the coverage described herein. The Department shall be notified in writing within ten days of any cancellation, notice of cancellation, lapse, renewal, or proposed change to any policy or coverage described herein. The Department’s approval or failure to disapprove any policy/ies, coverage, or ACORD Certificates shall not relieve or excuse any obligation to procure and maintain the insurance required herein, nor serve as a waiver of any rights or defenses the Department may have.

7-13.3 Insurance Required for Construction at Railroads: When the Contract includes the construction of a railroad grade crossing, railroad overpass or underpass structure, or any other work or operations within the limits of the railroad right-of-way, including any encroachments thereon from work or operations in the vicinity of the railroad right-of-way, you shall, in addition to the insurance coverage required pursuant to 7-13.2 above, procure and maintain Railroad Protective Liability Coverage (ISO Form CG 00 35) where the Department is the Named Insured, and the Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission, Volusia County, Seminole County, Orange County, Osceola County, and City of Orlando, each in the State of Florida, are each an Additional Insured, and where the limits are not less than $2,000,000 combined single limit for bodily injury and/or property damage per occurrence, and with an annual aggregate limit of not less than $6,000,000. Prior to the execution of the Contract, and at all renewal periods which occur prior to final acceptance of the work, the Department shall be provided with an ACORD Certificate of Liability Insurance reflecting the coverage described herein. The insurance described herein shall be maintained through final acceptance of the work. The Department shall be notified in writing within ten days of any cancellation, notice of cancellation, renewal, or proposed change to any policy or coverage described herein. The Department’s approval or failure to disapprove any policy/ies, coverage, or ACORD Certificates shall not relieve or excuse any obligation to procure and maintain the insurance required herein, nor serve as a waiver of any rights the Department may have.

7-13.4 Insurance for Protection of Utility Owners: When the Contract involves work on or in the vicinity of utility-owned property or facilities, the utility shall be added along with the Department, the Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission, Volusia County, Seminole County, Orange County, Osceola County, and City of Orlando, each in the State of Florida, to be each made an Additional Insured on the policy/ies procured pursuant to subsection 7-13.2 above.
Exhibit “D”

Resolution
FM#436014-1-52-08
**motion | recommendation**

Approval to execute Interlocal Agreement between Seminole County and the City of Winter Park for Tanglewood Canal Drainage Improvements Preliminary Evaluation and Basis of Design Report.

**background**

The Tanglewood Canal is a shared drainage ditch between unincorporated Seminole County and the City of Winter Park. It is located at the northeastern City limits along N. Lakemont Avenue and Arbor Park Drive. The contributing drainage basin includes two Winter Park residential neighborhoods as well as Seminole County neighborhoods east of the City limits. One of the Winter Park neighborhoods is located north of the Glen Haven Cemetery and is bordered by Howell Branch Road, Madeline Avenue, N Lakemont Avenue, and Magnolia Avenue. The other is south of the Glen Haven Cemetery, bordered by Hibiscus Avenue, Sunset Drive, Pine Avenue and Arbor Park Drive. Flood relief for the Tanglewood Canal is reliant upon two drain wells located in the N Lakemont right-of-way and ultimately flows south and east into a larger drainage basin which flows through the Interlachen Golf Course.

In recent years Winter Park and Seminole County have experienced localized flooding in these neighborhoods during rainfall events of extreme intensities. City and County Engineers have identified the drain wells and the Tanglewood Canal as a possibility for drainage improvements in these areas and have agreed to partner in a study for a solution.

In 2015 the Lakes and Waterways Advisory Board and the City Commission approved funding for the study from the Stormwater Utility capital improvement funds.

**alternatives | other considerations**

Do not approve agreement.

**fiscal impact**

Not to exceed Forty-Nine thousand, Forty Six dollars and Sixty Cents ($49,046.60) (fifty percent (50%) of the total cost of the study). Funded by the Stormwater CIP.
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN
SEMINOLE COUNTY AND THE CITY OF WINTER PARK
FOR TANGLEWOOD CANAL DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS
PRELIMINARY EVALUATION AND BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT

THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and between Seminole County, a charter county and political subdivision of the State of Florida, whose address is Seminole County Services Building, 1101 East 1st Street, Sanford, Florida 32771-1468, in this Agreement referred to as "COUNTY," and the CITY OF WINTER PARK, a Florida municipal corporation, whose address is 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida 32789-4386, in this Agreement referred to as "CITY."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, both COUNTY and CITY are concerned and interested in establishing a hydraulic and hydrologic basin model for the Tanglewood Canal drainage basin area located along the boundary of COUNTY and CITY; and

WHEREAS, COUNTY and CITY have determined that a preliminary evaluation and basis of design report ("Study"), as more specifically defined in Section 3 below, should be conducted on the Tanglewood Canal drainage basin area located along the boundary of COUNTY and CITY; and

WHEREAS, COUNTY has obtained a scope of work and estimated budget breakdown for the Study from Applied Sciences Consulting, Inc. ("Applied Sciences"); and

WHEREAS, CITY has reviewed the scope of work and estimated budget prepared by Applied Sciences and determined that CITY is willing to enter an agreement with COUNTY to pay fifty percent (50%) of the total fees for the Study; and
WHEREAS, CITY will reimburse COUNTY fifty percent (50%) of the total cost of the Study as payment for services rendered by Applied Sciences; and

WHEREAS, COUNTY will pay Applied Sciences the balance of the total cost of the Study; and

WHEREAS, entering this Interlocal Agreement is in the best interest of the citizens of CITY and COUNTY as it will benefit the health, safety and welfare of such citizens.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual understandings and agreements set forth in this Agreement, CITY and COUNTY agree as follows:

Section 1. Recitals. The recitals, above, are true and form a material part of this Interlocal Agreement.

Section 2. Purpose. The purpose of this Interlocal Agreement is to establish the terms and conditions for reimbursement for the cost of the Study.

Section 3. Study. The term "Study" is defined in this Agreement to mean the preliminary evaluation and basis of design report for establishing a hydraulic and hydrologic basin model for the Tanglewood Canal drainage area basin located along the boundary of COUNTY and CITY to be prepared by Applied Sciences. The parties agree that the total cost of the Study will not exceed Ninety-Eight Thousand Ninety-Three Dollars and Twenty Cents ($98,093.20).

Section 4. Term. This Interlocal Agreement will commence and become effective upon execution by the parties, the later date of execution controlling. This Interlocal Agreement will remain in force from the date of execution until Applied Sciences has been paid in full by COUNTY for the total cost of the Study, with CITY having paid COUNTY its fifty percent (50%) share of the total cost consistent with Section 5 below.
Section 5. Obligations of CITY. CITY shall pay COUNTY fifty percent (50%) of the total cost of the Study, provided CITY’s share may not exceed Forty-Nine Thousand Forty-Six Dollars and Sixty Cents ($49,046.60). CITY shall reimburse COUNTY for its fifty percent (50%) share as COUNTY sends quarterly invoices pursuant to Section 6 below.

Section 6. Obligations of COUNTY. Likewise, COUNTY shall pay fifty percent (50%) of the total cost of the Study. Within thirty (30) days of the end of each calendar quarter, COUNTY shall submit an invoice to CITY at the following address describing and evidencing services rendered by Applied Sciences for the Study during such quarter, and the actual cost associated with those services:

Assistant Director/City Engineer  
City of Winter Park  
401 Park Avenue South  
Winter Park, Florida 32789-4386

Within thirty (30) days after receipt of an invoice, CITY shall pay COUNTY its fifty percent (50%) share, provided both parties have reviewed and approved the invoice. CITY shall acknowledge COUNTY’s Engineering Division by email of invoice acceptance and approval for payment. CITY’s payment must be sent to:

Director of County Finance  
Seminole County Board of County Commissioners  
PO Box Drawer Q  
Sanford, Florida 32772-0869

Section 7. Termination. This Interlocal Agreement may be terminated, in whole or in part, by either party at any time, with or without cause, upon not less than sixty (60) days written notice delivered to the other party. However, any obligations under this Interlocal Agreement incurred prior to the termination date will survive the termination and be performed or paid, as the case may be.
Section 8. Indemnification. Neither party to this Interlocal Agreement, nor its officers, employees and agents may be deemed to assume any liability for the acts, omissions and negligence of the other party, its officers, employees and agents.

Section 9. Assignments. Neither party to this Interlocal Agreement may assign this Interlocal Agreement, nor any interest arising under it, without the written consent of the other party.

Section 10. Notices. Whenever either party desires to give written notice to the other party, notice may be sent to:

FOR CITY:

Assistant Director/City Engineer
City of Winter Park
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, Florida 32789-4386

FOR COUNTY:

Public Work Department
20 West County Home Drive
Sanford Florida 32773

Either of the parties may change, by written notice as provided in this Agreement, the addresses or persons for receipt of notices.

Section 11. Compliance with Laws and Regulations. In providing all services pursuant to this Interlocal Agreement, the parties shall abide by all statutes, ordinances, rules, and regulations pertaining to, or regulating the provisions of, such services, including those now in effect and hereafter adopted.

Section 12. Employee Status. Persons employed by CITY in the performance of services and functions pursuant to this Agreement are deemed not to be the employees or agents
of COUNTY, nor do these employees have any claims to pensions, worker's compensation, unemployment compensation, civil service or other employee rights or privileges granted to COUNTY's officers and employees either by operation of law or by COUNTY. Persons employed by COUNTY in the performance of services and functions pursuant to this Agreement are deemed not to be the employees or agents of CITY, nor do these employees have any claims to pensions, worker's compensation, unemployment compensation, civil service or other employee rights or privileges granted to CITY's officers and employees either by operation of law or by CITY.

Section 13. Governing Law. The laws of the State of Florida govern the validity, enforcement and interpretation of this Agreement. Seminole County is the sole venue for any legal action in connection with this Agreement.

Section 14. Parties Bound. This Agreement is binding upon and inures to the benefit of CITY and COUNTY, and their successors and assigns.

Section 15. Conflict of Interest.

(a) Each party agrees that it shall not engage in any action that would create a conflict of interest in the performance of its obligations pursuant to this Agreement with the other party or which would violate or cause third parties to violate the provisions of Part III, Chapter 112, Florida Statutes (2016), as this statute may be amended from time to time, relating to ethics in government.

(b) Each party hereby certifies that no officer, agent or employee of that party has any material interest (as defined in Section 112.312(15), Florida Statutes (2016), as the statute may be amended from time to time, as over 5%) either directly or indirectly, in the business of the
other party to be conducted here, and that no such person will have any such interest at any time during the term of this Agreement.

(c) Each party has the continuing duty to report to the other party any information that indicates a possible violation of this Section.

Section 16. Dispute Resolution. Either party to this Agreement may notify the other party that it wishes to commence formal dispute resolution with respect to any unresolved problem under this Agreement. The parties agree to submit the dispute to a Florida Bar Certified Circuit Court Civil Mediator for mediation, within sixty (60) days following the date of this notice. In the event that any dispute cannot be resolved by mediation, it may be filed as a civil action in the Circuit Court of the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit of Florida, in and for Seminole County, Florida. The parties further agree that any such action will be tried to the Court, and the parties hereby waive the right to jury trial as to such action.

Section 17. Entire Agreement.

(a) It is understood and agreed that the entire agreement of the parties is contained in this Agreement, which supersedes all oral agreements, negotiations, and previous agreements between the parties relating to the subject matter of this Agreement.

(b) Any alterations, amendments, deletions, or waivers of the provisions of this Agreement will be valid only when expressed in writing and duly signed by both parties, except as otherwise specifically provided in this Agreement.

Section 18. Severability. If any provision of this Agreement or the application of this Agreement to any person or circumstance is held invalid, it is the intent of the parties that the invalidity will not affect other provisions or applications of this Agreement which can be given
effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Agreement are declared severable.

(a) CITY and COUNTY acknowledge each other's obligations under Article 1, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter 119, Florida Statutes (2016) as this statute may be amended from time to time, to release public records to members of the public upon request. CITY and COUNTY acknowledge each other is required to comply with Article 1, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter 119, Florida Statutes (2016), as this statute may be amended from time to time, in the handling of the materials created under this Agreement and that this statute controls over the terms of this Agreement.

(b) Failure to comply with this Section will be deemed a material breach of this Agreement, for which the non-breaching party may terminate this Agreement immediately upon written notice to the breaching party.

Section 20. Equal Opportunity Employment. CITY and COUNTY agree that they shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment for work under this Agreement because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin. CITY and COUNTY shall take steps to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin. This provision must include, but is not limited to, the following: employment; upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship.

Section 21. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts each of which, when executed and delivered, constitutes an original, but all counterparts together constitute one and the same instrument.
Section 22. **Headings and Captions.** All headings and captions contained in this Agreement are provided for convenience only, do not constitute a part of this Agreement and may not be used to define, describe, interpret or construe any provision of this Agreement.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF,** the parties have made and executed this Agreement for the purposes stated above.

**ATTEST:**

CITY OF WINTER PARK

By: ________________________________

Steve Leary, Mayor

Date: ________________________________

**ATTEST:**

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: ________________________________

John Horan, Chairman

Date: ________________________________

For the use and reliance of Seminole County only.

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency.

___________________________

County Attorney

DGS/dre

07/11/16
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May 17, 2016

Mr. Roland Raymundo, P.E., CFM
Seminole County Public Works Department-Engineering Division
100 E 1st Street, Sanford FL 32771

RE: TANGLEWOOD CANAL DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS – PRELIMINARY EVALUATION AND BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT (BODR)
PS No: PS-8146-12/JVP

Dear Mr. Raymundo:

I am pleased to submit herewith our scope of work and estimated budget breakdown for the Tanglewood Canal Drainage Improvements – Preliminary Evaluation and Basis of Design Report (BODR).

We sincerely appreciate this opportunity to provide professional services for this project. If you have any questions concerning this proposal, or if there’s anything else we can assist you with, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Elie G. Araj, P.E., D.WRE
Principal Engineer
"EXHIBIT – A"

Seminole County Public Works Department

DATE: May 17, 2016

Work Order No:
PS No: PS-8146-12/JVP

PROJECT TITLE: TANGLEWOOD CANAL DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS – PRELIMINARY EVALUATION AND BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT (BODR)

SUMMARY:

The Seminole County Public Works Department (County) is requesting the assistance of an Engineering Firm (ENGINEER) to provide engineering services to develop a Basis of Design Report (BODR) for the Tanglewood Canal Drainage Improvements Project. The purpose of the project is to establish a hydraulic and hydrologic basin model for the Tanglewood Canal drainage basin area located along the boundary line of Orange and Seminole County, along with the development of design alternatives to alleviate recurrent flooding concerns and to improve water quality in the Econ Basin. The County will need basin modeling for the proposed storm sewer and conveyance system upgrades associated with the proposed Tanglewood Canal drainage improvements, alternatives probable cost estimates, and a BODR. This Work Order is being executed under Master Agreement for Professional Services (PS-8146-12/JVP) between Seminole County and Applied Sciences Consulting, Inc.

The ENGINEER will provide the following services including: Basin modeling for the system that includes the project area; conceptual stormwater system development; level of service analysis; and the preparation of a Basis of Design Report (BODR) that will include the preliminary ENGINEER’s Opinion of Probable Construction Cost of the proposed alternatives and recommendation. Limited topographic survey, structure, and stormwater system survey needed for basin modeling will be provided by the County as requested by the ENGINEER. The BODR will be the final deliverable for this work order.
SCOPE OF WORK:

Task 1 – Project Kick-off and Management

A. Project Setup: The Engineer will develop project documents and filing systems for the project that will include, project set-up, Project Management Plan, QA/QC Plan, hard and electronic files, sub-contract agreements and conduct an internal kick-off meeting.

B. Kick off Meeting: Conduct a project Kick-Off Meeting with the project team and County Staff to review project goals, scope of work, project schedule, communication protocol and administrative issues. Associated entities include the County’s Stormwater Project Manager and the City of Winter Park. Following the meeting, the Engineer will prepare summary meeting notes and distribute to the attendees.

C. Status Reports and Project Administration: The Engineer will provide monthly status reports of the progress of this scope of work to accompany monthly invoices and administer the project.

D. Project Team Meetings: The Engineer will conduct monthly internal design team meetings throughout the duration of this project. Six (6) meetings are anticipated.

E. SJRWMD Pre-Application Meeting: Set up, and conduct a pre-application meeting with the St. John River Water Management District (SJRWMD) to discuss the project and determine permitting requirements and feasibility of proposed alternatives. Those findings and minutes will be included in the BODR. No permitting is included in this Scope of Services.

Task 2 – Basis of Design Report (BODR)

A. Data Collection: The Engineer will review pertinent background information provided by the County to assist in the development of the model. The County will provide any existing modeling information, atlas sheets, available as-builts and ERP information previously collected by the County along with associated shape files and attribute data. Engineer will provide the County with a hard drive with sufficient available memory to receive all said data.

B. Data Review and Analysis: The Engineer will review the acquired data and incorporate information as necessary into the BODR. This review will also include: stormwater inventory review, stormwater review and analysis, permitting requirements, and other geographic information as available. Engineer will inform the County of any gaps in the available data that may need to be supplemented with field surveying. The County will be responsible for any needed surveying for the project.
C. Stormwater System Development – Existing Conditions: The Engineer will develop a hydrologic and hydraulic model that represents the existing conditions and conveyances for the project area obtained from the information made available by the County. The subbasin area covers approximately 161 acres as shown in Figure 1. The drainage subbasin area is bounded by Howell Branch Road to the north, Lake Howell Road to the east, Palmer Avenue to the south, and Sunset Drive to the west.

Figure 1. Tanglewood Canal Subbasin Area

Preparation of the existing conditions model will include:

i. Catchment delineation: The basis for the delineations will be information from the County’s Stormwater Atlas, the Digital Elevation Model (DEM), a review of ERP data provided by the County, as-builts drawings for CIP projects provided by the County, the latest aerials provided by the County. Land use and soils coverage for CN calculations will be verified by review of this data. This modeling effort will utilize AdICPR Ver.3 to develop the required hydrologic and hydraulic model.
ii. Junction – Reach Connectivity setup: Conveyance pipes that are 18-inch or larger in diameter will be modeled. Known elliptical pipes of an equivalent 18-inch size or bigger will also be included in the hydraulic model. Nodes will be set up only at junctions were the conveyance (e.g. pipe to ditch) or pipe size changes. All conduits entered from information extracted from ERP records and as-builts will be highlighted on future plans. Stage-Storage information will be input in the model rounded to one-foot increments. Once the model hydrologic and hydraulic data is set-up, the junction and reach feature classes for the study area will be updated such that the information can be easily incorporated for the entire study area. The metadata used for setting up the model will be preserved for future reference. The model will be set in NAVD88 with a cross reference to any NGVD29 elevations used from surveys or existing data.

iii. Model Calibration and Verification: The model for this area will be verified to the extent possible using available measured data for at least one storm event, within the budgeted timeframe and allocated resources for this task effort. The hydrologic data needed for calibration will be provided by the County (rainfall intensities, high water marks, stream gauges discharge or stage readings, etc.) Model calibration may consider water stages, volumes, and time of occurrence, as made available by the County. The model simulation results will be assessed for accuracy and reasonableness.

iv. Existing Condition Runs: Run the storms that are necessary for permitting requirements as determined by pre-application meetings with permitting agencies, up to three (3) storms, which are likely the 10-year/24-hour storm, 25-year/24-hour storm and the 100-year/24-hour storm.

D. Stormwater System Development – Proposed Conditions: The ENGINEER will investigate two (2) possible alternatives for solving documented flooding problems in the project area. The Engineer will run up to three (3) storms events for the proposed conditions: a 10-year/24-hour storm, a 25-year/24-hour storm and a 100-year/24-hour storm, as described above for the existing conditions. This work does not include topographic or land surveying. The model will encompass the contributing drainage basin to the project’s area in order to determine the expected runoff volumes for specified recurring storm events, and with that information, determine the recommended storm system design.

The target proposed system level of flood protection will be discussed with the County and design team and mutually agreed upon once reasonable alternatives are identified as achievable. The results of this investigation and recommendations will be incorporated into the BODR.
E. **Draft BODR:** The ENGINEER will prepare a draft BODR to confirm project design goals and design feasibility issues. A draft BODR will be prepared and submitted to the COUNTY for review. The draft BODR will include: results of data collection, stormwater review and analysis, preliminary hydraulic analysis, any alternatives needing either right-of-way acquisitions or easements requirements (if applicable), and permitting requirements. The draft BODR will not include conceptual plans but will include aerials with alternative locations.

F. **ENGINEER’s Opinion of Cost:** The ENGINEER will prepare the preliminary ENGINEER’s opinion of probable construction cost that will be included in the BODR. The estimate will contain information known and acquired at the time of the preparation of the draft report.

G. **QA/QC Review of Draft BODR:** Conduct quality assurance and quality control procedures for the draft BODR in accordance with the ENGINEER’s QA/QC Policy. This work includes: senior level review by a professional familiar with this type of work, but not directly involved with the project; documentation that review comments were addressed; and incorporation of COUNTY comments as appropriate.

H. **Submit Draft BODR:** Following modifications to the BODR based on QA/QC recommendations, submit electronic copies of the Draft BODR to the COUNTY for their review. The ENGINEER will assume comments will be received from the COUNTY within one month from the time the submittal is received, and a review meeting will be scheduled a maximum of two weeks from the date of receipt of such comments.

I. **BODR Review Meeting with COUNTY:** Conduct a review meeting with the COUNTY to discuss comments developed by COUNTY staff, provide a written summary of COUNTY comments that will need to be incorporated into the future design and develop meeting highlights and distribute to attendees. Any comments from the City of Winter Park for Cooperative Funding will be conveyed to the ENGINEER via the COUNTY. Upon agreement of modifications to the draft report, a final report will be prepared and submitted to the COUNTY.

J. **Final BODR:** The Engineer will prepare a final BODR report containing information from the design review meeting with the County.

K. **QA/QC Review of Final BODR:** Conduct quality assurance and quality control procedures for the final BODR.

L. **Submit Final BODR:** Following modifications to the draft BODR based on QA/QC recommendations, submit electronic copies signed and sealed by a Florida Licensed Professional Engineer of the final BODR.
DELIVERABLES — BODR:

1. Prepare and distribute summary meeting notes to all attendees of the Kick off Meeting.
2. One (1) each of monthly status reports with invoices.
3. Conduct one pre-application meeting at SJRWMD.
4. Electronic copy of the Draft BODR that includes the ENGINEER’s Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.
5. An electronic copy of the model that includes the data used, existing conditions, proposed conditions simulations, etc.
6. Signed and sealed electronic copies of the Final BODR that includes the ENGINEER’s Opinion of Probable Construction Cost.

COUNTY RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Provide any existing data pertaining to the project
2. Provide any needed land surveying and ROW information, including available LIDAR
3. Provide access to the site
4. Provide any other stormwater inventory information, permits, plans, or as-builts
5. Convey to the ENGINEER any comments received by County from the City of Winter Park
6. Attend meetings as required.

BUDGET:

Above scope of work will be performed on a Lump Sum basis. Other Direct Costs associated with the time and material work will be invoiced at cost.

BODR

$98,093.20

Detailed costs for the scope of work are provided separately on the attached spreadsheet as Exhibit B.
### EXHIBIT B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Senior Principal (hours)</th>
<th>Prof. Engineer (hours)</th>
<th>GIS Analyst (hours)</th>
<th>Engineer III (hours)</th>
<th>Admin Staff (hours)</th>
<th>Total Task ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROJECT KICKOFF AND MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Project Setup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$942.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kickoff Meeting and Minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,044.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Status Reports and Project Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,973.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Project Team Meetings (6 EA)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$5,278.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SJRWMD Pre-Application Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total Task 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$13,325.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT (BODR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,903.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Data Review and Analysis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$18,876.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Stormwater System Development - Existing Conditions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$16,689.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Stormwater System Development - Proposed Conditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,599.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Draft BODR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$12,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Engineer's Opinion of Cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>QA/QC Review of Draft BODR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,639.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Draft BODR Submittal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>BODR Review Meeting w/ County and City of Winter Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,262.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Final BODR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>QA/QC Review of Final BODR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Final BODR Submittal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,044.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total Task 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$83,940.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Mileage @0.445 per mile (950 miles @ $0.445)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$427.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Shipping and FedEx (at cost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Outside Reproduction Costs (at cost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total Task 4:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$827.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Hours</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$98,093.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
motion | recommendation

Approve temporary fee schedule for the Winter Park Golf Course.

background

The renovation of the golf course and the new business model have provided for an exciting new experience for our golf customers. The Golf Course Committee has recommended this new fee structure in order to meet their revenue proforma.

Staff is preparing to proceed with the sale of Partnerships, Corporate Membership and Individual Memberships upon approval of these recommended fees.

This is a temporary fee approval that will become part of the City’s Fee Schedule approved by Public Hearing in a upcoming Commission meeting effective October 1st.

alternatives | other considerations

Golf Course fees could remain at the current rates.

fiscal impact

These fee changes are projected to increase golf course revenue per the proposed proforma.
GOLF COURSE FEES (all include sales tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Proposed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Membership</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 members</td>
<td>16 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Partnership</td>
<td>20,000 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Fees (includes tax):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night scramble (36 person minimum)</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private scramble (36 person minimum)</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED FEE
### Subject

Guidelines for city proclamations

### Motion | Recommendation

Staff is recommending approval.

### Background

Proclamations are an excellent way to recognize community milestones, achievements, celebrations and initiatives. At the City Commission’s request, staff has prepared proposed guidelines that can help streamline the process and offer the appropriate recognition for these community requests.

### Alternatives | Other Considerations

Without approval of the proposed guidelines, staff will consider each request on an individual basis absent of approved guidelines in place.

### Fiscal Impact

There will be no measurable fiscal impact to the adoption of these guidelines.
Guidelines for City Proclamations

Requests for City of Winter Park proclamations must be submitted via email to the Communications Department for review and preparation at least three weeks prior to date needed.

Each request must include six to eight “whereas” statements outlining the significance of the recognition. The city has the right to grammatically edit these statements, if necessary.

Contact information, including mailing address, email and phone numbers, must be provided.

Proclamations may be presented at City Commission meetings, at special events or mailed to the entity, depending on timing, schedules and availability.

The city has the right to deny any proclamation request that does not meet the following standards.

City of Winter Park Proclamations:

Must

- support the city’s vision
- be related to or in support of a Winter Park entity, service, organization, initiative, citizen, business or club
- be presented in English

May

- create public awareness
- recognize an organizational milestone or anniversary
- recognize a resident’s milestone birthday (100 years)
- recognize national occasion
- encourage fundraising for charitable initiatives
- support arts and cultural celebrations
- acknowledge special honors relating to Winter Park citizens/employees
- recognize individuals/organizations that have made significant contributions to the city

May not

- relate to political or campaign matters
- address personal convictions
- promote commercial purposes
- promote ideological or religious beliefs
- promote events or organizations with no direct relationship to the city
subject

Permitting Process for Public Awareness Campaigns

motion | recommendation

Staff is recommending the adoption of the proposed process of permitting any public awareness campaigns which involve the posting of signs or any otherwise prohibited materials on public property.

background

In recent years it has become popular to promote private awareness campaigns with the posting of materials/signs throughout the city on public property. This activity has been in direct violation of Article IV – Section 58-34 of the city’s sign ordinance. These awareness campaigns often never receive formal approval but are deemed in the city’s best interest to allow so tacit approval is given. This lack of public policy for the placement of these campaign signs continues to create issues with our routine enforcement activity thus impacting the community’s overall quality of life.

The policy we are proposing would require the submission of an application by a registered non-profit organization affiliated with a Winter Park-based organization. Signs would be allowed to be placed for no more than 14 calendar days; with no more than two separate events occurring within 12 months by the same organization. Signs would be required to meet existing city code for size and placement. All approvals would be subject to final review by the city manager or their designee. Applications would be processed and permitted at no cost to the applicant.

An outline of the proposed policy and application is attached for your review.
alternatives | other considerations

Staff has not considered any specific alternatives to the proposed process, but is open to any considerations the commission may have. Without any action to adopt this policy the alternative would be to continue to negotiate each request as it appears.

fiscal impact

There will no measurable fiscal impact to the implementation of this policy.
**City-Permitted Public Awareness Campaign Sign Process**

**Article IV – Section 58-134 Temporary Signs.**

(a) In addition, to other signs permitted by this section, temporary signs may be permitted in accordance with the following requirements: Such temporary signs shall meet all requirements of this article except as otherwise provided in this subsection.

Must be a registered 501(c)(3) organization or with the support of a bonafied 501(c)(3) non-profit organization’s campaign. Non-profit organizations must be Winter Park-based, or affiliated with a Winter Park-based organization.

Allowed for a specific period of time not to exceed 14 successive calendar days and for not more than two individual campaigns in a 12 month period.

Must meet size and placement requirements currently found in Article IV – Section 58-134.

One larger campaign announcement sign may be placed on one property also meeting Article IV – Section 58-134. Final location to be approved by the city. Sign design and map location must be provided prior to final approval.

All campaigns must complete a city-approved application. The process shall include review by the Building Official and Code Compliance Sections for overall compliance. Appeals shall be filed with the City Manager.

Applications must be submitted 60 days prior to the planned initiation of the campaign.

All applications for this process must be approved by the City Manager or their designee.

All campaign signs must be removed or will otherwise be considered illegal signs after the approved awareness period of 14 successive calendar days, subject to the Code Compliance enforcement process.

City-intiated projects are exempt from this process.
Organization name

Organization address

Contact name

Contact email

Contact phone

Is your organization located within City of Winter Park limits? □ Yes □ No
Are you a registered 501(c)(3) organization? □ Yes □ No
If no, please list the 501(c)(3) Winter Park-based organization you are affiliated with and provide documentation in support of your campaign:

Please explain how this campaign directly impacts city residents and businesses:

Dates requested for signage display (cannot exceed 14 successive calendar days)

Specific location(s) requested

I agree to the following:

☐ I have attached a copy of the letter from the Internal Revenue Service validating our tax-exempt status as a public charity as defined in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.
☐ I have reviewed the city’s Code of Ordinances Article IV – Section 58-134.
☐ My application is being submitted 60 days prior to the planned initiation of the campaign.
☐ I agree to remove all signs immediately after the approved period expires.
☐ I am attaching an image of the sign designs I wish to display.
☐ I am attaching the required support documentation, if applicable.
☐ I am attaching a location map indicating where my signs will be displayed.

Applicant signature
subject

Petitioner’s Committee certificate of insufficiency.

motion | recommendation

Commission either approve or disapprove the certificate of insufficiency of petition.

background

Section 5.06. (b) City Charter – outlines Commission review and what takes place if a petition has been certified insufficient (highlighted).

On July 21, 2016, the Petitioner’s Committee delivered 2,256 signatures for verification. The required number was 2,011. Upon review by the Supervisor of Elections Office, it was certified that 2,043 signatures were valid. Each form had the committee’s proposed ordinance previously filed with the clerk’s office that prohibited the construction of the Winter Park Library at Martin Luther King, Jr., Park. (copy attached).

The City Clerk’s Certificate of Insufficiency of Petition was mailed to Mr. Michael Poole on Thursday, July 28, 2016 via certified mail. Mr. Poole accepted the certificate on July 30, 2016.

Since the City Clerk determined that the certificate was insufficient as stated in the certificate (attached), the Petitioner’s Committee has requested that the City Commission review the Clerk’s certificate and their petition ordinance at the next meeting of the Commission of August 8, 2016.
Other documents attached:

1) Certified meeting minutes of 10/26/15 Commission meeting.

2) Certified meeting transcription for the City Commission meeting that occurred on 10/26/15.

3) Executed copy of Bond Ordinance No. 3020-15.

4) Copy of the fully assembled petition, including circulator’s affidavit and a copy of the proposed ordinance.

5) Other communications from Mr. Poole from the date of filing the petition (7/21/16) through the present time.

6) City Charter Article V. – Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

7) Library agenda item and backup materials from the 10/26/15 City Commission Meeting.

alternatives | other considerations

fiscal impact
CITY CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF INSUFFICIENCY OF PETITION

I, Cindy Bonham, pursuant to Article V, section 5.06 of the City Charter of the City of Winter Park (the "City Charter"), do certify that the Orange County Supervisor of Elections has canvassed the petition filed before me on Thursday, July 21, 2016, regarding the prohibition of construction of the Winter Park Library at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park (the "Petition"). A true and correct copy of the Final Certification is attached as Exhibit "A." In accordance therewith, I hereby find that:

i. 2,256 signatures were submitted;

ii. 2,043 were qualified electors of the City and eligible to sign; and

iii. Said number of signatures does equal at least ten (10) percent of the total number of qualified voters registered to vote at the last regular City of Winter Park election, which number was 2011. *Reference Article V, section 5.05(a) of the City Charter.*

Moreover, in accordance with Article V, section 5.06 of the City Charter of the City of Winter Park, I reviewed the aforesaid Petition in accordance with the additional criteria as set forth in Article V, section 5.05 of the City Charter of the City of Winter Park. In accordance therewith, I have found the following insufficiencies described in particular as follows:

i. The Petition fails to include the full text of the ordinance sought to be reconsidered. Despite being labeled a citizen initiative, the Petition requires the reconsideration of City Ordinance No.: 3020-15 enacted on November 23, 2015, and the City Commission's affirmative votes to locate the library and events center in Martin Luther King, Jr. Park occurring at the City Commission meeting occurring on or about October 26, 2015. *Reference Article V, section 5.05(b) of the City Charter;*

ii. The Affidavit of Circulator fails to contain an oath or affirmation that each signer of the Petition had an opportunity before signing to read the full text of the ordinance to be reconsidered. Despite being labeled a citizen initiative, the Petition requires the reconsideration of City Ordinance No.:
3020-15 enacted on November 23, 2015, and the City Commission’s affirmative votes to locate the library and events center in Martin Luther King, Jr. Park occurring at the City Commission meeting occurring on or about October 26, 2015. Reference Article V, section 5.05(c) of the City Charter; and

iii. The Petition is untimely as it was not filed within thirty (30) days after adoption by the commission of the ordinance sought to be reconsidered. Despite being labeled a citizen initiative, the Petition requires the reconsideration of City Ordinance No.: 3020-15 enacted on November 23, 2015, and the City Commission’s affirmative votes to locate the library and events center in Martin Luther King, Jr. Park occurring at the City Commission meeting occurring on or about October 26, 2015. Reference Article V, section 5.05(d) of the City Charter.

Cynthia S. Bonham, City Clerk

Date: July 28, 2016
ORANGE COUNTY INITIATIVE
FINAL CERTIFICATION

JULY 27, 2016

I, BILL COWLES, Supervisor of Elections, Orange County, Florida, do hereby certify that

there were 2256 petitions submitted for

WINTER PARK CITIZEN INITIATIVE TO PROHIBIT CONSTRUCTION OF
THE WINTER PARK LIBRARY AT MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARK

Of that total, 2043 were qualified electors of the city and eligible to sign a petition

for this initiative. The initiative has met the petition requirement of 2011 valid signatures

needed to qualify for this ordinance.

(seal)

BILL COWLES
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS
**Action Items Requiring Discussion**

a. Library report from consultant

Library Board of Trustees President Jeff Jontz and Library Executive Director Shawn Shaffer thanked the Commission for the allowing them to explore the possibility of a new library. They spoke about the importance of having a new library, that the task force was a good decision, the two comprehensive reports they prepared on the task force findings, and thanked the numerous residents who attended the public forums and workshops.

Julie Von Weller, Aci Architects, summarized the workshops held and the user experience survey.

John Cunningham, Aci Architects, addressed the Winter Park visual character from the workshops, the exterior architecture styles considered, the concept budget, and the community visual preferences. Discussion ensued regarding the breakdown of what it would cost citizens depending on the amount of the bond, whether to have a $25 million or $30 million bond amount, and who should be educating the public during the referendum.

**Motion made by Commissioner McMacken that we accept the final report from ACi; seconded by Mayor Leary.**

**Motion made by Commissioner McMacken to approve the general location of the new Library/Civic Center as shown in the report; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel.**

**Motion made by Commissioner McMacken to direct staff to bring back an ordinance calling for a bond referendum to be held in conjunction with the City election on March 15, 2016 in an amount not to exceed $30,000,000; seconded by Mayor Leary.**

**Motion amended by Commissioner Sprinkel to make the not to exceed amount $25,000,000; seconded by Commissioner Cooper.**

The following spoke on this issue:

Joe Terranova, 151 N. Virginia Avenue, thanked everyone involved in this project. He stated we need to consider other locations because of the environmental impact to the park. He asked where this project fits into the City’s priority list.

Gary Sachek, 1034 Aloma Avenue, asked if this is the best place for the library, did not believe we need a parking garage there, and that he does not want to include the library in the same project as the civic center.

Bob Bendick, 1211 Oxford Road, spoke in favor of a new library but disagreed with the proposed location as he thought it should stay downtown.
Brooks Weiss, 1244 Via Salerno, spoke in favor of the library and civic center (and bond of $30,000,000) and of the great opportunity to set Winter Park apart.

Gene Sullivan, 2423 Via Sienna, spoke in favor of the library and the proposed location.

Barbara Chandler, 1048 Azalea Lane, spoke in favor of the library and that the library is a destination for people visiting the city.

Linda Heinl, 608 S. Phelps Avenue, spoke in favor of the library and location.

Daniel Butts, 120 W. Reading Way, spoke in favor of the library/civic center, the importance of it being a convenient destination and the great opportunity this is.

Nancy Shutts, 2010 Brandywine Drive, spoke in favor of the new library but expressed concerns with the reduction in size being proposed for the civic center and if we will lose the revenue from the civic center. She supported the $25,000,000 because of potential funding from other entities. She expressed concerns with the garage and hoped it would have sufficient spaces and could easily accommodate the elderly.

Gary Barker, Library Task Force member, commented that the task force reviewed other locations that were not City owned properties and determined the proposed location to be the best. He stated the site will be better off environmentally because of the new civic center building.

Mayor Leary explained the not to exceed amount is an “up to amount” and believed we would get donations to help fund the library/civic center.

Upon a roll call vote on the amendment to make the not to exceed amount $25,000,000, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Cooper, and McMacken voted no. Commissioner Sprinkel voted yes. The motion failed with a 4-1 vote.

Upon a roll call vote to direct staff to bring back an ordinance calling for a bond referendum to be held in conjunction with the City election on March 15, 2016 in an amount not to exceed $30,000,000, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and McMacken voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Upon a roll call vote to approve the general location of the new Library/Civic Center as shown in the report, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Sprinkel, Cooper and McMacken voted yes. Commissioner Seidel voted no. The motion carried with a 4-1 vote.

Upon a roll call vote that we accept the final report from ACi, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and McMacken voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.
Attachment 2
10-26-15 City Commission transcript regarding action Item ‘a’ – Library report from consultant:

Jeff Jontz: As president of the Board of Trustees of the Winter Park Public Library, I want to thank you all for taking this 18 month journey with us to explore the possibility of a new library. The task force was definitely a good decision. It resulted in a diverse group of our citizens a number of you are here, listening to a lot of folks in Winter Park through a number of public forums. We have prepared two comprehensive reports on the findings of the task force. I really doubt any other city in America has spent as much time and has as thorough a process just trying to decide where to put a library, not the library itself, but this has been a very careful, thorough and inclusive process. We also want to thank the hundreds of citizens who attended public forums and workshops, to those who vote and emailed and called with their thoughts and to those who sat down with us one to one at the library and there were a lot of those folks.

And we also want to thank those who may not fully agree with us but whose thoughts and concerns and ideas helped shape and improve the process and that really happened. In a few moments you will see the proposal that is a result of many months of study and public input. It has the full support of the Library Board of Trustees many of whom are here this afternoon. So I am here to give you our assurance that we are fully behind the concepts embodied in the ACI report that you are going to hear, we are fully prepared to be active and vocal advocates for the proposal and for the valid initiative to fund the multi-purpose destination that will serve every sector of this community because we really believe this may be the signature event in this decade in the City of Winter Park and the Library Board is fully prepared to support that action. Thank you.

Shawn Shaffer: Good afternoon and my thanks to Jeffrey. It has been an amazing process and I am so grateful for the opportunity to have the conversations, the community forums, and your input on this exciting project. Every time I am stopped and asked, “Are you moving the library?” It has been an opportunity to share the story about a process and the community engagement that has been involved and it is always an opportunity to share how public libraries change lives every day. As you
know, this process started long before I arrived. We started with a space study in 2002. Thanks to your creation of a task force we were able to have some serious discussions about the need for a new library building. There have been eight public workshops, countless meetings of the task force and many hours of time by staff and volunteers that got us to this important day. I have always said that I do not want a new building just to move the books to a bigger facility; that would be to build the best library of the last century. We are talking about building a library of this century for ours and future generations of Winter Park residents. The concept you will see today looks to be the jewel of the community that celebrates all that the best that Winter Park has to offer, our education, natural beauty. The new library will be flexible to allow us to evolve with the times and allow us, our children and grandchildren to smoothly transition between the needs that the future and present. People of all ages will come to prepare themselves and participate in the 21st century economy that is emerging. This new concept can be an anchor of the community enrichment corridor into Winter Park. It will be about learning and literacy, local history and a wide range of cultural opportunities with the inclusion of the civic center space. Using research from some of the nation’s most forward thinking experts you see comments from the Aspen Institute up on the screen, in libraries in cities we (inaudible) increment services and offer cutting edge materials in this new facility where people elsewhere are only beginning to talk about. Extraordinary is Winter Park’s brand. I want to show you a video that ACi did talking to some of the people who participated in the community input sessions that they facilitated. I have been so appreciative of the people who have attended these sessions over the last year and a half. As Jeffrey indicated, especially those who were not sold on the project even if they were not sure it was needed or they did not think this was the right direction, these people gave their all, they gave their time and fully participated in all the sessions. The best part is this community engagement does not end. As we move forward we will continue with our transparent process and there will be even more opportunities for community input into this facility. In keeping with the theme of this day, we have a video. VIDEO SHOWN AT THIS TIME. I want to introduce Judy VonWeller. She is the Director of Community Engagement for ACi.
Judy VonWeller: Thank you, Shawn. I think before we start, I will start taking you through this community process that we have. It is important to delineate that we have this exciting opportunity to create this new library and create this new library for Winter Park and its citizens and it think we all know as exemplified again today how unique this town is. So you have heard from the woman on the video the idea of collaboration and the need to get together and collaborate, (inaudible) actually going out into the park was fantastic. That was hands on, that’s what we need, that’s engagement, that’s involvement. I couldn’t have scripted it better if I tried, it was such a great thing to hear and I think it’s also important to note as Shawn said, not everyone came to the community workshops feeling excited about where we were and I think it was very important that we value community (inaudible), design and we were in the conceptual stages and so you are going to see back in a minute from John. But it’s very important that we value what our community thinks and improving that so that participation for a more democratic outcome was key for us, creating that sense of community, people’s attachment to their place and to each other was definitely strengthened through the three workshops and helping them to involve them in their decision making process because we took the views from many of you in this room and it is important that this continues throughout this process. So speaking on those community workshops, we see that is actually workshop 6, 7 and 8 and I just want to point out that we had more than 250 people come and participate in person and I thought it was really important that we had people that weren’t able to attend log on and be a part as well so we used Periscope for free. To make sure were engaged that we had over 700 online logins, 713 individual logins. I don’t know if this has ever happened before in the City but that is something you all should feel really proud of.

We started out by the placemaking, is what we talked about here and that’s important to notate was that before. We even talked about the building. We wanted to really explore the site that the Commission adopted as part of the recommendation from the task force and we really wanted to make sure the people understood the entire site and were able to walk it and I think she notated that happened and kind of really had a different feel once we began talking about where the site was within the site.
And for those who weren’t there briefly they were given planning chips and aerial views and were able to be hands on and collaborative in where they thought it should go. The second workshop, the building design possibilities, and community workshop was fascinating. We were able to do a visual preference study for those who attended, we took them through that, we were able to further evaluate the site and then on the third workshop we came back to the community with our initial visualization taking the cues from them and we wanted to make sure we wrote back to say whether we did right, whether we maybe could do better at to continue to refine that process. In speaking on that user experience survey, what happened at the second workshop, I know it’s hard to read up there but just want point out towards the top the description, I’ll just read it: “We asked all of the people who live there what do you use and love about the existing library and would like to see in the new space?” We just thought taking people through that exercise how they currently use the library, whatever they think needs to be improved or changed or added or maybe even taking away as we evolve into this 21st century library was very important. So we were able to take them through that, we had some user profile information that we requested from them whether it was age, gender, frequency of library use, transportation to and from, so we had some additional data to work from which I thought was really great. This is just one example. On our team we had an incredible anthropologist who was able to help us put this together and evaluate again the uses that people are currently, patterns that they use; and this is just one of many, many examples where it talks about the need for these spaces between the children’s area and the teen or tween area to be more open and flexible because you know those of you who have young children often times you have an older child as well and right now you cannot see two at the same time. So that’s just one example we wanted to give. I want to say thank you again to Shawn and what she said that this was such a wonderful process, it was transparent, it is a very complex issue for the community and we welcomed everyone who came and spoke and gave their all as Shawn said to the process and again she is absolutely correct, it does not stop the transparency and the engagement is critical for the next step. So we just want to say thank you on behalf of ACi and our team who are here today. I would love to introduce John Cunningham who is our co-founding and design partner at ACi.
John Cunningham: Good afternoon. I hope everyone can hear me. The sign in Winter Park shows you actually do everything with extraordinary care and not just drive here because we did take the time having been here for 22 years, it’s just wonderful (inaudible), once in a while create a friction, that’s fine and you know that we desire having to be absolutely impartial and be great listeners to the community and to take all this information and assemble it and bring it back and our own personal thoughts about what it should be didn’t (inaudible) even though we might be citizens but what we did was as professionals. We came back and brought forth the information that we heard from the number of participants that were involved. We wish we had more but we did have 700 online that did participate and were aware and we had hundreds of people and you saw from the video as dramatic as that seemed that’s what was really (inaudible), the people were really hands on and weren’t just reading pieces of paper together, there were a lot of words behind each one of those images. So it was really exciting and was great to be involved in that.

Another thing we brought together for the benefit of Winter Park with the approval of all of you, some of the most world class people, Project For Public Spaces, their world class thinking in terms of placemaking and those opportunities, the things they talked about in the park also affected how the library was situated and placed and with the anthropologist that we brought on board with our consultant HPS Exception and Behavior and then of course the Aspen Institute and all their great thinking and forward thinking about the library. Nothing was taken lightly here by any means.

(inaudible) visual character there was an exercise on that weekend August 22-23 about visual preference which was an orientation of character that exists in Winter Park whether it be Mediterranean, whether it be arts and crafts, whether it be modern without getting into all the details. We had 20-30 boards up in that workshop and (inaudible) exterior architectural style one being of Mediterranean character with multiple exterior/interior type views. While we talking about exterior visual preference we wanted people to see interior views so that they would have the opportunity to understand the type of experience they have on the interior as well although we were just looking for the visual of the exterior.
So then we have arts and crafts and there can be stucco, there can be wood, there is one material that is wonderful, bracket details around the arts and crafts in Winter Park. And the third being modern style forward thinking possibly have some exciting elements but also we got back some early modern elements such as the (inaudible) House and some of those types of interiors that are warm. So as this project moves forward, there is an opportunity that could have warmth and feeling of inviting.

We allowed discussion about the site and all the wonderful things that could happen not just throughout the park but also localized adjacent to the park; the activities and the types of beautification and the (inaudible) planting. And then our interior (inaudible) style we also have a visual preference for that. We had 10-15 boards for different types of spaces and we want people to understand that the interior obviously is reflected on the exterior and the opportunity to have the feeling of how open or how closed do they want the library. Some of the things that we found out were people wanted a library that was very transparent, open so that the outside was inside and the inside was outside so that being that we had the opportunity for it to be near the park or in the park or at the edge of the street but that there was the sense that when you were outside the library you knew the library...what was going on inside and inside you could appreciate the exterior.

It’s really the community visual preference and wasn’t ours because there was voting at one point where everyone came up with green dots and red dots and someone said they taking the Chicago approach and were voting early and voting often but of course that was a joke because everyone was only given a certain number of dots of green and red type that were counted out so you couldn’t vote early or vote often as someone joked and that was funny but ..... You have the modern (inaudible) picture clearly was democratically the winner. We had 108 green dots and 28 red dots. The Mediterranean we had 90 green and 27 red; close call but still clear winner and then 41 green and 34 red for the arts and crafts style so we then after that began to have the verbal discussion with the public and everyone felt comfortable with the idea of this transparency and this sense of modern and forward thinking and so that’s how we moved forward with the visual expression.
Back to the community workshop site studies. There were basically 12 designs, 12 tables and of those there were a number of reoccurring themes, four that are hard to see but 1, 2, 3 were recurring themes that helped influence the site attributes that we came to in both option A and B. One factoid before we go to Options A and B, that is the community was also very concerned. We know at the task force there was a discussion about it being a two story library. Many people in the workshops voiced the opinion that they wanted to have the least imprint on the site itself with the library, civic center and garage so if the garage was oriented on the existing parking lot, the civic center and the library took up the least amount possible so the factoid is this new facility takes up less than 1 percent of additional park space when you consider the entire park down from the old Porsche dealership, was where the sink hole is, to the Rollins softball field all up along Harper across from Morse and down Denning so less than 1 percent; .83%. That’s very important to many people, sustainability, community was very vocal on that, many citizens and others and that was important to us as well. So we painstakingly listened to that. (laughter). So the two that came out of this, recurring themes were: the idea of creating a civic presence as you come around from 17-92 because (inaudible) was always the (inaudible) gateway, we now have an opportunity to create a gateway but the ability to come up from 17-92 downwards and see some form of a civic (inaudible) across from the retail; this is the most recent plan we were given from the City of how the retail lines with the parking lot and the parking garage and were noticing this (inaudible) and there was a parking garage here, the civic center, covered outdoor (inaudible) public space that also acts as the lobby of the civic center and the library and upper amphitheater space. This represents the entire affected site area if you will and some landscaping.

We took great pains to reduce the number of trees that are affected in each scheme, tried to maintain as many of the existing trees as possible which were the ones that you see all along here. What we noticed in this scheme was the views to (inaudible) the park at large are really directional, there are east or south and not holistic and the other scheme that was talked about was that the views be really entirely in the park and the opportunity and the other thing that was important you saw someone in the video showing their
hand motioning through the idea that there is this view (inaudible) through the building and the idea of glass in (inaudible) would allow for transparency through the building because it is only about 90 feet deep. All those things were taken into account and the last discussion was is the building on the street, is it at the park, is it in the park and looking at parks all over the country and all over the world and (inaudible) public spaces and their (inaudible) and (inaudible).

It became apparent that putting the building in the park (inaudible), all the buildings for example in Central Park in New York are in the park other than the Metropolitan Museum which is on the street and if you look at it (inaudible) photograph on google it’s pretty, it looks like a growth, everything else is very organic and landscape oriented and you can’t tell that’s a tree, rock or a building from (inaudible). So we thought it was best to place it in the park so that when you came around the corner there is a civic presence and a beautiful (inaudible) and you have the opportunity for (inaudible), the building setbacks so it is (inaudible) with the park and is representative of what Winter Park stands for, its greenspace, its celebration, its people. Part of the (inaudible) on a Saturday—meaning we have private/public spaces was to really go out in the park and doing a placemaking game; there were forms that were filled out and a lot of design time and this is (inaudible) the park, it is (inaudible) idea of things that can happen in this wonderful space we now call park but to activate it so if the community uses it there are all sorts of things that the library and the community work with whether it be for example this bridge that is right outside of the public (inaudible) piazza that this theme creates can be a wedding chapel, the bridge could be a wedding chapel, there could be a boat dock where little radio control boat races can take place, there can be carousels or not. It’s a sensitive point for some people. There can be areas for temporary food trucks and then permanent structures that can later be put in there like the (inaudible) Gardens in New York when you can actually rent these spaces. Those little buildings are temporary; the same in Paris they bring in steel containers and make them into restaurants and put out Teflon awnings and seats in there; those restaurants are (inaudible) in the summer so there are so many wonderful experimental ideas you can do here in the park.
(inaudible) that led to a design, not the design just as these site plans are a site plan, not the site plan; there’s (inaudible) the second phase for this when you select architects and construction managers. And so the first view is from along Morse Boulevard and Denning. Excuse me, and Morse Boulevard is in the background, you see the Bank First Building which is now Seacoast Bank and there’s the bridge we are talking about. Imagine redoing that and creating some sculptural bridge element. The three story library with an overlook (inaudible) overlooked park, could be a roof terrace for event space, you can rent that. The ground floor between the civic center and the library is of course the covered event space, right on the corner on the ground floor you can imagine a café, a restaurant like you have now in the library where it can break out into this beautiful setting so people using the park from other areas can come by. And it is also an outreach program because some may not be a member (inaudible) seize the opportunity to be a member.

Hard to see there are trees, we pasted the trees in so you can see part of the building but those trees exist in front of the building so imagine you’re not seeing much of the building and (inaudible) 17-92 you come down the corner to Morse and this is the (inaudible) you would see this striking modern, crisp lightened area progressive thinking building in the park and you have the covered entry piece between the civic center and the library that you can clearly see a view (inaudible) 75’ wide and you can clearly see directly through to the park and there is also another space between the park and garage which you see here.

And we are thinking the parking garage is almost covered in ivy or plantings so it is a green garage and it goes away; it’s a one story garage grate(?) plus one elevated deck so that it is about 14 1/2’ tall and it really becomes an element that is an opportunity not a detractor. It blocks that surface parking lot in the back of all the retail across the street and on the park side, everyone would walk to the park side and there is a covered walkway all along that side of the garage; a trellis if you will, a garden trellis could have bougainvillea or wisteria on it so imagine being under the covered walk in a light rain and the hot sun but you are under cover, under shade and you can walk to the civic center, walk to the library completely under cover. The garage is the opportunity being it’s (inaudible) to take a few of parking
spaces out from the second level to create light wells(?) on the ground floor, open those spaces in the exact location below and put plantings and trees in there so you have natural light and people don’t feel like they’re in a claustrophobic urban garage more like an azalea garden.

In the end if you were on the bridge or across over (inaudible) Park looking back at the library at night there is this wonderful glowing beacon that could be majestic in its form but delicate because of its feeling of openness. You have these wonderful events whether it’s black tie or you can have your event the other night, the (inaudible) 4 Rivers (inaudible). So this acts as between the civic center and the library you have this wonderful relationship for public celebration of life here in Winter Park; the ground floor (inaudible) space on the ground floor and then on the second and third floor you really have this complete covered portions south facing overlooking the library so imagine during the day you have your book, you’re sitting out there looking out at your friends and other people and the birds and things happening in the park and you are reading and just enjoying life and at night (inaudible). With that, that really concludes the architectural portion.

Concept budget: Okay, the other thing we listened very carefully to the library task force, the library board, the librarian, the librarian staff, talked to benchmark many other consultants and projects around the country, spoke with the Aspen Institute, one of them understands completely what should go into a library and not just about the architecture. On the concept budget there are a lot of cost (inaudible) for the library and civic center and garage and some of these will be self-explanatory which goes with which. One of the things that’s important to Winter Park is long life span, durability, maintain ability, and the (inaudible) of the quality of the (inaudible) architecture, the interiors and the (inaudible) and what does it take to create that world class library and those were benchmarked.

The flexibility, so (inaudible) spaces in the library we do have large, spanning open spaces not a lot of (inaudible) walls, there’s columns and then the open floors for flexibility. We do have a (inaudible) free space for the civic center. There is also a consideration for increased floor (inaudible), they’re reconfigured, the walls, and don’t have to go partitions in this building so they are not just drywall petitions with metal studs screwing into
the floor, screwing into the deck, partitions cannot have as thinking changes as programs change, walls can move, which is a great thing.

There is a community (inaudible), there is meeting spaces, collaborative rooms, café, there’s enhanced technology, raised access flooring over about 50% of the building not the entire building and that gives the flexibility for example, very simply put, you have book cases here today, and six years you want to move them over three feet, oops, the floor receptacles that were once (inaudible) a need for them are now under book cases you have a problem so you have raised access flooding which is very simple to just move technology and electricity and all those things around. That’s the way things of thought of today in libraries. (inaudible) Green certified, other levels can be achieved but it’s benchmarked as green certified.

There’s three stories, originally thought about (inaudible) those sorts of things. (inaudible) system, it’s made clear that these are extremely efficient in terms of how long it takes to get a book from the book box back to the shelf. I think it’s 8 or 10 times more efficient so it could be back in one day versus eight days, depending on the library as an example. The architectural facades are really enhanced as required.

And then the last thing was the earlier estimates that were proposed, it was discussion early on, (inaudible), the thinking at the time one of the thoughts was us going out for a bond referendum trying to move this thing along faster as we became more apparent and (inaudible) estimating, you’ll see the numbers, there’s the contingencies are higher because the duration was pushed out further from when you would start construction and a guaranteed maximum price would be actually achieved. So, the numbers, we want to break this out two ways for your thinking so we could benchmark it. The previous number of $15.2 million dollars for a library that (inaudible) only hard costs. The reason I said hard costs that’s just construction. The modifiers that changed the numbers like consultants, (inaudible), contingency, those numbers were (inaudible) proportionated and raised the number because the higher value of the base hard costs (inaudible) that numbers but if you build just the library and the surface parking you are looking at hard costs of $15.2 million and the site work, the soft costs, new library only that’s about $9.8 million. Then there’s a credit for library
contributions, grants and fund raising campaign (inaudible) and a new library you would have a $22.5 million project library only, the surface parking, the site work required, all the fees, it’s just (inaudible) architectural interior fees, that’s fees such as testing and threshold inspection and (inaudible) fees and all the things you need to build.

Commissioner Cooper: So it’s $26 million before we look at grants and library contributions.

Cunningham: Correct, and then for the design you saw up on the screen for the library/civic center and garage, that’s $20.8 million hard costs. When you add all those other items the site work from FF&E, it comes up to $29.9 million again after you subtract out the $2.5 million grant and library contribution. Now, remember all those items that I just spoke of, concept budgeting, cost drivers, we heard, we listened, we budgeted and benchmarked for the best, there is a professional opinion as the full consultant team, including Wharton Smith general contractor who has assisted us in all the cost benchmarking and has great success in these types of projects and worked on many projects together that are civic oriented. We believe there is wiggle rooms in all those line items, there is only (inaudible) information you have to make some key assumptions and we wanted to provide the best so I am sure there if need be there is opportunity for wiggle room and I guess we’ll open up for questions. We’re done with our presentation.

Mayor Leary: Thank you, John.

John Cunningham: Thank you. It’s been a great 14 months.

Mayor Leary: Questions. Commissioner Seidel questions?

Commissioner Seidel: No.

Commissioner Sprinkel: So as a City if we were able to say we want to bond $25, not $30 million, okay. We put a big project together for $25 million and we looked at it. My whole questions that I sent back to Randy that I’d like him at some point, I don’t know how you want to do this, but, talk about what it’s going to cost the average taxpayer out there to put something like this together. I think we have already said we support it, we’ve already said
we want it here, we have already done all the things that you needed to do, but now we need to figure out how to pay for it. $30 million is, I know, gone up that much because of contingencies and I just would like to look at what it would take us if we had $25 million, what it would cost the taxpayer because that is ultimately what they need to know.

Mayor Leary: I asked the same questions.

City Manager Knight: So what I passed out, maybe we can put one up on the overhead. What you have before you is a breakdown of what it would cost in bond annual debt service and down the left hand column you have different assessed valuations of property after homestead exemption. Across the top you have a $30 million issue, a $25 million issue or a $20 million issue and then the annual impacts is down the two columns; you have the one column for what the new bonds are and what the new bonds are net of the golf course bonds that are rolling off. So that’s what the two columns are under each section. For example, if you go to the bottom of the first column, a $100,000 homestead exemption, the annual cost of the bonds would be about $49 annually and then when you net out the golf course bonds that are going away so the new net cost would be about $41. Then you can see how that scales down at a $25 million bond issue or a $20 million bond issue.

Comm. Cooper: And how many years do we have before the public safety building ..........?

CM Knight: The public safety building bond goes away in 2021 and that’s I think, Wes about a .2 mil rate right now or something close to that? Is that right?

Finance Director Wes Hamil: That sounds about right. I think it’s about .18.

CM Knight: So that would also roll off after 2021 and all of these numbers go down each year as assessed valuations go up, new projects come online, the first year is typically the most you would ever spend on your personal tax bill for the bonds so these are first year costs as based on your current year assessed valuations.
Comm. Sprinkel: So for anybody who may be listening why don’t you give them that $100,000 evaluation just for 30, 25, and 20 and maybe go all the way up to $300,000 and let’s don’t even get into the million dollar range.

CM Knight: Okay, for the $100,000 of assessed valuation, that would really be if you have a $150,000 home you take away the $50,000 homestead exemption and leaves you with $100,000 taxable assessed valuation. For a $30 million bond issue, that would cost $49 per year which is a $41 increase over the golf course bonds that exist today. For a $25 million bond issue that same $100,000 home would be $41 or $32 net new and for a $20 million bond issue that would be a $33 per year or a $24 net new. $200,000 is just double those numbers, it would be $99 a year for $30 million bond issue.

Mayor Leary: Randy, can I interrupt for one moment?

CM Knight: Yes.

Mayor Leary: Can you tell me the average selling price of a home in Winter Park today? (Not sure who this is): $468,000. Mayor Leary: So $468,000 is the average home? (people talking from audience). Mayor Leary: So somewhere between $500,000 and $300,000, do you guys do agree on that? Several unknown: Good, why not. Mayor Leary: Sorry commissioner.

Comm. Sprinkel: No, I just wanted us to look at what it is going to be costing about $40 if you go with $30 million, $30 if you go with $25 million and $24 or so if you go with $20 million.

Commissioner McMacken: Per year. So you’re at $100,000 you’re essentially talking less than $1 a week kind of thing. That’s not even a Starbucks. So as we proportion this out those are not per month, those are per year which....

Commissioner Sprinkel: I’m done. I just wanted this out there.

Commissioner McMacken: Thanks for asking. I just had a real easy one. There was an A and B and I am assuming that the number whatever it might be, the $30 million we’ll say covers either one of those. You had two
schemes, John, one was the two squares and one was the ???? and the $30 million would cover either one of those schemes or concepts, one was not more expensive or less expensive than the other? Mr. Cunningham: No, you are correct. Comm. McMacken: Okay, thank you. That’s all I had.

Commissioner Cooper: Well, they had my heart right away because I’m a big fan of carousels and Glen Echo and been there and done that. But when I moved away from the lovely conceptual drawings and I got down to the price per square foot, is when I started having heartburn and if we’re going to do this I want it to be incredible. I have visited the Hunt Library, I have seen some of the sources you put together and I would like to talk to you about that but I also want to talk about what we can do for some value engineering under numbers that we have here, um, if these are old and I don’t have the proper escalators, forgive me about that, but if you go back to the public safety building I think that’s Leads Certified is about $123 a square foot, the Community Center was about $250 a square foot and if I back out the parking garage and I back out pro rata share of the soft costs associated with the parking garage I am still up to about $384 to $390 per square foot. So I am trying to figure and I think possibly the numbers that we have for the library and the cover and the civic center may actually already have some reserve in them and I thought maybe that additional $3.4 million reserve, I talked to Randy, I guess maybe that’s inflation but your (inaudible) is not going to start in time? I’m trying to figure out if there is a 5% value engineering savings that we could reach within the basic hard cost and if the CRA funded the parking garage and if the extra reserves were reduced to like 10% then we really could do the $25 million bond and get a fine building and I don’t know if those kinds of numbers, I guess the reserves are the big thing, John, I am trying on that per square foot cost.

John Cunningham: Well, first of all the Community Center and the Public Safety Building they’re kind of like oranges and cranberries trying to (inaudible).

Commissioner Cooper (interrupted) I appreciate that. I think there are some people that are building things down at Disney and the number they came back with me was getting closer of where we’re at but still not there yet so my question is, is there contingency built into those basic numbers?
John Cunningham: (inaudible) - built in basic numbers I think the contingency, there is a lot of hope like I was saying, you know.... When you are dealing conceptual idea it’s hard to knit pick each little item; what you can do is because it was all based on conceptual benchmarking but one thing you didn’t say is we did do a three day model of the entire scheme which was scalable and the contractor was able to take that off so every façade and roof he had a three dimensional model in the computer which benefitted this go-around and the estimate was (inaudible). (inaudible) professional opinion the contractor Wharton Smith and ourselves you can reach the goal of cost contain--- you just can’t do it at this point by saying I am going to line item take this out or take that out.

This sort of vision reasonable facsimile of this vision and plan and visually could be reached by the right group of professionals that you hire next year should the bond referendum go ahead and will reasonably reduce the number somewhere between $25-$27 million probably more comfortable toward $27 but that is not for us to decide. But it could if you roll up your sleeves and with the proper input from your staff, from the community and the team sitting around the table you can achieve it, very similar when Maitland did their fire station, police station and City Hall, they had a number, first they had a thought of where they were going to be and they realized what they wanted to spend and then the (inaudible) became the criteria and everyone got up around the table rolled up their sleeves, and actually delivered it for under budget. $11 million program for $700,000 under budget. So it’s achievable, it’s just would it be exact (inaudible) it was never meant to be exact but..

Commissioner Cooper: In the Civic Center portion, how much of that space is column less? You said some of it was.

John Cunningham: Pretty much all of it, there was a small kitchen...

Commissioner Cooper: Like 7,000 square feet?

John Cunningham: Yes.

Commissioner Cooper: More than we have now or at least equal?
John Cunningham: Correct. We have another 2,000 square foot kitchen and the rest of it would be the kitchen, (inaudible) space and the rest of it just open free flex space.

Commissioner Cooper: Is there a way and one of the questions I received from numerous people is about weddings and I don't want to have my wedding in a library space. So my question is how you thought through how to keep the library and the...are they still going to be venues that make sense? Are we going to be able to utilize them for both weddings and libraries and how does the structure make that happen?

John Cunningham: Absolutely, cause they are together but separate and right now they are joined by covered outdoor public ?? plaza and event space but to the south towards the lake there will be a separate terrace for weddings and events and it is not detailed because....

Commissioner Cooper: that's the question I keep.....

John Cunningham: You can have a two or three foot grade change from the private terrace from the civic center landscape, shrubbery and hedges, all those wonderful things can.......

Mayor Leary: (inaudible)

John Cunningham: Those are the kinds of things that people would do to handle it.

Commissioner McMacken: I was really just going to reiterate something that John brought up that at this level of conceptual design I would hesitate to get into saying can you take five bucks out of the civic center and two bucks out of ... and three dollars out of here; it's really (both Commissioners talking at the same time-inaudible).

Commissioner McMacken: And if you look at this one why it actually came to $13 million. We've done things in response to input from all over that brought us up to this number and what I would hope that we would be looking at is what is that overall number because that is what you are going to give eventually to an architectural and construction team; here is the number we have to work with and they will design to that number as
opposed to trying to reverse that process. I’m personally comfortable with the number that’s presented; I’m not scared of that contingency because again at this level of design I professionally would put that kind of number on a contingency. I mean that just is what you would do. I looked at the numbers where John presented earlier and had that $22 million scenario and what if you read the fine print that’s no parking garage. That sort of becomes a giant parking lot, there’s the civic center space there, we kind of go against all the things that we talked about wanting to do as far as preserving greenspace and making this as efficient as possible so there’s some real, they’re not just coats of paint that can be taken off this thing. I think there would be some substantial issues that were addressed in all the public input portions of this that if we really wanted to start whacking at that $29 or $30 million number that those are substantial cuts and are problematic cuts, so......

John Cunningham: (inaudible) that contingency, if you read (inaudible) conceptual schedule I had as well which we did you are going to issue the (inaudible) the day after your referendum were hopefully approved and you went out for RFP, made a selection or RFQ’s whichever you do, make the selection, you get moving, you move like the wind, you have your public input for maybe a month rather than 14 months like this was but you do it for about a month, intense, and you aren’t going to go out for bid until April, May probably of 2017 so that initially you are carrying 5 or 10 percent contingency at most. But this has escalation in there because things are still continuing to heat up in the construction world and it’s not slowing down and so if you are going to continue with anything it would want to be the hard value.

Mayor Leary: Yeah, $517 a square foot gave me great...it really kind of hit me hard. So I started breaking down the numbers. One of the things we’ve said or I said personally is I think the Alfond set the new standard for what we should expect for the City and as the number one ranked hotel in the State of Florida now, is number seven across the country, it is a draw to our City, it improves everything we do in our City and I think the library has the opportunity to do that too. And one of the things I’ve also been very vocal about is I want people to leave Winter Park and talk about our library. It’s nice that we have the number one library in the state from time to time but
I think going forward and going home and having people say “you got to go see the library” is something that I would take great pride in. Again, looking at the numbers, I also want to say and I want to make it very clear that from my perspective a successful referendum is an educated referendum. I don’t believe it is this Commission’s responsibility to talk to people and push a bond referendum of any size, especially this scale. So I believe the onus is on the committee that put this together and the library board to go out and really board to try to sell this to the citizens of Winter Park whose backs this is going to be on.

That said, when you look at the numbers and you think about, and Randy correct me if I’m wrong, just basically just doing some quick math on this, we are talking about a $30 million issuance and every $5 million is about another $10 to the homeowners, that’s kind of what we’re looking at, 10 to 12 a year, so you start looking at the numbers and the difference between $20,000 and $30,000 to a $100,000 appraise if from $24 to $41 that’s a big number but it’s not a shock. I think there is, Commissioner Cooper, some value engineering that will be done, I also think that the library has committed, the library board has committed to raising private funds for this and I think that will be interesting.

Randy, can you share with us because we all either fall in love or fall out of love with a picture, so some people may buy into this based on the picture and some people may fall out it based on this picture that we’re going to be presenting and I think that was the challenge for the group, too is to present something that is close enough to take it to a referendum. Can you share with me just the referendum process and what we will share with the public?

City Manager Knight: Sure.

Comm. Cooper: And the design process. I think that’s important.

City Manager Knight: As John said, this is a concept. This is not the design. The process starting from today: we have three commission meetings between now and the end of the calendar year and by the end of the calendar year we have to adopt an ordinance which takes two readings if we want this on the March 15 election. So my plan was to bring back to you at the next meeting the ordinance that puts it on that March 15 ballot.
Mayor Leary: The ordinance required will also include the language included in the referendum?

CM Knight: Yes, sir. It will have the ballot language and it will be a bond ordinance. What that means is it will be asking the voters can the City of Winter Park issue bonds not exceeding X dollars for the purpose of building a civic center/library and so that actual ballot language will be in that ordinance. So that would be --- for the March referendum. Now we have two choices on how to proceed with hiring an architect then so we actually have to hire an architect under the CC&A rules to design the library. It can be done. We can start the bidding process ahead of time so that we can appoint the architect immediately following the referendum, of course that would be subject to it passing or we can wait until it passes and put it out to bid so you’re looking at about a 90 day swing depending on whether we started in January, have it ready for April 1 roughly or start it right after the referendum so you can shave 90 days off the whole process if we started that RFP in January or December. So but the actual design would take time during that process and so what you are seeing here is conceptual, the architect that you hire, whomever that is, would take that into consideration because that is what you are going to be showing, we just have to make the committee sell this.

Mayor Leary: Can I pause you for one moment? Patrick, would you just switch back onto the thing so we can see Commissioner Seidel in case he has questions?

Commissioner McMacken: Let him know we’re doing that. Laugh....

Mayor Leary: I hope he is still with us. Greg, we couldn’t see you while we were on another item so I wanted to make sure you are still with us, okay? Great, thank you. Randy, go ahead.

CM Knight: So once you hire that architect they would actually design the building that is going to be the one that we build.

Mayor Leary: Okay, thank you.

Comm. Cooper: But what is the process by which we decide. There are only a very selected number of people who voted on this design. The question is
for the entire community and certainly for the commission to be able to express our preferences relative to.... I don’t know if you ended up with two. I don’t know if one totally washed out but you started out with Mediterraneanean, Modern and Craftsman. And of those three when we move forward to an architect we’re certainly going to have to tell them one to move forward with. So the question is how did we get from three to one?

CM Knight: That will be a Commission decision.

Comm. Cooper: But based on what?

Mayor Leary: Again, let’s, I want if we could if you wouldn’t mind Commissioners I would like to stay focused on the referendum and then.........

Comm. Cooper: This impacts the referendum. For me it’s real important. I would like to understand our process.

Mayor Leary: Are you saying then you would not support a referendum to build a new library/civic center if you ........

Comm. Cooper: I said it was very important to me what the process was for us selecting a style.

Comm. Sprinkel: But if you read this you read how they did it and you saw the numbers and (inaudible) hands down and Modern came out. So what else do you need to know?

Comm. Cooper: For one ---with a certain number of people but I am trying to understand....

Mayor Leary: Excuse me, Commissioner. Let’s go back to what we asked. We asked them to get together We asked them to hear from the community in order to create a concept to go to referendum.

Comm. Cooper: So we’re saying that we have decided as a group for Modern? Is that........... I’m not there.

Mayor Leary: No, we have decided that in order to go...what we decided, what we asked the committee to do through all the public meetings was to go to the public , get public input to create a document that will help
documentation to educate the public on the referendum that is coming before them.

Comm. Cooper: Right, so (everyone speaking at once)... getting here to the final design.

Mayor Leary: Randy just said we can take that on any time, we can start going out to a RFP and discuss that in the process once the referendum is passed and it is not passed, then we don’t have to worry about it.

CM Knight: And once you have an architect on board you have two options, the Commission can certainly pick a style and then hire an architect based on that style so we want an architect that is going to design an Arts and Crafts building or a Modern building, whatever. Or you can hire the architect as John said earlier and in that have a public process to hear from the public what style they want and what they want out this library and the Commission is certainly going to make that final decision. I mean, even though this group of 100 or so picked Modern the Commission is going to make the decision what the style will so........

Comm. Cooper: So there will be another process another public process?

CM Knight: Absolutely.

Comm. Cooper: And is that part of these numbers that I am looking at?

CM Knight: (inaudible)

Mayor Leary: That’s part of the referendum ballot.

Comm. Cooper: Okay, and will ACi be leaving that process?

(Everyone talking at (inaudible) cost. The building cost for the library is somewhere in the $275-285 square foot and the civic center is actually around $237. I just wanted to make sure everyone understood.

Mayor Leary: People are going to look at that square footage and do the quick math.

Comm. Cooper: For my numbers, I actually backed out the garage and I backed out the prorate share of the soft costs for....
Mayor Leary: Let me just ask, Commissioner Seidel, you have not weighed in. Do you have anything for us, Sir?

Comm. Seidel: (skyped in): (Questions/comments were inaudible).

CM Knight: What he’s asking is do we have to vote on these items today?

Mayor Leary/Comm. McMacken: Of agenda packet it’s page number 15 of 176 and the motion/recommendation is that we accept the final report. We approve the location, and direct staff to bring back a bond referendum for whatever amount we see fit. That is what I see as the three things we are being asked to do today and I would like to potentially do those three things today.

Mayor Leary: Commissioner Seidel, sometimes you sound like the teacher on Peanuts so it’s a little difficult ...there’s a little bit of that, so bear with us as we try to articulate what you are saying. But as the Commissioner said on page 15 are the three bullet points they are looking for today.

Comm. Sprinkel: Okay, so my first point is that when we started this and the library task force was busy working with this. We gave them that job and now we’ve enlarged this task; it is no longer something that’s just a library, it’s also dealing with the civic center and also dealing with redoing the lake and redoing the park over there, there is a lot that’s involved in this and I don’t think we can put all of this job on the library task force to go out and try to get the public behind this referendum. If we today or some near future say, yes, we want to go out for referendum, it is encumbered upon us as a City to help that group and not just make it the library task force because the library task force didn’t come to us and say, “Hey, we want to get involved with the civic center.” That was part of what happened and that’s what I think has made this such a great, terrific...but I would not like to just put that on the library task force. I think it needs to be a bigger ???, more the people who are dealing with the referendum than the library task force because this is not something that’s just a library anymore. This is a big center for the City of Winter Park and I don’t know how we do that but I would like to see that happen. The only other thing that I have was with as much as I would love to have it....I just think that we can’t (inaudible) this, we have to say I think that is what Tom was saying, “this is the report they
gave us, this is the report that says this was what was favored. That doesn’t mean we have to take everything livestock and barrel, but we can’t discount anything from here and say there were only a few people, we take this report and we don’t cherry pick it we simply say this is what the public that was involved said and so that’s why I would be prepared to go forward with this report.

Mayor Leary: Okay, we can certainly entertain a motion and then open up the floor to public comment so that they know....

Comm. McMacken: Would you like to have (inaudible) open up for public comment?

Mayor Leary: I think so. We can always make amendments once that is but this will at least give the public an opportunity to address the motion.

Comm. McMacken: If that’s the case, I would move the following that we accept the final report from Aci, that we ..... 

Mayor Leary: I second that. I’m sorry Commissioner. Would you like to do this in three motions or would you like to......

Comm. McMacken: I’ll take it in three just to give anybody an opportunity if they want to amend any one portion of it.

Mayor Leary: I’ll second your first motion.

Comm. McMacken: My second motion is to approve the general location of the library/civic center as shown those in the report and my third would be to direct staff to bring back an ordinance for a bond referendum to be held in conjunction with the City elections and that amount not to exceed $30 million.

Mayor Leary: I need a second on the second motion.

Comm. Sprinkel: I’ll second that.

Mayor Leary: And I need a second on the final motion.

Comm. Sprinkel: I will make an amendment to the final motion.
Mayor Leary: It’s not been seconded yet.

Comm. Sprinkel: Okay, sorry.

Mayor Leary: I will second that, Commissioner.

Comm. McMacken: Thank you.

Mayor Leary: Commissioner Sprinkel.

Comm. Sprinkel: I move that to be $25 million because I’m having a really big heartburn on 30 and I will amend it to be up to $25 million then it would be incumbent upon the City to come back with ways whether it’s the CRA for $3 million in the parking garage or whatever it is that would be put on the City to come back with other things. I would cap the bond issue at $25 million.

Mayor Leary: Can I leave the amendment at that ............... 

Comm. Sprinkel: Yes, I don’t care how we figure it out. I just want it to be 25, not 30.

Comm. Cooper: I would second that.

Mayor Leary: Are you okay to open the floor for public comment?


Mayor Leary: Anyone wishing to address the Commission on this item please step forward, please fill out a yellow card and hand it to Ms. Bonham. She has scolded me for not making sure people do that.

Joe Terranova: Joe Terranova, 151 North Virginia Avenue, Winter Park. First of all, I would like to thank John Cunningham, Larry Davis and all the staff of Aci for the work they have done in presenting this project, also the library task force under Sam Stark in presenting his report. The problem here is from my perspective I think we have the cart before the horse and there are certain things that I think we should consider before we consider the things that you are about to talk about. First of all, I am concerned by the fact that the library task force was not given the task to find the best place for the library. They were given the task to find out where they could
put it on City property and I’m just concerned that there are probably other locations at least some that I have looked at that I think should be looked at before we nail this thing down in concrete. As I said last time I talked, I didn’t think the park site was the best location for the library. In fact it would be my last choice but if you are going to choose the park you’ve chosen the best place in the park but nothing has been said about the environmental impact on the park as a result. The park is not that big, this huge building in there, even though the architect has said there’s only one percent increase in terms of building space, you’ve got a lot of activities that will be going on in that space that is going to disturb the environment from my perspective. The other thing which I think that you have not considered which to me is very important, where does the library fit into the City’s priority list. If we are going to spend $25 or $30 million is this our first choice? I think you know I’m a supporter of the library but there are other things we have on our plate. What about advancing the underground, what about more money for trees, what about more money for park acquisition, what about the street decorative lights and you could go on and on this list but I think that those things ought to be considered before you move forward. Tying this thing to an artificial date so you can get it on the March 14 ballot is just tying your hands. Everybody wants to rush and forget about these other things that ought to be considered. And I just ask you, stop, take a breath, forget about March the 15th, consider the consequences of what you are doing and how these priorities work out.

Gary Sachek: I’m Gary Sachek, 1034 Aloma. I think the prior comments were quite interesting that the Alfond Inn set a new standard. I agree. I think it does, it’s outstanding and I think the question maybe you should ask yourselves in this meeting is will the Alfond Inn be as great next to 17-92 where the proposed library location is. I think also in fact this is a legacy item for each of you as Commissioner and Mayor as the Mayor mentioned earlier this is a great opportunity, I think the public will really support but it’s really a legacy item. Is this the best place? Is this really going to showcase Winter Park the way you envision it any way you vision the public does? I think it’s really key that someone said a long time ago, “It’s not so important to be understood is to understand.” And going forward I listed four items I picked up from the meetings I attended and initially the post
office location was the first choice the library task force, it was turned down because it was too expensive and maybe some other reasons, but of course now we are looking at a substantial expense. So does that bring in that back as another alternative? So that’s number one. Number two I know in the library meetings they had a demographic of a geography of where the usages are for the library patrons and right now the location is almost smack dab in the middle of that demographic. As in any business you’ll do a study and find out where your market is and you’ll try to target your store in the middle of that market and we’re moving the library to the outside perimeter of that market study where it showed more usage was. That was number two. Number three, the City Hall and existing library location. The stumbling blocks in those two proposed sites in the meetings were the parking deck garage that was required for the existing library location. It was required for the City Hall so the pushback was you gotta put a parking garage, do you really want to have that expense in that facility? And the answer is no. But the new location is going to have what, a parking deck garage. And lastly, one of the things that brought up and I think Aci brought it up possibly, maybe you didn’t, but we don’t want to piggyback the civic center. The library is such a jewel, do you really want to do that or do you envision maybe a civic center in the future that really attracts cultural events like great theater, great music and maybe that is not right where we need to be. Are we really talking about what we really want for Winter Park and a civic center in the future, where are we going? And (inaudible) we just said, listen, pop the civic center on top of the library but I know in the meetings it came up from the professionals that let’s not piggyback those two things. And so lastly and concluding, I just say go back, it’s important to understand as a public versus be understood and I hope in your communication that you are able to pass on not only what you feel but remember the objections and overcome those objections in your presentations or your communication whether it starts real quickly in the library by simply putting on their seat, “are you aware that we’re looking to move our library”? and in fact today I stopped by the library to see if they had any literature there. They didn’t and I asked a gentleman, “Hey, by the way, can I ask you a question?” and he was with his son and I said “do you know the library is moving?” He said no. And so I know it is incumbent upon the public to be aware of this but it’s also important to communicate.
Bob Bendick: Hi, my name is Bob Bendick. I reside at 1211 Oxford Road. We have lived there for 20 years. We support the idea of a new library, we think the design process has been a good one and we’re confident that the ultimate design will be excellent. We’re not particularly bothered by the cost but as Commissioner Sprinkel said what this library project is now coming to be is the construction of an alternate town center, an alternate city center for Winter Park which will ultimately undermine the vitality of Park Avenue and our existing center. We have an exceptional place in our downtown. Our Alford Inn is successful because it is in exactly the right place for it to be successful. We hate the idea of opposing things. We are strong believers of civic investment and the civic culture. That is why we moved to Winter Park 20 years ago. We think this building is in the wrong place. It should be in the downtown. It would be a great and lasting asset to the community if it’s there. Where it is proposed to be it could be a nice building, the pictures are wonderful, it will eventually undermine what makes Winter Park a special place because it is creating a new downtown center in competition with the one outside the door here. Thank you.

Brooks Weiss: Hi, my name is Brooks Weiss. I live at 1244 Via Salerno with my wife Susie. We have been here since 1975, I think and I would like to congratulate Steve on his attitude toward making this a memorable piece of architecture for Winter Park. I think as an architect myself having talked to Larry and John in the past about this and participated in the workshops...one of the main points I have made that this is an opportunity for Winter Park and really sets itself apart of where we have been and be a keynote for where we make better with the architecture as Winter Park has been a leader in so many things in the Central Florida area and Florida in general; another great opportunity which should not be missed to capture a significant piece of architecture. So, Sarah, I am sorry, I think we should go with the $30 million and maybe more because the opportunities will not happen again and to nickel and dime this is not the opportune time to be intelligent (inaudible). John gave a terrific appraisal of what it’s done and if Wharton Smith has been involved I am sure that the numbers are correct. So rather than err on the side of a low bid, I’d rather have an extra $2-$3 million to hit the $30 million mark. Also, let’s not forget with proper design and program, we can have a lot of income reducing facilities within this, the
restaurant was mentioned, the wedding facilities, etc. etc. As I have been in
town we have opened the country club for my first daughter's reception, the
city really didn't realize that was a functioning place until we showed them
what we could do and that took off. So that's what is that on that. And as
the architect for the existing civic center I would like to publicly put forth the
idea that kind of savings we could generate by keeping the existing building
in favor of tearing it down and reconstructing it. If the new design is the
way to go, I'll support it and let the old thing go and get behind that as well.
As far as the architectural selection process, I think the process needs to be
carefully considered, not just maybe an RFQ and RFP but maybe follow the
situation that the City of Orlando did with the Dr. Phillips Performing Arts
Center where there is actual an architectural selection committee formed
and a strong attitude toward how we go about it, who we select, whether it
is invited competition, it's all local, it's local and brand name architects to try
and achieve that greatest piece of architecture for our City. Thank you.

Gene Sullivan:  Gene Sullivan, 2423 Via Sienna, Winter Park, I'm a frequent
user of the library and I like the site where it is now but it's been carefully
explained to me that isn't feasible and I would just like to speak to the new
location. I'm a senior citizen and like a lot of senior citizens and other folks
we don't like change. Having said that, I see Winter Park expanding
westward. We've got Hannibal Square that has been re-done, we've got
Winter Park Village, a lot of folks in this town if they want to eat they go to
restaurants there or mainly Publix to shop so they are frequently using the
roads to go in that area and even now with Trader Joe's they are crossing
17-92. So I see the City not abandoning this neighborhood, not abandoning
Park Avenue, or New York Avenue but merely extending the (inaudible)
prurview as it were to that area and by the way I get down Morse Boulevard
frequently and is very little traffic. Yes, there is on Fairbanks but it's an
easy neighborhood to get to that we're talking about. So I am very much in
favor of the proposed site. Thank you.

Barbara Chandler:  Good afternoon. My name is Barbara Chandler, 1048
Azalea Lane. I was travelling about a year and a half ago in Virginia and I
met the travel (inaudible) who mentioned to me that when he visits the area
he visits libraries. I was surprised to hear that. He showed me on his phone
where visited the Winter Park Public Library and said it was his favorite
amongst all the libraries that he was touring at the time. As the prior gentleman mentioned, I see it as an extension of Winter Park. As we know working in the hospitality industry, it is a destination. I was at the Hannibal Square Heritage Center for about five years and when tour groups were coming, visitors were coming and there would say where else is there to visit I could easily point out the different museums, etc., etc. So I am able to now point out of course the new location of the Winter Park Public Library as a destination, a (inaudible) destination. I also see it being extremely accessible. I think one of the reasons, I have a mom who is a senior and trying to keep her active, trying to keep her engaged, driving from where she is to where the site is right now is extremely intimidating for her. So it’s walkable to where she can get to it. I see this being user friendly to the community that is now closer to and exactly I see it also as an expansion. So I myself is highly in favor of the new location and I see it being an overall benefit especially with the SunRail, people being able to get off the SunRail and being able to walk to it and visit another location in Winter Park. Thank You.

Linda Heinl: Hi, my name is Linda Heinl and I live at 608 S. Phelps Avenue. I have been very involved with the library since we moved here but I think we all have to keep in mind a library is a destination point. It would be great to have it downtown at the post office but that’s really not necessary. I think where we’re putting it in the concept of making it really stand out as something that Winter Park should be proud of. So I think where it is going to be sounds great and we have to keep in mind that it is a destination place. It’s not just something you walk into like a store.

Daniel Butts: Hello, Daniel Butts, 120 W. Reading Way in Winter Park. I thank you all for this opportunity; obviously someone has been involved for several years with the library board. I have very excited and encouraged to see a kind of a groundswell of support on the concept of continuing to nurture our library and our patrons. We have done a phenomenal job for many, many years in our current facility and now we have a great opportunity to look to continue to serve our community but to up our game and in doing so looking at new locations. You know the task force looked at a lot of locations and I’ll be honest early on, this was not my number one choice, I had some other ideas and after reflecting and doing as the previous
gentleman mentioned, doing a good bit of listening, learned that a lot of my preferences were shaped by my own personal preferences. And while those are important, I'm not everyone in the community and so there are a lot of conveniences or driving some of my initial preferences at the end of the day we had to look at the broader community who it serves and the fact that as Linda just mentioned, it really is a destination; important that it this be a convenient destination but it be one that can have a campus and what better location to have it at such a (inaudible) location on a beautiful yet some would argue underutilized park. So we're very excited, and I'll tell you the second piece I gave, some us brief pause, was about the charge that the commission gave the task force to move forward with the study at least of a combined project with a new civic center. There was concern, oh no, now we're starting over of the civic center if it doesn't fly and this is the anchor so there was concern initially. But in further study with our consultants looking at what other municipalities around the country have done, listening to folks like the Aspen Institute talk about what great partnerships exist when collaboration occurs and when great places are created, everything that we're excited about was just magnified, intensified by the partnerships on a campus like this. So to have it on a park, to have a civic center and to get the city to rally behind it is just a great opportunity. And the last thing I will say it was echoed, it was mentioned earlier, the expansion of our core is happening already and trust me a civic asset a couple of blocks away is not going to compete with Park Avenue, it's going to compliment it and I'm a business owner on Park Avenue and there's nothing better than to have multiple cultural corridors. We deserve it and what a great opportunity. So thank you all for your consideration; looking forward to moving this forward and putting it in the hands of the voters. We will advocate but we'll be looking for a partnership in doing that. Thank you.

Nancy Shutts: Nancy Shutts, 2010 Brandywine Drive, I've spent a lot of hours going and listening to all the task force things. I want us to move forward with this. I have some design issues which I guess we can address once we get to the next phase. One of my concerns, just to bring it up so it's on the table, we're going from a civic center that was 13,500 square feet to 8,000. One of the first things that we talked about at my house when we were looking at the initial design was why do we need all this more space in
the library. Well, my question is: are we going to have all the small spaces for small meetings and groups in the library? Is the civic center just going to be two big rooms for events? With all the small rentals in the library are they going to be rentals, are we going to not have that revenue that we have had for years that has helped us pay for the civic center. So I hope that puts on the agenda for thought as we move forward. I agree with a couple of other people that we are not competing with Park Avenue. We always have had other corridors that have been ignored. Park Avenue is not our only place and to have another destination is very important. It’s important that the civic center is accessible and priced so that the general public can use it. That is part of the problems with our gem, the Alfond. So many people in the City cannot afford to stay or eat at the Alfond. So we have to consider the demographics of our community when we are talking about how we are rent out the civic center or are we going to rent anything in the library. I can’t quite decide on the $25 million to $30 million. But I think I’m going to go with the $25 and support that idea because there’s no reason that the CRA cannot fund part of that and as we move forward and selling this to the community I am sure there are some of the rich people out here that are going to want to help donate, maybe get their name on a plaque or something even though we don’t have our name on the plaque down at the place down in Orlando where we gave them a million dollars but we didn’t get any acknowledgment like everybody else did gave them that much money. I do have a little bit of concern with the garage. There’s going to be people who say they don’t want you to give up greenspace; at least make sure that the design has more (inaudible) parking or ADA for the elderly. We already have a 30 percent population of elderly and if we’re going from the parking garage to the civic center to the library either whether you’re 90 years old trying to go to the library or if you have a one and three year old and are trying to go to the library and have to walk all the way across there are some design issues that we have a serious problem with. But I am in favor of moving this forward.

Gary Barker: I just want to address a couple of things that were brought up and I’m sorry (inaudible) everyone’s names on the top in order but Mayor Terranova mentioned we only looked at City property; we didn’t. We looked at other private properties; some of the things we couldn’t talk about
because it would have started to drive cost up for private properties and so those kinds of issue; but we did look at other properties besides City owned properties. In terms of environmental concerns, the old civic center versus the new, there will be a lot of better environmental things happening with the new civic center being rebuilt. So that’s going to address some of that issue and I think the net sum of that is going to be looking better off environmentally because of the new building. In terms of using money for trees up (inaudible), buying parkland, cityscape I think a lot of that was CRA money that could be done that way so I just wanted to address that. The second speaker talked about site location being the best. Post office, we looked at that and that was when you look at what we’re trying to build and buy the post office property and move the post office that was just way out of hand. Nonetheless, the post office property is not available so it’s a deal breaker on that. About the alternate town center, I think Daniel addressed that beautifully and so did Nancy about talking about expanding that. We can stay on Park Avenue but if we keep doing that we’re going to start going up and looking like Manhattan so I think moving out into the area of Winter Park and expanding our center is good. (Inaudible) the (inaudible) of the parking garage I think that is still in play. To build a parking garage that is big enough for the civic center and for the library but not expanding in terms of the footprint, we may have to do something with that. One of the designs, too was having one of the lots or one of the levels be below surface so you’re not seeing this huge parking garage there so there are things we can play with on that. And the last thing is the civic center right now is booked out more than a year in advance. I think with the new design of the civic center we can certainly raise the fees and still be fine and make more money using that and in terms of the civic center being smaller, yes, there will be meetings in the library that will take over some of the aspects of the civic center now. So, if you guys have any questions or anything else, I just want to this is the best thing I have ever been involved in my life, my civic duty and if this comes to fruition this is going to be wonderful and is going to be great for our City so thanks.

Mayor Leary: Okay, we’ll close the floor for public comment. Further Commission discussion?

Commissioner McMacken: No sir.
Mayor Leary: The only other thing I’ll say the point was raised a couple of times and it’s been one of the things I have believed in and there is one way to protect the core of the City; there’s a couple of different ways you can protect the core. I think maintaining ...... just the focus on the core is probably the impractical way to do it. I love the idea of expanding our core. You protect the core by enlarging the core, not by building walls around it so I think this is a tremendous opportunity to tie different aspects of the City back into our core. Commissioner Sprinkel.....

Comm. Sprinkel: I just want to say that I remember sitting up here when we said that the first time and it just was a light bulb for me because I am over there so much and I thought, “Wow, we can have more of Winter Park, we can have a better Winter Park, we can have more places for more people to go”. And after you said that I started noticing all the people on Morse Boulevard and so I really appreciate, Mr. Mayor you saying that because it opened my eyes to a new location and I appreciate that.

Mayor Leary: Thank you. Anybody else want to compliment me while we’re at it? (Laughter and comments inaudible as everyone talking at once.) Commissioner Seidel? (all his comments were inaudible per the skype).

Mayor Leary: Commissioner Sprinkel, I wanted to mention that, the 25 versus 30; I anticipate us getting assistance. This is an up to and that doesn’t mean this Commission has to, Randy, correct me if I’m wrong, the referendum is an up to $30 million.

CM Knight: That is correct.

Mayor Leary: If we....as we move forward, even if we approve, if the referendum gets approved at $30 million, if this Commission and the task force and the library board seek other funding sources and are turned down, we can still say we’re not going to approve $30 million. We can......the decision still lies on this Commission to say we’re not going to approve $30 million even if that was approved.

CM Knight: That’s correct.

Mayor Leary: That’s correct. So my hope and I’m okay with the $30 million, I don’t anticipate $30 million, I don’t want to see $30 million, I want
to see partners come in and assist and I think the task force and the library board have committed to that, I think there are some interesting opportunities out there for partnership so I won’t support your amendment but I am with you and in agreement with you. I just like to give the up to right now.

Comm. Sprinkel: And the reason I am not going to go up to is that my experiences, when you say up to most people do and so what I would like to look at is being able to say to people in our community who live in a $300,000 home, its $100 a year. That’s exactly why that was where I ended up and because I do believe we are going to have just what you said. I do believe people are going to opt in but I think it’s sometimes harder to opt in when the City’s already got the money.

Mayor Leary: Great. Commissioner Seidel, I am going to ask you to go first on these so I want to be very clear on what you’re voting on, okay, Sir?


Mayor Leary: Okay, the first motion is we have the amendment, correct?

CM Knight: Correct.

Mayor Leary: We have an amendment that Commissioner Sprinkel made to have the budget set at $25 million. I guess we then have to take a vote on the third motion, correct, Mr. City Attorney?

City Attorney Ardaman: On the amendment, (inaudible) up to $25 million so you vote on the amendment and if it passes ........

Mayor Leary: Right, do I still need to have a motion on the ........

City Attorney Ardaman: You’re supposed to actually vote on the motion as amended, but if it fails, you would also have a vote on the original motion without the amendment.

Mayor Leary: Okay. I just wanted to be clear on that. So, Greg that is what we will be doing and the third will be the motion .....I just lost my page here.....the second motion is for the location and the third motion or the fourth motion will be accept the final report from Aci. So first we’re voting
on the amendment to $25 million, the second vote will be for $30 million as amended or not amended, the third vote will be for the new location, and the fourth vote will be accepting the final report.

Comm. Sprinkel: Is that actually how it came to us? I thought we only had three.

Mayor Leary: Your amendment is the fourth. There’s three. Your amendment is the fourth. So Cindy, please read the roll, the first is the amendment to $25 million.

City Clerk Cindy Bonham: Okay, Commissioner Seidel-No, Commissioner Sprinkel-Yes, Commissioner Cooper-No, Commissioner McMacken-Yes, let me clarify that please.

Mayor Leary: The amendment was Commissioner Sprinkel’s motion to move from $30 million to $25 million; I think you voted incorrectly based on your comments earlier.

Commissioner McMacken-Yes, I am very sorry, I vote No.

Commissioner Sprinkel: Commissioner Cooper seconded it but didn’t vote for it. Commissioner Cooper (comments inaudible)

Mayor Leary: To just be clear, I want to clarify for the record, Cindy, we have with the amendment that we just voted on for $25 million, Commissioner Seidel voted no, Commissioner Sprinkel voted yes, Commissioner Cooper voted no, Commissioner McMacken voted yes but I believe he meant to vote no.

Commissioner McMacken: I was incorrect in my vote; I wanted to vote no on that.

Mayor Leary: So the vote is no. Great, so that is a 4 to 1 vote. Thank you so much.

Now the motion we’re going to $30 million referendum, Cindy please read the roll: Commissioner Seidel-Yes; Commissioner Sprinkel-Yes, Commissioner Cooper-Yes; Commissioner McMacken-Yes; Mayor Leary-Yes.
And now the second or the next is regarding the location, (Clerk called the roll): Commissioner Seidel-No; Commissioner Sprinkel-Yes, Commissioner Cooper-Yes; Commissioner McMacken-Yes; Mayor Leary-Yes.

And the first is to accept the final report from Aci: Commissioner Seidel-Yes; Commissioner Sprinkel-Yes, Commissioner Cooper-Yes, Commissioner McMacken-Yes; Mayor Leary-Yes.
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ORDINANCE NO. 3020-15

AN ORDINANCE CALLING A BOND REFERENDUM TO BE HELD ON THE QUESTION OF THE ISSUANCE OF NOT EXCEEDING $30,000,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 2016, OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, TO FINANCE THE COST OF THE ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINTER PARK LIBRARY AND EVENTS CENTER AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CITY; AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF SUCH BONDS IF APPROVED BY REFERENDUM; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA (the "Issuer"):

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR THIS ORDINANCE. This ordinance is enacted pursuant to Chapters 100, 166, and 215, Florida Statutes, and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS. The City Commission of the Issuer (the "Commission") hereby determines that:

(a) it serves a public purpose and is in the best interest of the Issuer and the general public to issue General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016 (the "Bonds") to finance the acquisition and construction of the capital improvements described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, and all purposes incidental thereto (collectively, the "Project"); and

(b) the Project will be used for educational and cultural events and programs and have shared meeting spaces; and

(c) the individual components of the Project are united by a single public purpose and constitute a single project for the purposes of all applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 3. AUTHORIZATION OF BONDS. Subject and pursuant to the provisions hereof, the Bonds are authorized to be issued in the aggregate principal amount of not exceeding $30,000,000 to finance the Project. The money received from the issuance of the Bonds will be used for such purpose and for the benefit of the Issuer. The Bonds shall be payable from ad valorem taxes levied without limitation as to rate or amount on all taxable property in the area of the Issuer. None of the Bonds shall be issued for a longer term than 20 years from their date of issuance, and such Bonds shall bear interest at such rate or rates not exceeding the maximum rate permitted by law on the date of sale of the Bonds.
SECTION 4. BOND REFERENDUM. A bond referendum of the qualified electors residing in the area of the Issuer is hereby called to be held on March 15, 2016 to determine whether or not the issuance of the Bonds, in an aggregate principal amount of not exceeding $30,000,000 shall be approved by such qualified electors to finance the cost of the acquisition and construction of the Project. All qualified electors residing in the area of the Issuer shall be entitled and permitted to vote in such bond referendum. The polls will be open at the voting places from 7:00 A.M. until 7:00 P.M. on the same day.

SECTION 5. NOTICE OF BOND REFERENDUM. As required by law, at least 30 days' notice of the bond referendum shall be provided. This ordinance shall be published in full as part of the notice of such bond referendum, together with an appropriate notice in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit "B," in the Orlando Sentinel or any other newspaper published and of general circulation in the area of the Issuer, at least twice, once in the fifth week and once in the third week prior to the week in which the bond referendum is to be held.

SECTION 6. PLACES OF VOTING, INSPECTORS, CLERKS. The places of voting and the inspectors and clerks for the polling places for the bond referendum shall be the same as in general elections held in the area of the Issuer.

SECTION 7. OFFICIAL BALLOT. The form of ballot to be used shall be in substantially the following form:

OFFICIAL BALLOT
CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA
BOND REFERENDUM – MARCH 15, 2016

For the purpose of building the Winter Park Library and Events Center, to include library facilities, civic meeting and gathering facilities and related parking structure, and improvements, and all purposes incidental thereto, shall the City of Winter Park, Florida, issue not exceeding $30,000,000 general obligation bonds, bearing interest at not exceeding the maximum legal rate, maturing within 20 years from date of issuance, payable from ad valorem taxes levied on all taxable property in the City area, without limitation as to rate or amount; as provided in Ordinance No. 3020-15?

Instructions to Voters:

If you are in favor of the issuance of the bonds, select "FOR BONDS."

If you are not in favor of the issuance of the bonds, select "AGAINST BONDS."

Ordinance No. 3020-15
SECTION 8. ABSENTEE VOTING. Paper ballots shall be used at such election for absentee voting. The form of ballot to be used in the referendum for absentee voters shall be in substantially the form specified in Section 7 above.

SECTION 9. PRINTING OF BALLOTS. The Supervisor of Elections is authorized and directed to have printed a sufficient number of such ballots for use of absentee electors qualified to cast ballots in the bond referendum, and shall also have printed sample ballots and deliver them to the inspectors and clerks on or before the date and time for the opening of the polls for such bond referendum, for use at the voting places; and further is authorized and directed to have printed on plain white cardboard or paper and delivered in accordance with law, the official ballots for use in such bond referendum.

SECTION 10. REFERENDUM PROCEDURE. The bond referendum shall be held and conducted in the manner prescribed by law for holding general elections in the area of the Issuer, except as may be provided by Sections 100.201 through 100.351, Florida Statutes. The inspectors and clerks at each polling place shall prepare and file returns of such bond referendum and shall deliver the same to the Issuer. Such returns shall show the number of qualified electors who voted at such bond referendum, and the number of votes cast respectively for and against approval of the proposition. The returns shall, as soon as practicable, be canvassed by the Commission.

SECTION 11. REFERENDUM RESULTS. If a majority of the votes cast at such bond referendum shall be "For Bonds," such proposition shall be approved; and then the Bonds and, at the option of the Commission, bond anticipation notes, may be issued as hereafter provided by subsequent resolutions of the Commission.

SECTION 12. SEVERABILITY. In the event that any word, phrase, clause, sentence or paragraph hereof shall be held invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect any other word, clause, phrase, sentence or paragraph hereof.

SECTION 13. REPEALING CLAUSE. All ordinances, resolutions or parts thereof in conflict or inconsistent with this ordinance are hereby repealed insofar as there is conflict or inconsistency.
SECTION 14. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its final passage and adoption.

ADOPTED after reading by title at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, City Hall, Winter Park, Florida, on this 23rd day of November, 2015.

ATTEST:

Cynthia S. Bonham, City Clerk
EXHIBIT "A"

Description of Project

A new library and events center consisting of library facilities, civic meeting and gathering facilities and related parking structure, and improvements incidental thereto, and the demolition and removal of the existing civic center.
EXHIBIT “B”

NOTICE OF BOND REFERENDUM IN THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA ON March 15, 2016.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A BOND REFERENDUM will be held on March 15, 2016 in the City Winter Park, Florida (the "Issuer"), for the purpose of determining whether or not General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016, of the Issuer shall be issued in the aggregate principal amount of not exceeding $30,000,000, bearing interest at such rate or rates not exceeding the legal rate as shall be determined at the time of sale thereof, maturing over a period not to exceed 20 years from the date of issuance of such Bonds, payable from ad valorem taxes levied without limitation as to rate or amount on all taxable property in the area of the Issuer, for the purpose of financing the acquisition and construction of a municipal complex consisting of a library and events center which shall include library facilities, civic meeting and gathering facilities and related parking structure, and improvements incidental thereto, and the demolition and removal of the existing civic center; all as more specifically described and provided in Ordinance No. 3020-15 of the Issuer (the "Ordinance").

The places of voting in the bond referendum shall be those same places of voting as for general elections held in the area of the Issuer. The polls will be open at the voting places on the date of the bond referendum from 7:00 A.M. until 7:00 P.M. on the same day, all as provided in the Ordinance published in full below as part of this notice.

All qualified electors residing within the area of the Issuer shall be entitled, qualified and permitted to vote at such referendum.

CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA

By /s/ Randy B. Knight, City Manager

Ordinance No. 3020-15
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CITY OF WINTER PARK
CITIZEN INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PETITION FORM
RE: TO PROHIBIT CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINTER PARK LIBRARY
AT MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARK

Sec. 104.185, Florida Statutes - A person who knowingly signs a petition or petitions for a candidate, a political party, or an issue more than one time, or signs another person's name, or a fictitious name to said petition commits a misdemeanor of the first degree punishable by a fine up to $775.083 or 6 months in jail.

This petition is being circulated by a petitioners' committee consisting of five qualified voters of the City of Winter Park (Michael Poole, Sarah Flynn, Marjorie L. Bridges, Joseph Terranova, and Charles J. Williams, Jr.). The petition proposes a citizen initiative ordinance pursuant to Section 5.01 of the Winter Park City Charter. You should read the proposed initiative ordinance which is attached to this petition form before you sign this petition. The text of the proposed initiative ordinance has been prepared by the petitioners' committee and not the City of Winter Park.

By signing this petition you hereby petition the City Commission of City of Winter Park to adopt this initiative ordinance pursuant to Article V, Sections 5.01 and 5.08(a) of the City of Winter Park City Charter. If the City Commission fails to adopt the initiative ordinance, the City Commission will be required pursuant to Article V, Section 5.08(b) of the City of Winter Park City Charter to place the proposed initiative ordinance before the qualified electors of Winter Park for approval or disapproval at a duly held referendum election.

Each signature below shall be executed in ink or indelible pencil, and shall be followed by the address of the person signing.

Please print your name:

1. Name: FRED W. HASLER Signature: Signature: Address: 608 BRECHIN DRIVE 32719
2. Name: CLARE L. HASLER Signature: Address: 608 BRECHIN DRIVE 32719
3. Name: MILES C. MCDONEL Signature: Address: 625 BRECHIN DRIVE 32719
4. Name: Barbara Gruber Signature: Address: 617 Brechin Dr. 32719
5. Name: FRED J. Gruber Signature: Address: 617 Brechin Dr. 32719
6. Name: CAROL ANN THERESA Signature: Address: 609 Brechin Drive 32719
7. Name: MARTA WESTALL Signature: Address: 679 Brechin Dr. 32719
8. Name: ROSIE EVANS Signature: Address: 635 Brechin Dr. 32719
9. Name: CHARLES W. (JR) Signature: Address: 617 Brechin Dr. 32719
10. Name: CAROL A. WIECZOREK Signature: Address: 656 Brechin Drive 32719
11. Name: Barbara Hunt Signature: Address: 630 BRECHIN DRIVE 32719
12. Name: JENNIFER KOHLBAUER Signature: Address: 664 BRECHIN DRIVE 32719

A Paid Political Advertisement by: SAVE OUR LIBRARY WP: 1671 SUMMERLAND AV., WINTER PARK, FL 32789
NOTE: Section 5.05(c) of the Charter of the City of Winter Park states:

Each paper of an initiative petition shall have attached to it when filed an affidavit executed by the circulator thereof stating that he personally circulated the paper, the number of signatures thereon, that all the signatures were affixed in his presence, that he believes them to be the genuine signatures of the persons whose names they purport to be and that each signer had an opportunity before signing to read the full text of the ordinance proposed or sought to be reconsidered.

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared MILES C. McDONNELL, JR. who, by me being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am over the age of eighteen years. I am authorized to make this Affidavit, and I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein.
2. I personally circulated the attached petition with the initiative ordinance attached to the petition.
3. The attached petition contains 26 signatures, and all the signatures were affixed (made) in my presence.
4. I believe the signatures to be the genuine signatures of the persons whose names they purport to be.
5. Each signer had an opportunity before signing to read the full text of the ordinance proposed.

Sworn to under oath and subscribed to before me this 19th day of July, 2016, by MILES MC DONNELL, JR. who personally appeared before me or has produced person known as identification.

KAREN L. MARLIN
NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: May 23, 2019
ORDINANCE NO. ____-16

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, PROHIBITING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINTER PARK LIBRARY AT MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARK (FORMERLY KNOWN AS LAKE ISLAND PARK), A CITY PARK BOUNDED BY W. MORSE BOULEVARD, S. DENNING DRIVE, HARPER ST., AND W. COMSTOCK AVE.; PROVIDING LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE FOR THIS ORDINANCE.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR THIS ORDINANCE. This Ordinance is enacted pursuant to the provisions of Article V, "Initiative, Referendum and Recall," of the Charter of the City of Winter Park and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS. It is hereby ascertained, determined, and declared that:

A. Article V of the City Charter authorizes qualified voters of the City to propose ordinances to the City Commission. If the Commission fails to adopt the proposed ordinance without any change in substance within sixty (60) days, the proposed ordinance must be submitted to the voters of the City at a regular or special election within the time requirements of Section 5.08 of the Charter.

B. A petitioners' committee of five (5) qualified voters commenced initiative proceedings to propose an ordinance prohibiting the construction of the Winter Park Library or similar library facility at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park (formerly known as Lake Island Park), a City park bounded by West Morse Boulevard, South Denning Drive, Harper Street, and West Comstock Avenue in Winter Park. All papers of the initiative petition filed with the City Clerk have been determined to be sufficient.

SECTION 3. CONSTRUCTION OF WINTER PARK LIBRARY AT MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PARK PROHIBITED.

The construction of the Winter Park Library at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park shall be prohibited.
SECTION 4. CONFLICTS. All ordinances or parts of ordinances and all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict with any of the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, word, or provisions of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, whether for substantive, procedural, facial, or other reasons, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 6. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall be effective immediately upon its final passage and enactment.

ENACTED after reading by title at a meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park held in City Hall, Winter Park, Florida, on this ___ day of __________, 2016.

______________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

______________________________
City Clerk, Cynthia S. Bonham
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July 21, 2016

Ms. Cindy Bonham  
City Clerk  
City of Winter Park  
401 Park Avenue South  
Winter Park, Florida 32789

RE: ORDINANCE PROHIBITING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINTER PARK LIBRARY AT MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARK

Dear Ms. Bonham:

Accompanying this letter, the Petitioner’s Committee is delivery to you today 139 petition forms (2-sided) with approximately 2,234 signatures from Winter Park citizens who are registered voters. The amount of signatures required based on 10% of the registered voters at the last election date is 2,011.

Each petition signature form is attached to the proposed ordinance previously filed with you. We have numbered each page of the petition signature forms, but not the proposed ordinance pages. The signature pages are numbered 1 thru 178. This should help you keep track of all the forms. We have made a copy of each of the petition signature pages.

Please send all certified letters to the address below.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Poole  
1671 Summerland Av  
Winter Park, Florida 32789
August 1, 2016

Ms. Cindy Bonham  
City Clerk  
City of Winter Park  
401 Park Avenue South  
Winter Park, Florida 32789

Dear Ms. Bonham:

I received your certificate of insufficiency on July 30, 2016. We disagree with your findings.

In accordance with Section 5.06(b) the Petitioners’ Committee is requesting the City Commission to review your certificate and our petition ordinance at the next Commission meeting on August 8, 2016.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael W. Poole
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ARTICLE V. - INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM AND RECALL

Sec. 5.01. - Initiative.

The qualified voters of the city shall have power to propose ordinances to the commission and, if the commission fails to adopt an ordinance so proposed without any change in substance, to adopt or reject it at a city election.

Sec. 5.02. - Referendum.

The qualified voters of the city shall have the power to require reconsideration by the commission of any adopted ordinance and, if the commission fails to repeal an ordinance so reconsidered, to approve or reject it at a city election.

Sec. 5.03. - Recall.

The qualified voters of the city shall have the power to recall and to remove from office any elected official of the city as provided by general law.

Sec. 5.04. - Commencement of proceedings.

Any five (5) qualified voters may commence initiative or referendum proceedings by filing with the clerk or other official designated by the commission an affidavit stating they will constitute the petitioners' committee and be responsible for circulating the petition and filing it in proper form, stating their names and addresses and specifying one street address to which all notices to the committee are to be sent, and setting out in full the proposed initiative ordinance or the ordinance sought to be reconsidered.

Promptly after the affidavit of the petitioners' committee is filed, the clerk or other official designated by the commission may, at the committee's request, issue the appropriate petition blanks to the petitioners' committee at the committee's expense.

Sec. 5.05. - Petitions.

(a) **Number of signatures.** Initiative and referendum petitions must be signed by qualified voters of the city equal in number to at least ten (10) percent of the total number of qualified voters registered to vote at the last regular city election.

(b) **Form and content.** All papers of a petition shall be uniform in size and style and shall be assembled as one instrument for filing. Each signature shall be executed in ink or
indelible pencil and shall be followed by the address of the person signing. Petitions shall contain or have attached thereto throughout their circulation the full text of the ordinance proposed or sought to be reconsidered.

(c) Affidavit of circulator. Each paper of a petition shall have attached to it when filed an affidavit executed by the circulator thereof stating that he personally circulated the paper, the number of signatures thereon, that all the signatures were affixed in his presence, that he believes them to be the genuine signatures of the persons whose names they purport to be and that each signer had an opportunity before signing to read the full text of the ordinance proposed or sought to be reconsidered.

(d) Time for filing referendum petitions. Referendum petitions must be filed within thirty (30) days after adoption by the commission of the ordinance sought to be reconsidered.

Sec. 5.06. - Procedure for filing.

(a) Certificate of clerk; amendment. Within twenty (20) days after the petition is filed (five (5) working days for a referendum), the city clerk or other official designated by the commission shall complete a certificate as to its sufficiency, specifying, if it is insufficient, the particulars wherein it is defective and shall promptly send a copy of the certificate to the petitioners' committee by certified mail. Grounds for insufficiency are only those specified in Section 5.05. A petition certified insufficient for lack of the required number of valid signatures may be amended once if the petitioners' committee files a notice of intention to amend it with the clerk or other official designated by the commission within two (2) days after receiving the copy of the certificate and files a supplementary petition upon additional papers within ten (10) days after receiving the copy of such certificate. Such supplementary petition shall comply with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of Section 5.05, and within five (5) days after it is filed the clerk or other official designated by the commission shall complete a certificate as to the sufficiency of the petition as amended and promptly send a copy of such certificate to the petitioners' committee by certified mail as in the case of an original petition. If a petition or amended petition is certified sufficient, or if a petition or amended petition is certified insufficient and the petitioners' committee does not elect to amend or request commission review under subsection (b) of this section within the time required, the clerk or other official designated by the commission shall promptly present the certificate to the commission and the certificate shall then be a final determination as to the sufficiency of the petition.

(b) Commission review. If a petition has been certified insufficient and the petitioners' committee does not file notice of intention to amend it or if an amended petition has been certified insufficient, the committee may, within two (2) days after receiving the copy of such certificate, file a request that if be reviewed by the commission. The commission shall review the certificate at its next meeting following the filing of such request and approve or disapprove it, and the commission's determination shall then be a final determination as to the sufficiency of the petition.

Sec. 5.07. - Referendum petitions; effect on ordinances.

When a referendum petition is filed with the clerk or other official designated by the commission, the ordinance sought to be reconsidered shall nevertheless be deemed a valid and effective ordinance unless and until it is repealed by the commission or a vote of the electors of the city.
Sec. 5.08. - Action on petitions.

(a) Action by commission. When an initiative or referendum petition has been finally determined sufficient, the commission shall promptly consider the proposed initiative ordinance in the manner provided in Article II, or reconsider the referred ordinance by voting its repeal. If the commission fails to adopt a proposed initiative ordinance without any change in substance within sixty (60) days or fails to repeal the referred ordinance within thirty (30) days, it shall submit the proposed or referred ordinance to the voters of the city.

(b) Submission to voters. The vote of the city on a proposed or referred ordinance shall be held not less than thirty (30) days and not later than sixty (60) days from the date that the petition was determined sufficient. If no regular city election is to be held within the period prescribed in this subsection, the commission shall provide for a special election; otherwise, the vote shall be held at the same time as such regular election; otherwise, the vote shall be held at the same time as such regular election, except that the commission may, in its discretion, provide for a special election at an earlier date within the prescribed period. Copies of the proposed or referred ordinance shall be made available for inspection at the office of the city clerk or other designated official not less than five (5) days prior to the election and at the polls.

(c) Withdrawal of petitions. An initiative or referendum petition may be withdrawn at any time prior to the fifteenth (15th) day preceding the date scheduled for a vote of the city by filing with the clerk or other official designated by the commission a request for withdrawal signed by at least four-fifths (4/5) of the members of the petitioners' committee. Upon the filing of such request the petition shall have not further force or effect and all proceedings thereon shall be terminated.

Sec. 5.09. - Results of election.

(a) Initiative. If a majority of the qualified electors voting on a proposed initiative ordinance vote in its favor, it shall be considered adopted upon certification of the election results and shall be treated in all respects in the same manner as ordinances of the same kind adopted by the commission. However, no ordinance adopted by an electoral vote shall be repealed or amended except by an electoral vote. The commission may, by ordinance, submit to the electors a proposed ordinance to repeal or amend any such ordinance. If conflicting ordinances are approved at the same election, the one receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

(b) Referendum. If a majority of the qualified electors voting on a referred ordinance vote against it, it shall be considered repealed upon certification of the election results.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item type</th>
<th>Action Item Requiring Discussion</th>
<th>meeting date</th>
<th>October 26, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prepared by</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>approved by</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic objective</td>
<td>Exceptional Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment in Public Assets &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**subject**

New Library/Civic Center Final Report

**motion | recommendation**

The following motions are needed:
- Accept the final report form ACi.
- Approve the general location of the new Library/Civic Center at the existing Civic Center site
- Direct staff to bring back an ordinance calling for a bond referendum to be held in conjunction with the City elections March 15, 2016 in an amount not to exceed $30,000,000 (or such other amount as the Commission sees fit).

**background**

At the July 13, 2015 Commission meeting the Commission directed staff to utilize the services of ACi to facilitate a series of community outreach meetings, to develop site plans and building elevations and to provide an estimated cost that can be used for the bond referendum.

ACi did facilitate three community outreach meetings which led to the attached final report that includes site plans, building elevations and estimated costs for the new Library/Civic Center facility. Based upon those meetings there appeared to be consensus that the northwest corner of the property (the site of the existing Civic Center) is the best location for the new facility. The all-in cost of the Library, Civic Center and Parking Garage is estimated to be $32,414,311. With the Library committed to $2.5 million (including grants) the remaining amount needed is $29,914,311. It should be noted that this number includes a fairly healthy contingency of 15% ($3,450,243) of the construction component of the costs.
In order to have the Library/Civic Center bond question on the ballot March 15, 2016 the Commission will need to adopt an ordinance calling for the bond question by the first meeting in December. The current schedule is to put the ordinance on the two meetings in November.

A $30 million 20-year bond issue would require a first year millage rate of approximately 0.4937. The golf course bonds that are rolling off the tax bill were at 0.0892 mills so the net new millage would be approximately 0.4045 mills. These numbers are scalable, meaning for $1 million increase or decrease to the bond issue the millage would increase or decrease approximately 0.0165 mills.

alternatives | other considerations

There are numerous options that can be considered. The Commission could choose to pay some of the cost from other sources other than the bond issue and thereby reduce the amount in the bond question. The scope of the project could be modified. The contingency could be reduced.

fiscal impact

TBD
Winter Park Public Library and Civic Center at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park

Community Engagement Workshops

Prepared for:
City of Winter Park, Florida & Winter Park Public Library Board of Trustees

Prepared by:
City Consulting Architect-ACi Architects

ACi Consulting Team:
Jeffrey Blydenburgh Architect
HKS Architects
Project for Public Spaces
Stantec/Haley Harrison Landscape Architects
AVCON Engineering

Date: October 26, 2015
“The idea of collaboration, the need to get together and collaborate, share and actually going out into the park was fantastic! That was hands on. That’s what we need. That’s engagement. That’s involvement.”

Winter Park Citizen & Workshop Collaborator

The ACi Team wants to express our deepest thanks to those who made these workshops possible including the City of Winter Park Commission and the Winter Park Library Board of Trustees, Executive Director and Staff, the City Manager, City Communications Department, the City Parks & Recreation Director and Staff and the City Library Task Force for their tireless efforts.

Special thanks to our guest speakers Amy Garmer, Director of the Communications & Society program for The Aspen Institute, Dr. Norman Jacknis, President of the New York Metropolitan Library Council and Fred Kent and Elena Madison, Principals of Project for Public Spaces.

The greatest thanks goes to our citizens, friends and neighbors who showed up in great numbers. They enthusiastically helped us improve our community’s civic participation process, ensuring a democratic outcome, and creating a strong sense of community that strengthens people’s attachment to their place and to each other.
The New American Public Library

"The library, the most democratic of public institutions, is the **essential civil society space** where this new America will take its democratic character.

The library is a core civic society institution, democracy’s ‘maker space.’"

Amy K. Garmer
The Aspen Institute
Table of Contents

Introduction / Foreword .......... 1
Community Engagement .......... 4
Location .................. 28
Visualization ............. 34
Technical Feasibility / Concept Budget .. 36
Appendix .................. 40
INTRODUCTION / FOREWORD
Introduction / Foreword:

One of the most important attributes about our 128-year old city is that this long and wonderful amount of time has allowed each succeeding generation to make its own unique contribution to Winter Park’s future.

As times, trends and community demographics have evolved, so has our community library. Relocating 3 times, starting in the early 1900’s, the last expansion (1975) was a 3rd floor addition that was added to serve the growing needs of our city’s children and youth.

With each physical relocation that occurred, the library physically and strategically grew to serve its community. Not because it wanted to get bigger, but because our community needed a different kind of library. The proposed next era of the Winter Park Public Library is not unlike other great communities and libraries across America that are building a new 21st century public library platform. That new platform accelerates us all from “knowledge information” to “knowledge creation”. This transformation is being integrated with new places of community collaboration that are multi-use civic/library destinations. The “City Task Force Final Report” of June 22, 2015, documents the fact that 80% of library construction built in the last few years is all new construction. These results also show significant increases in the number of users, members, visitors and improvements involving the city’s social and economic quality of life.

Today, the presentation of this “Community Engagement Workshops” report builds upon the Task Force Report recommendations regarding site location. Following 10 months of well-attended public meetings more than 5 locations were studied, including the existing location. In a unanimous vote, the Task Force overwhelmingly recommended the site for the new library be located in the northern sector of Martin Luther King JR. Park (MLK Park).

Following the Commission’s review of the City Task Force’s recommendation for this location, through a unanimous vote, the Commission directed the City Manager to move forward with a more detailed conceptual study by the City’s consulting architect, ACI, to achieve the following outcomes:

- Continue informing and involving the community with open access, dialogue, participation and input regarding a specific location within the northern sector of MLK Park to build consensus regarding concept site composition, quality of architecture, style, and visualization;
- Include a new civic center and low-profile garage;
- Illustrate 2 options for the community preferred location in the northern sector;
- Prepare a conceptual library design visualizations;
- Based on the above, prepare an updated preliminary Concept Budget;
- Present the above information to the Commission on October 26, 2015.
It is important to note that this document represents a community-led framework of guiding principles for more community engagement to follow. Following the results of the public bond referendum, this document will be important to the next steps of finalizing the conceptual work presented herein.

What We Did
The purpose of this next step was to more carefully assess the report’s high-level findings regarding physical and implementation constraints, impacts and opportunities including park character and open space, surface and structured parking, street presence, existing storm water capacity, as well as re-purposing the existing civic center with the new library. A key guiding principle of this next step was to bring forth valid site location options that could enrich and energize better utilization of existing park space as a multi-use destination for all members of our community. The process, which took place, as described herein, was intended to create a transparent and open dialogue with the community. It was structured to inform and involve our citizens with sensitive site development relationship concepts between the new proposed library building, civic center, garage and the northern sector of MLK Park.

To do this, and both retain and improve the community’s use of park’s open space, viewshed, landscape, wildlife and current experiences, the process was structured to start with the park, not the buildings.

What We Learned From Our Community
A huge thanks goes to the large numbers of people that attended the 3 community Workshops at the Civic Center at MLK Park and/or watched the live streaming of the workshops online.

What we learned from our community is that a great public civic use is really a community’s “third place” (personal fulfillment beyond where one lives or works). An interactive place for all people individually or in groups to come together to openly discuss, learn, discover and create. In order to create a civic and park composition for the new Library and Civic Center, community-led thinking has been the key.

The Scope
- Site location (2 options)
- Street presence
- Site access/vehicular circulation (public, service)
- Parking
- Park view shed/open space, existing/proposed landscape
- Site/civil/storm water
- Sustainability
- Pedestrian, bicycle access/circulation
- Relationship to surrounding uses
- Conceptual design expressions
- Conceptual budget
Following the City’s authorization, a "Kickoff Meeting" occurred between all required team members to review and align the goals, objectives, required tasks and key schedule milestones to be completed by the City, Library Administration, ACi and bond referendum consultant.

ACi and its sub-consultants generally collected, studied, evaluated and developed specific data which was then used in connection with the following areas of study in preparation for:

- Review of existing data including topographical, boundary & utilities
- Create a conceptual Civic Center facility program
- Develop site location options for new Library, Civic Center & Garage
- Civil drainage/storm water capacity study
- Sustainability considerations
- Pedestrian, bicycle access/circulation
- Relationship to surrounding uses
- Conceptual site and building design expressions
- Concept budget

The ACi Team assisted the City and Library Administration in facilitating 3 community workshops. ACi recommended the Community Workshops be conducted at the Civic Center located at MLK Park to physically have a “hands on” experience with the park. The specific sequence and content of these workshops is further described within this report.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Community Engagement:

At the direction of the Winter Park City Commission, ACi began a three-pronged phase of community engagement, structured to bring the community’s knowledge to the forefront both in person and virtually live-streaming the workshops.

The purpose of the workshops were to:

- Continue Commission’s emphasis on Community-led thinking.
- Co-create a new “place” for a new 21st century Library/Civic Center in MLK Park.
- Visualize the “place” and “building character” of our new Library/Civic Center.

Three Community Workshops:

- Site Placemaking Possibilities, August 22, 2015
- Building Design Possibilities, August 23, 2015
- Community Findings & Visualization, September 17, 2015

Site Placemaking Possibilities ~ Workshop 1:

On August 22, 2015, the ACi Team assisted the City and Library Administration in facilitating the first community engagement workshop for the New Winter Park Public Library/Civic Center. The workshop introduced an overview of the vision, existing site conditions, a site walkabout, and site and building planning input. Visualizing the “place” first and “building character” second, led the discussion to include open space, landscape, street view, surrounding neighborhoods, and user preferences regarding trees, walkability, image, comfort, safety, parking and access to the park.

Prominent guest speakers were presented which included, Dr. Norman Jacknis from The Aspen Institute, advisor to the U.S. Council of Mayors, President of the New York Metropolitan Library Council, and Director of Cisco’s IBSG Public Sector Group (the company’s open innovation and strategic advisory group) along with Fred Kent and Elena Madison, Founder and Principals from Project for Public Spaces. All three are globally recognized, world-renowned experts in their respective fields of working with communities involving 21st century public libraries, famous award-winning parks, socio-economic development, and public/civic space placemaking.

Dr. Jacknis began his presentation by introducing the community to all the library competitors of today, such as Kindle, Google and many other Internet and technological resources, which serve as a platform similar to the “traditional” library. Jacknis spoke to the library as a nationally networked platform, no longer being local, instead having an array of digitalization, oral and visual materials combined with paper and other non-electronic media. Subsequently, Jacknis explained a brief history of the library, showing comparisons of what the library’s collection used to be in the past and what it is today and will be in the coming future. Though books in the traditional sense remain important, our society has moved from storing books locally to storing somewhere out there – in the Cloud.
We have an infinite collection of wearable technology including in-sight information, translators, display screens, Facetime and Skype that enable us to connect with the world from anywhere.

Following up, Jacknis explains that The Aspen Institute believes the library will be the platform of the future, and will serve to connect people to place, creating a lifelong learning and creativity space, sometimes known as a “third place”. He goes on showing what path the library could possibly take, by being partners or serving as a platform for self-publishing services, having maker spaces with art, music and video; or also serving as an innovation space, with conversation cafes, innovative technology and long lasting history. Based on The Aspen Institute’s detailed and published research, Jacknis and The Aspen Institute believe the “public library is the most cost-effective institution for life-long learning,” therefore it should not be forgotten or left in the past.

The workshop continued with Fred Kent and Elena Madison from Project for Public Spaces. A space can be transformed into an active and living area for the future of the community, with parks and libraries benefiting from such a location as the one proposed. Kent stated, “In the 21st century the best city parks are also multi-use destinations and catalysts for community development.” Workshop attendees were presented an array of examples such as Bryant Park and Central Park, which led to observation through the pictures of community involvement and the difference of those places. Throughout this part of the workshop, Elena and Fred demonstrated to the community how the transformation from a simple park to an active park is possible and an exciting one, where in the long term, placemaking pays off with the green spaces advancing the economic development of the city and its residents.

Since citizens understand their community’s need, hopes and desires for the future, ACi invited the audience to walk the park/site so they could observe the location, the park, current civic center, surrounding neighborhoods, and user preferences regarding trees, walkability, image, comfort, safety, parking and access to the park.
After an engaging walk by all workshop attendees, the small groups became filled with ideas and discoveries, and began formulating opinions on the site location. These small groups gathered at their tables and began to formulate which area, within the park, the library and civic center should go, and what placemaking possibilities the park could plan for outside of the library and civic center.

After a period of discussions and placemaking decisions, the team leaders presented each groups’ proposed plans (see appendix for more information on team ideas). The groups seemed extremely interested in the project with extraordinary ideas that could not only benefit their neighborhood, but the City of Winter Park as a whole. The outcomes were extremely interesting, and varied from activities in the park, water activities, to common spaces to meet/gather or just be alone in the park with natural shade, cafes, and even a carousel.

The workshop was an engaging opportunity, enabling the community to connect to the project, giving important opinions and input for the ACi Team to then translate. The workshop’s goal was to engage with the community on the vision, existing site conditions, placemaking possibilities and library and civic center site location. The citizens’ passion for Winter Park’s public resources led to a very positive discussion as our community moves forward in a 21st century that requires access to information, knowledge and networks.
Building Design Possibilities ~ Workshop 2:

Following the community-led thinking process described above on “Place the Site”, the second workshop opened in the afternoon of August 23, 2015 with visual pop-up’s and placemaking ideas which came from the community input given from citizens in the first workshop. Those ideas were laid out to the community whom attended (both in-person and through the live-stream) to gather feedback and thought.

Citizens expressed, in their dialogue and through group presentations, that Winter Park has the remarkable opportunity to define its new library and MLK Park as “21st century places.” The community’s input emphasized the need for sensitivity in bringing the park and library together and protecting the open viewshed that exists at the corner of Morse and Denning. Placing the new library, civic center and garage in the general area of the existing civic center was a common comment: the new composition should more fully integrate and be envisioned as the heart of a multi-use destination: a vibrant, green, dynamic and exciting place that enhances the experience of both park and library, and builds a strong sense of community. Planning and integrating some of the ideas created by the community in workshop #1, the MLK Park will better support the broader plans for extending Winter Park’s village core to Morse Boulevard, creating a distinct and active walkable city edge. The new library building has the potential of being a catalyst on Morse Boulevard, bringing activity closer to the street and creating a library plaza at the corner of Morse Boulevard and Harper Avenue.
Library User Behavior:

Before the second workshop concluded, the ACi Team facilitated a Library User Experience Survey exercise where 51 workshop attendees participated. The below summarizes the main findings from those activities and includes key examples. These were then shared at Community Workshop #3 on September 17th.

I. Main Findings:

- More & larger reading areas with access to natural light & views.
- Generations tend to share similar interests in spaces of engagement and quiet repose.
- Thus, organization of the library should be considered by functional use rather than by mostly age.
- However, with these shared interests and needs, ensure that services are distributed throughout the library spaces for optimal use.
- Consider a combined bookstore/cafe to meet desire for food service & ability to purchase items of “literary and historical interest.”
- Make sure that services and spaces are strategically located within and throughout the space to avoid the isolation or high threshold of effort to get to locations (i.e., adult interest areas currently segregated by child/teen/tween zones.
- Employees are also end users and their spaces should be allocated as a mix between ease of access to the public with private, secure areas for administrative functions.

II. Visual Preference Insights—New Library Interiors

Visual Preference Boards featuring images from six different categories of the Future Library’s program were displayed for the public’s critique. Users were asked to place green circular stickers on boards to which they had a positive reaction. Red stickers were to be placed on images that they did not favor. The interior design team was then able to identify certain interior preferences based on the collection of these stickers.

Overall, the users were drawn to images that have natural light and views to the outdoors. They preferred larger scale spaces but also favored smaller task-oriented areas. Color preference was weighted toward subdued crisp accents, instead of highly saturated tones. For special use areas such as a café, the users were overly interested in an outdoor/indoor space.
NEW WINTER PARK PUBLIC LIBRARY / CIVIC CENTER: CIVIL ENGAGEMENT SPACE
SMALL TO AUDITORIUM
NEW WINTER PARK PUBLIC LIBRARY / CIVIC CENTER: READER AREAS

COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS: AUGUST 22 - 23, 2015
III. Library User Experience Insights

Each workshop participant was given a small packet of papers with a “worksheet” collecting basic demographic information and key questions about preferences and use in the existing library space. Floor plans were included to share how they enter/exit the building, spaces they access (or not) and services they use. Those who participated in the User Experience mapping exercise ranged in ages from 5 to 86 who submitted feedback via written note, annotated plan and drawings.

Major insights were regarding both user experiences within the current Winter Park library and their expectations for the future library. Overall, patrons enjoyed the bookstore and voiced interest in bringing back some degree of food service. The community room was seen as a useful but less than functional space requiring more room, more aesthetic care and access to daylight. Reading areas, both large/communal and small/silent with access to daylight were valued from the youngest patron to the oldest. Parents voiced a desire for some spaces in which their children could read to them.

A continued presence of “new” and periodical materials, as well as digital materials (i.e., DVDs) was also important across most age groups. However, the Archives were a point of differentiation for many older patrons; either they considered it an asset or were unaware of its existence. Space for tutoring and homework was of higher interest for parents. Some of the younger patrons specified spaces for adults and staff, along with quiet reading areas, which is an interesting perspective to consider in the context of shared preferences and activities. Library staff and patrons alike mentioned an interest in having the staff more centrally located for ease of access and connectivity with the community.
Interactive Design Visual Preference Study:

To assist the ACi Team’s ability to translate the community-led thinking on building design, we began with Winter Park’s own visual character. A brief architectural history of Winter Park was given, followed by an interactive Visual Preferences Design exercise where participants were able to engage through placing green and red dots next to pictures they connected with or away from. These visual preferences ranged from three distinct exterior architecture categories of Arts & Crafts, Mediterranean, and Modern (alphabetical) to Interior Architecture design, Parking Structure designs, and Sustainability design preferences.

This engagement led the ACi Team to identify preferences based on the collection of these stickers. This data collection resulted in moving forward with a modern architecture design since that was the design with the community’s highest volume of green dots.
Community Findings & Visualizations ~ Workshop 3:

ACI Team members evaluated and applied the community-led thinking and results of their table work from Workshops 1 and 2, translating a consensus-led approach to creating concept recommendations that were brought back to the community in this third workshop. This workshop provided opportunity for the community to further refine the guiding principles formed by them in the previous community workshops. This workshop was used to guide finalization of 2-dimensional and 3-dimensional visualizations of site planning options and physical design expressions that support the community preferences.

Carefully integrating the new library at the northwest corner area with MLK Park is the best strategy to enhance the library experience and bring activity into an under-utilized park. Using the principles of placemaking, this integration can result in another uniquely positive destination for the Winter Park community.

Like other libraries around the country, the new Winter Park Public Library can become a "destination" in the same way that museums, renovated railroad stations, and new university buildings attract visitors eager to see the newest in architectural design. The phenomenon of the destination library has helped to position libraries as vehicles for cultural tourism and economic development. More importantly, it has amplified libraries' impact on their local communities from the perspective of placemaking. Locating the library with MLK Park also can reflect a growing consciousness on the part of the Winter Park community of their value as public spaces, moving beyond their traditional functions to take leadership in developing great places for civic, cultural, environmental and social exchange.

A great public space is like a magnet for people. People go there not only because they must pass through on business, but also because it is just pleasant to be there. They are drawn by it. What makes an otherwise ordinary park into a magnet for people?

In its 40 years studying what makes a good public place, Project for Public Spaces has found that four key attributes typically characterize a good public space. The first of these is Comfort and Image: users describe a place as “safe”, “clean”, “green”, “charming”, “attractive” and “historic”. There is comfortable seating; the space is well landscaped and maintained; walking into and through the space is appealing.

The second feature of a good public space is a variety of Uses and Activities that make the place interesting. Users describe the space as “fun”, “special”, “vital” and “real”. Food vending and other retail activities may go on in the space along with library or recreational program; celebrations and weddings occur; children play there.
A third attribute is **Access and Linkage**: that is, the place is visibly connected to other spaces, to transit facilities, to streets, to parking. There are no dead ends; entrances are inviting and easy to find both on foot and by vehicle; the function and connections can be understood at a glance, and the space is designed and located for convenience.

And last, a good public space has **Sociability**: the elderly sit and gossip; chess or other board games are ongoing activities; people meet acquaintances and stop to visit; there is a sense of ownership and pride in the place.

"It is difficult to design a space that will not attract people. What is remarkable is how often this has been accomplished."

- William H. Whyte
Placemaking Principles for Great Destinations:

We firmly believe that a detailed program of uses and activities will be needed to define both the library and the park as great public spaces. Below are certain principles to guide the conceptual design of the new library and its adjacent public spaces as they integrate into MLK Park.

1. The Inner Park and the Outer Park:

Visionary park planner Frederick Law Olmsted's idea of the "inner park" and the "outer park" is just as relevant today as it was over 100 years ago. The streets and sidewalks around MLK Park greatly affect its accessibility and use, as do the ground floors of the buildings surrounding it. The edges of MLK Park are currently very passive, surrounded by suburban buildings that do not engage the street or the park. Within the park itself, there is very little activity visible from the street, and the edges are un-engaging.

Now imagine the new Winter Park library in MLK Park with its doors opening right onto an active plaza at the corner of Morse and Harper; people sit outside and read in a pleasant outdoor environment; walking along Morse Boulevard in the park and along the library is interesting and comfortable; the corner of Morse and Denning has an interesting use to offer – maybe a newspaper kiosk or an ice cream cart – which draws people coming from Park Avenue on foot, by bike and by car. In short, the outer edge is essential to the wellbeing of the inner park.

2. Attractions and Destinations

Any great park has a variety of smaller "places" within it to appeal to a variety of people. For the library in MLK Park these could include reading rooms and children's play areas along the lake that are visible through the glass patio of the light, airy library building; comfortable green spaces and an amphitheater sloping to the water; the bridge across the lake as a beautiful photo-op location with a jewel building for weddings and celebrations nearby; a pleasant picnic area near the playground along Denning Drive. These are just some initial ideas for attractions that MLK Park and the library could offer. They don't need to be big to make the place a success. In fact, some of the best civic spaces, parks and libraries, have numerous small attractions such as a vendor cart, a carousel, and a kids reading area that, when put together, draw people throughout the day. We often use the idea of "The Power of Ten" to set goals for destinations within a park. This concept helps us create ten good places within the park and around the library, each with ten things to do, offering a full program for a successful public space.
3. Image and Identity

Today, libraries can be the center of communities and together with parks and plazas, as they traditionally helped shape the identity of entire cities. Sometimes a fountain or another focal element was used to give the park a strong image: think of the Bethesda Fountain in Central Park or the Swann Fountain in Philadelphia’s Logan Circle. The image of many parks was closely tied to the great civic buildings located in or nearby, such as cathedrals, city halls, or libraries.

Bringing the new library to MLK Park can help both park and library become significant places in Winter Park. The location in a part of town that is being reinvented as more urban environment, but that is currently a very passive suburban park is a challenge. It provides a great opportunity to build a unique, multi-functional civic destination, which also preserves and enhances the natural features of the park.

4. Amenities

The public spaces of the new library should feature amenities that make it comfortable for people to use. Appropriate seating, shade or waste receptacle in just the right location can make a big difference in how people choose to use a place. In general, flexible amenities, such as movable chairs, umbrellas, benches and plantings that are not structural but could be moved for a special event or celebration, make for the most comfortable and inviting public spaces. Public art and landscaping features can also be a great magnet for adults and children of all ages to come together. Whether portable, movable or permanent, good, thoughtfully selected amenities can go a long way to establish a convivial setting for learning and social interaction.
5. Flexible Design

The use of the library's public spaces, and the park in general should change during the course of the day, week, and year. To respond to these natural fluctuations, flexibility needs to be built in. Instead of a permanent event location, for example, a movable stage could be used, with the design allowing for needed infrastructure, access, and potential green room/back stage area. Thus a sloping amphitheater with the lake as a backdrop may only be appropriate for small events, while larger activities take place closer to the library building in the covered park plaza. Likewise, the library building itself could accommodate a movie screen for screenings and regular outdoor movie programs. For weddings and special celebrations parts of the park and civic center could be used without disturbing public uses.

6. Seasonal Strategy

A successful public space can’t flourish with just one design or management strategy. Great parks such as Bryant Park, Madison Square Park, or Houston’s Discovery Green change with the seasons. Skating rinks, outdoor cafés, book festivals, author readings, horticulture displays, art and sculpture can all help adapt the use of the space, and its look, from one season to the next. Celebrations related not only to the seasons, but to the library and its programs should also be part of this strategic thinking for the public spaces of the library.

7. Information and Linkages

Merging the synergies of the Winter Park Public Library and MLK Park destination, the surrounding area will become more of a distinct new third place. This includes surrounding neighbors, residents, students, workers, children, families, recreational users and visitors to share a heightened sense of place. As important, it has an opportunity to, over time, set in motion and accelerate a new link to Park Avenue especially on foot and bicycles. As one of the City’s most historically planned gateways, Morse Boulevard is currently not very pedestrian-friendly because of the suburban aspect of the buildings lining it. While the walk from Park Avenue isn’t long, it is not yet very pleasant particularly as the sidewalk disappears in several instances. The key for the new linkage will be to provide engaging and appropriate information at the park and library gateways, including the egress points from the parking garage, and to make sure that public areas in the library and its outdoor reading rooms are easily accessible, inviting, and clearly open to the public. Providing bicycle parking, in addition to vehicle parking, will also help improve access to the park and the library.
8. Reach Out Like an Octopus

Just as important as the edge of a park is, so is the way that streets, sidewalks and ground floors of adjacent buildings lead into it. Like the tentacles of an octopus extending into the surrounding neighborhood, the influence of a good public space starts at least a block away. Vehicles slow down, walking becomes more interesting, and pedestrian traffic increases. Elements and buildings within the park are visible from a distance, and the ground floor activity of the library building entices pedestrians. This reaching out could be a challenge for MLK Park and the new Winter Park Library if not addressed properly.
LOCATION
Location - Overview

As part of the community workshops, all participants were informed of the City appointed Library Task Force’s recommended location. Citizen’s comments, input and recommendations about the new library/civic center and garage being located in the northwestern corner and away from the northeastern corner at MLK Park was largely based on the following unique attributes:

- Winter Park has the remarkable opportunity to define its new library and MLK Park as a civic gateway to the City and as 21st century places. This will create positive distinction to the private sector edge of commercial development that surrounds the outer edges of MLK Park across Harper Avenue and Morse Boulevard.

- The park and library together have been envisioned as the heart of a multi-use destination, a vibrant, green, dynamic and exciting place that enhances the experience of both park, library, civic center and builds a strong sense of community including large areas of open space that are directly accessible to the new library, park, children’s playground, athletic events and recreation.

- Transforming MLK Park could support the broader plans for extending Winter Park’s Park Avenue/SunRail village core along the Morse Boulevard Historic gateway corridor creating a distinct and more active edge of walkability/ bikeability that will connect us all to a new “third place” of diverse knowledge, learning, recreation, living, relaxing, gatherings and shopping.

- The new library building can have a huge impact on Morse Boulevard, bringing activity closer to the street, creating a library plaza at the corner with Harper Avenue.

- Integrating the new library in MLK Park is the best strategy to enhance the library experience and bring activity into an under-utilized park. Using the principles of Placemaking, this integration can result in another great destination for Winter Park.
Location – Overview

Fact:
The total area of the new library, civic center and garage “footprint” will require less than 1% of additional open space above the area where the existing parking lot and civic center now exist.

City Martin Luther King, Jr. Park – 26.8 acres
Location – Northern Sector Overview (MLK Park)
Community Location Study – Option A (New Library, Civic Center, Garage)
Community Location Study – Option B (New Library, Civic Center, Garage)
VISUALIZATION
Community Visualizations - Overview

The collaboration of more than 270 citizens of our Winter Park Community provided a unique consensus building process to guide the visualizations that follow.

Throughout the community process, a variety of points of view were exchanged. Citizens were engaged in numerous conversations, creative expression, and thoughtful civil dialogue about their perspectives and aspirations. This sharing was amongst a diverse group of multi-generational and new shifting demographic voices. This included 3 different families with fourth grade children.

Building consensus internally and externally evolved over the 3 community workshops at the Civic Center. This dialogue would lead to the creation of a preferred location, architectural image, and park oriented multi-use destination vision of a new civic gathering place for sharing knowledge and collaboration.

We owe a tremendous amount of thanks to the many voices that came together in MLK Park for these workshops. Their valued contributions can be attributed to a course of action that is positively motivated and challenging to us all to listen and share with each other what kinds of things Winter Park can do that other cities cannot.

As the project design moves forward, these visualizations are intended to serve the community and professional consultants as strong guiding principles for further design community engagement and implementation of a Winter Park community-led 21st century American library that is expected to be an exemplary model for the nation.
Park View
(From Denning Avenue Looking West)

New Winter Park Public Library / Civic Center
Preliminary Visualization
TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY / CONCEPTUAL BUDGET
I. Stormwater Management Concept

Background

The City of Winter Park’s Library Task Force and City have recommended the development of a new library facility. The preferred site is the northern sector of Martin Luther King, Jr. Park (MLK Park). One of the City’s directives to the City’s consulting Architect (ACi) is review the current stormwater capacity for the new project and technically viability of the proposed size and location of the envisioned new library, civic center and low profile, 1-story parking garage. This narrative was prepared by AVCON Civil Engineering experts who have recently completed the last 2 modifications to MLK Park stormwater system for the CNL Office Building and Paseo Apartments at Winter Park Village. This is a general assessment and discusses known stormwater conditions and potential solutions to providing treatment and attenuation for the proposed facility.

The water body located in MLK Park is known by a number of names including “Lake Island”. Lake Island was created out of an existing wetland system and was developed with a two-fold purpose. First, to serve as a public amenity and addition to the park, and second, to provide partial treatment and attenuation to the basin that drains into the system and eventually into Lake Killarney. The City provided an interconnect piping system between Lake Island and Lake Killarney that improved stormwater capacity.

The lake also provides partial stormwater treatment to the entire existing basin, and is permitted to provide treatment for the CNL Office Building across Morse Blvd. and the Paseo Apartment Building on the corner of Denning Dr. and W. Canton Ave. The lake boundaries were increased as part of the permitting process to provide the required treatment for these projects. Currently, there is no additional capacity in the pond for additional stormwater management.

Development

The new library, civic center and parking garage project has been proposed in the same general location as the existing civic center and parking lot/driveway impervious areas. A low profile, 1-story parking garage to service both the library and new/repurposed civic center may slightly increase the existing impervious area. The two buildings provide a footprint of approximately 25,167 square feet compared to the existing community center building, which has a footprint of approximately 13,500 square feet. The proposed parking garage has a footprint of approximately 42,000 square feet and will be located over an existing parking lot that is approximately 42,000 square feet in size. Based on these dimensions, there will be approximately 11,667 square feet of additional pavement in the total development, assuming the access roads are similar in character and size. The site will therefore not generate a great deal of additional runoff compared to the existing condition.
The existing civic center site has not previously been permitted. Therefore, the new site will need to be brought up to current stormwater treatment standards for the entire approximate 58,000 square feet of proposed development. In order to provide that level of treatment, and due to the constraints on the site, a number of alternatives will are available at a reasonable cost and can be evaluated and implemented to provide the required treatment volume. These options include portions of the following, which will be finalized through the final design process:

A. **Additional Expansion of Lake Island:** This option provides a wet retention solution similar to that proposed for the CNL Project and Paseo Apartments. Due to the flooding conditions in the area, the available depth for treatment is somewhat limited so the benefits are not as large as would be anticipated in typical wet retention systems. However, one of the added benefits of this option is the additional storage volume that is created in Lake Island. This will further reduce the potential for flooding in the surrounding streets.

B. **Pervious Pavement:** This option can be applied to any of the roadways, at-grade parking, courtyards and hardscape on the proposed project site. This pavement will generally treat the water that falls directly on its surface and will therefore eliminate it from being included in the other stormwater management systems.

C. **Underground Exfiltration Systems:** This option basically provides underground dry retention through the use of open bottomed chambers and coarse gravel. The potential for this use is based on the actual level of groundwater in the area and its efficiency is related to how deep that water is. The systems will need to be located in areas void of trees and potential tree roots, which may limit its usefulness in the park environment.

D. **Rain Gardens or Above Ground Treatment Facilities:** Since much of the stormwater runoff will be generated from rooftops or the parking garage roofs, we can take advantage of the elevation head to move the water into above ground rain gardens. These facilities can take many forms such as a walled system with a gravel bottom for percolation. Water tolerant plants can be placed within the system to provide an aesthetically pleasing appearance. The gardens could also potentially be tiered to provide a cascading effect during heavy rainfalls, and could also serve as an education tool as it relates to water quality pollutant removal processes.

As noted in earlier in the narrative, the final solution will likely include some form of a number, or all of the above noted options. Once final soil testing is performed and hydraulic analysis completed, the final plan can be developed with input from the entire design team the City of Winter Park and the local residents.
Conceptual Budget - Overview

The June 22, 2015 Task Force Report included a Concept Budget that was created for a 2-story library with surface parking (no structured parking garage) that was shown in different locations in the northern sector of MLK Park.

Following the Commission's directive for a more specific location and desire to minimize the impact of the new library at the park, a 3-story new library footprint with a new re-purposed civic center and parking garage was preferred and to be confirmed in more specific detail through the community-led workshops.

The following modifications/clarifications for the updated Concept Budget described herein is based on the following key assumptions:

- 3-story versus 2-story 50,000 BGSF new library to minimize impact on the existing park’s open space.
- Replacement/repurposing of the existing Rachel Murrah Civic Center with a cost effective shared use approach with the library, i.e., meeting rooms, auditorium, parking, services and energy/building systems.
- A new low profile, 1-level above ground parking garage built to city code requirements with enhanced architectural facades.
- A revised, updated construction budget to include above programmatic elements for a new library, civic center and parking garage and associated sitework/storm water costs.
- Potential future MLK park-wide improvements are not to be included in this budget.

- For a quality, highly flexible, long life public building at this early concept stage, a safe contingency is included in the budget. This is prudent to assure the bond referendum amount is adequate and meets the community's expectations for a well-designed 21st century library. Anticipating a bond referendum public ballot vote on March 15, 2016, the budget contingency also takes into account an estimated time for selection of professional design consultants, a continued public engaged design process, and time for the proper preparation of construction documents to ensure a predictable cost. To obtain a competitive guaranteed maximum price (GMP), based on the City's current schedule, final design, engineering and construction documents for a solid GMP is estimated to occur in early 2017. This amount of time for projects of this complexity and quality accounts for the contingency carried in the Conceptual Budget at this time. The contingency breaks down into 2 basic sub-contingencies-1) market condition increases and 2) final building/site program adjustments.

The Concept Budget was prepared in conjunction with the Task Force, Library Board outside third party cost consultants, City of Winter Park, ACI Architects and Wharton Smith Construction Managers using national, state and local cost date for public projects of similar size, quality and complexity.
## New Library, Civic Center & Garage Concept Budget

**Concept Building Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$13,400,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>$2,530,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard Cover</td>
<td>$1,877,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork, Utilities, Landscape, Hardscape</td>
<td>$2,001,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Garage w/some surface parking)</td>
<td>$3,004,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$186,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Construction Subtotal w/Library + Civic Center + Garage** $23,001,622

6. **Contingency-based on Bond Referendum (15%)** $3,450,243

7. **Subtotal with Contingency** $26,451,865

8. **Architectural/Engineering/Interiors Fees** $1,914,891

9. **Other Soft Costs (specialty consultants-geotech, civil, landscape, traffic, lighting, energy/LEED, acoustic, kitchen)** $778,000

10. **Subtotal with Soft Costs** $29,144,756

11. **Library Campaign Contribution** $2,000,000

12. **Library Grants** $500,000

13. **Furnishings/Fixtures/Equipment-Library** $2,025,000

14. **Furnishings/Fixtures/Equipment-Civic Center** $658,000

15. **Net Cost** $29,227,756

16. **Interest Cost (bond financing 2% of net cost)** $586,555

17. **Subtotal with Interest Cost** $29,914,311

**TOTAL BUDGET** $29,914,311

- **Gross Building Square Footage (Library-Civic Center)** 58,505
- **Construction Cost/SF Library-Civic Center** $272
- **Number of parking spaces (200 Garage + 10 Surface)** 210
- **Cost/garage parking space (200 spaces Garage only)** $17,278
- **Estimated construction duration (months)** 14

**Notes/Key Assumptions:**

1. Budget assumes Architect & CM on board May 2016 to deliver 100% Const. Docs for a GMP 1Q-2017 to minimize construction cost increases.
2. Includes building permit & independent testing.
3. Includes general liability insurance.
4. Does not include impact or related fees.
5. Stormwater vault included - compensating storage not included.
6. Does not include organic material or soil improvement.
7. Includes FF&E budget allowances for both Library & Civic Center.
9. LEED Certified Level.
10. All construction-related on-site facilities and staff are distributed into line items 1 through 4.
11. 15% contingency includes program adjustments, market conditions, consultant scope adjustments.
14. Sale of current library building & property is not included.
15. The above costs are based on conceptual building programming, code research, conceptual level design & city provided site data.
APPENDIX

Library User Human Behavior Study
Place Game Questionnaire
Additional Reference Material
**User Experience Survey**

**WINTER PARK PUBLIC LIBRARY**
**SUNDAY - AUGUST 23, 2015**

**DESCRIPTION**
What do you use and love about the existing library and would like to see in the new space?

**DIRECTIONS**
Show and tell us how you use the library with the attached questions and/or floor plans. An example response has been provided.

- Where do you enter and exit the building?
- Where do you typically go and what do you do?
- What are services (spaces) you use?
- What are spaces you like most? (Why?)
- What are spaces you like least? (Why?)
- What spaces do you wish this facility had?
- What kind of arrangement of seating do you prefer?
- Do you use or would like to use any outdoor spaces?
- Additional thoughts/comments?

**USER PROFILE**
Please check the following options to provide general demographic information for this exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY USE</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION TO/FROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 18yrs</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Own Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25yrs</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Carpool/drop off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35yrs</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45yrs</td>
<td>Prefer Not to Answer</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Walk/Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66yrs+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example: Coming for children's story time.*
User Experience Survey

WINTER PARK PUBLIC LIBRARY
SUNDAY - AUGUST 23, 2015
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PLACE GAME
PLACE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A Tool for Initiating the Placemaking Process

"New Winter Park Public Library / Civic Center"
Winter Park, Florida

COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS
August 22 - 23, 2015

Project for Public Spaces (PPS) is a nonprofit planning, design and educational organisation dedicated to helping people create and sustain public spaces that build stronger communities. Our pioneering Placemaking approach helps citizens transform their public spaces into vital places that highlight local assets, spur rejuvenation and serve common needs.

PPS was founded in 1975 to expand on the work of William (Holly) Whyte, author of The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces. We have since completed projects in more than 3000 communities in 43 countries and all 50 U.S. states and are the premier center for best practices, information and resources on placemaking. More than 600 people worldwide are members of our Placemaking Leadership Council.

© 2015 Project for Public Spaces, Inc. The 'Placegame' cannot be used without formal, written permission from PPS. If permission is granted, full credit must be given to PPS on all written materials and in any verbal descriptions of the game.
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Imagine the Place

1. What is this place's biggest asset?

USES & ACTIVITIES

2. What types of activities could be provided to attract residents and visitors?
   - Activities that are free of charge (e.g. library activities, readings, games and tournaments, story time, splash pad, parades)
   - Activities that could include a charge (attend a concert, film, or party, eat at a restaurant or café, ride on a carousel)

3. What special events and programs do you think would attract people, especially in the short term? (free performance, free wifi, games, markets, etc.)

4. What activities located elsewhere could be co-located here? (i.e. mini-post office, meeting rooms, banquet hall, etc.)

Identify Opportunities

5. Can you think of any programs and events that have outgrown their current location and could move to Library Plaza? (i.e. parades, concerts, movies, runs, festivals, etc.)

COMFORT & IMAGE

6. What types of amenities would be required to support the activities that you have outlined above? (seating, lighting, shade, sound, screen, etc.)

7. What elements could define the identity and experience of this place? (e.g. history of the area, monument, the landscape, art, fountains, etc.)

ACCESS & LINKAGES

8. How could we make it easier for people to get here? (i.e. better or more conveniently located transit, better crosswalks, an improved walking environment or path system, bicycle lanes/routes, senior shuttle, etc.)

9. What local partnerships (civic/education institutions, business, community groups, etc.) or local talents (artists, garden clubs, students) could be involved in programming this place?
Subject: Request for an Ordinance to Dissolve the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD). SECOND READING OF ORDINANCE AND ADOPTION

The City has received a request from the Board of the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD) to dissolve that entity. Attached are the Ordinance (which has been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney) and the other backup materials provided by the applicant.

Summary:

The City Commission adopted Ordinance No. 2916-13 on April 8, 2013, establishing the Ravaudage Community Development District, pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes. However, at this time the Board of Supervisors of the District adopted Resolution 2016-04 approving dissolution of the District and submitted a “Petition to Dissolve Ravaudage Community Development District” dated June 1, 2016 to the City, requesting that the District be dissolved pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes.

Staff Recommendation:

The staff has no objection to dissolving the CDD if it has turned out to have no meaningful purpose for the developers of Ravaudage.
ORDINANCE NO. _____ - _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, GRANTING THE PETITION OF THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND DISSOLVING THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT PURSUANT TO SECTION 190.046(9), FLORIDA STATUTES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; FURTHER, PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida (the “City”), adopted Ordinance No. 2916-13 on April 8, 2013, establishing the Ravaudage Community Development District (the “District”), pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the District adopted Resolution 2016-04 approving dissolution of the District and submitted a “Petition to Dissolve Ravaudage Community Development District” dated June 1, 2016 (the “Petition”) to the City, requesting that the District be dissolved pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Petition, the record and public hearing for the adoption of this Ordinance, the City determined that the statements within the Petition were true and correct, that the dissolution of the District was appropriate under Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, and that, as of the date of the adoption of this Ordinance, the District has no further outstanding financial obligations, and no further operating or maintenance responsibilities.

WHEREAS, dissolution of the District pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, serves the public interest that any independent special district created pursuant to state law not outlive its usefulness and the dissolution of the District will not prevent the provision of basic community development services to the area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. Legislative Findings. The Board hereby adopts the “WHEREAS” clauses stated above as true and correct legislative findings in support of this Ordinance.

SECTION 2. Authorization. That the City authorizes the dissolution of the Ravaudage Community Development District and is authorized to adopt this Ordinance under the authority granted by the provisions of Chapter 166, Florida Statutes, Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 3. Findings. That it is determined that:

A. The District Board of Supervisors has petitioned the City to dissolve the Ravaudage Community Development District.

B. The information provided in the Petition to the City is true and correct.
C. The District has provided information to the City that, as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance, it has no further outstanding financial obligations, nor any further operating or maintenance responsibilities.

D. The District has provided information to the City that, as of effective date of adoption of this Ordinance, the District is not responsible for, nor is the District the owner of, any public improvements.

SECTION 4. Dissolution of District. That the City Commission grants the Petition and dissolves the Ravaudage Community Development District.

SECTION 5. Severability. That if any clause, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, word or provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, whether for substantive, procedural, or any other reason, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

SECTION 6. Conflicts. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances, resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict with this Ordinance, are repealed to the extent of such conflict.

SECTION 7. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be effective immediately upon its passage and adoption by the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this ___ day of __________, 2016.

__________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

____________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC