

Citizen Comments for the July 13, 2021 Meeting Agenda

(Received as of 8:00 p.m. July 12, 2021)

The following Citizen Comments were received for
Item 4 - Proposed Resolutions Relating to Recent State and Federal
Election Reform Laws

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 4 - Proposed Resolutions Relating to Recent State and Federal Election Reform Laws	Name: N Elizabeth Markovich
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1308 Betton Rd.
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 5:58:00 AM

I have reviewed the stipulations of the recent Florida Voter Law. I am not a partisan, just a citizen (and a registered Democrat).

The restrictions on monitoring drop boxes seem reasonable.

I agree we should restrict partisans from approaching voters in line to vote.

Also reasonable is the requirement for voter ID at the polls, and the requirement to request an absentee ballot rather than automatic mail - out.

On the restriction on collecting and turning in collected ballots from others: I see where this practice could be very much abused but also where some voters may have trouble turning in a ballot. Abuse can be carried out by either side.

I am grateful that we in Leon County have had a very good Supervisor of Elections, and I think fair practices.

It is vital that all Floridians have high confidence in our voting system and overall the new law is reasonable.

The following Citizen Comments were received for

Item 30 - Status Report on the Open Burning Ordinance and Information Regarding Open Burning and Air Quality Regulation, Including Emissions that May Cause Smoke Nuisances, and Request to Schedule the First and Only Public Hearing to Consider Adopting a Proposed Ordinance to Repeal Section 18-142 of the Leon County Code of Laws and Adopt New Provisions Related to Open Burning, for September 14, 2021

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 30 - Status Report on the Open Burning Ordinance and Information Regarding Open Burning and Air Quality Regulation, Including Emissions that May Cause Smoke Nuisances, and Request to Schedule the First and Only Public Hearing to Consider Adopting a Proposed Ordinance to Repeal Section 18-142 of the Leon County Code of Laws and Adopt New Provisions Related to Open Burning, for September 14, 2021	Name: Stephanie Lollar
Lobbyist: No	Address: 2053 Shady Oaks Dr
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 2:50:00 PM

Hi Commissioners,

I would appreciate a motion on item #30 to continue further with a hearing on smoke nuisances. I live in Leon county, outside the city limits, and deal with smoke nuisances. Our lot sizes are an average of under a half acre.

Today, a person can burn yard waste in a barrel and produce as much smoke as they want. These nuisances cannot, and are not, regulated by any authority, yet they impact my quality of life and the personal enjoyment of my property. Similar to a noise ordinance, the item making the noise cannot be controlled, but the sound coming from it can. Burning is no different. Smoke should be controlled by the person doing the burning to limit encroachment on surrounding neighbors. Failure to do so should result in fines or some other form of punishment. I have spoken with an attorney and because there is no law being broken, it is very hard and very expensive to move further with litigation.

The following Citizen Comments were received for
Item 31 - Status Update on the Local Emergency Declaration and
Procedures for County Commission Meetings

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 31 - Status Update on the Local Emergency Declaration and Procedures for County Commission Meetings	Name: Jeff Blair
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1803 Old Fort Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/10/2021 1:14:00 PM

Comment on Agenda Item #31—Specifically Policy No. 01-05 Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners—Citizen Input.

Dear Commissioners,

Do not vote for Option 1 and 2 defaulting to pre-COVID status, **and instead Approve Option 3** and direct staff to prepare an analysis of ways to expand citizen involvement at and before Board meetings on policy issues, including codifying a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during the scheduled public comment opportunities provided during BOCC meetings.

Exemplified in the over all goal of the County Strategic Plan’s of enhancing public involvement, and consistent with the Commission’s Policy for Citizen Input (Policy No. 01-5, IX. A.), stating that “the Board recognizes the importance of protecting the right of all citizens to express their opinions...and encourages citizen participation in the local government process,” the Commission should take every step to ensure that it is easy and safe for citizens to provide real-time feedback by providing the option for real-time virtual public comment at all Commission meetings, workshops, and public hearings going forward.

It is difficult for many citizens to take time from work and family obligations to drive and park downtown when we have viable options to allow for meaningful citizen participation via Internet based technologies. The disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to enhance the public participation procedures in the Commission’s meetings, workshops, and public hearings. Our laws and policies predate the internet era and do not take into account modern tools for public engagement. This should be permanently rectified by providing procedures for real-time virtual public comment during all BOCC meetings, workshops, and public hearings. In an effort to enhance the public’s ability to participate in local government decision making it only makes sense to put in place clear, accessible, and transparent procedures providing a mechanism for real-time virtual comments that are broadly communicated to the public.

Your constituents are asking that you amend your Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners (Policy No. 01-05) to provide a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during all scheduled public comment opportunities.

As an example, I am providing draft language for implementing this option into your Rules of Procedure. The County attorney can no doubt provide better language as well as provide conforming language where required globally throughout the Policy.

Amend Policy # 01-05, Section IX. Citizen Input: Addressing the BOCC as follows:

A. Citizen Input. Remains the same.

B. Options and Methods for Citizen Input. Citizens may provide input by one of three methods in accordance with adopted procedures. 1.) Written comments submitted in advance of the meeting; 2.) Real-time virtual comments made during scheduled public comment opportunities; and, 3.) In-person comments made during scheduled public comment opportunities.

The previous B. becomes C. and the text remains the same.

D. Citizen Input on a Matter Pending Before the Board. Each citizen who wishes to address the Board real-time virtually shall register by 8:00 PM the day before the meeting when the issue will be considered. Written comments should be submitted by 8:00 PM the day before the meeting when the issue will be considered. Each citizen who addresses the Board in-person on an agenda item pending before the Board shall complete an input card and submit the card to the Chair...

Thank You.

Jeff Blair

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 31 - Status Update on the Local Emergency Declaration and Procedures for County Commission Meetings	Name: Jeff BLAIR
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1803 Old Fort Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/10/2021 1:16:00 PM

Comment on Agenda Item #31—Specifically Policy No. 01-05 Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners—Citizen Input.

Dear Commissioners,

Do not vote for Option 1 and 2 defaulting to pre-COVID status, **and instead Approve Option 3** and direct staff to prepare an analysis of ways to expand citizen involvement at and before Board meetings on policy issues, including codifying a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during the scheduled public comment opportunities provided during BOCC meetings.

Exemplified in the over all goal of the County Strategic Plan’s of enhancing public involvement, and consistent with the Commission’s Policy for Citizen Input (Policy No. 01-5, IX. A.), stating that “the Board recognizes the importance of protecting the right of all citizens to express their opinions...and encourages citizen participation in the local government process,” the Commission should take every step to ensure that it is easy and safe for citizens to provide real-time feedback by providing the option for real-time virtual public comment at all Commission meetings, workshops, and public hearings going forward.

It is difficult for many citizens to take time from work and family obligations to drive and park downtown when we have viable options to allow for meaningful citizen participation via Internet based technologies. The disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to enhance the public participation procedures in the Commission’s meetings, workshops, and public hearings. Our laws and policies predate the internet era and do not take into account modern tools for public engagement. This should be permanently rectified by providing procedures for real-time virtual public comment during all BOCC meetings, workshops, and public hearings. In an effort to enhance the public’s ability to participate in local government decision making it only makes sense to put in place clear, accessible, and transparent procedures providing a mechanism for real-time virtual comments that are broadly communicated to the public.

Your constituents are asking that you amend your Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners (Policy No. 01-05) to provide a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during all scheduled public comment opportunities.

Sincerely,

Jeff A. Blair

Leadership Team, Keep It Rural

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 31 - Status Update on the Local Emergency Declaration and Procedures for County Commission Meetings	Name: Jeff BLAIR
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1803 Old Fort Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/10/2021 1:18:00 PM

Woodland Drives Neighborhood Association

Comment on Agenda Item #31 – Specifically Policy No. 01-05 Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners.

Dear Commissioners,

Do not vote for Option 1 and 2 defaulting to pre-COVID status, **and instead Approve Option 3** and direct staff to prepare an analysis of ways to expand citizen involvement at and before Board meetings on policy issues, including codifying a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during the scheduled public comment opportunities provided during BOCC meetings.

Exemplified in the over all goal of the County Strategic Plan’s of enhancing public involvement, and consistent with the Commission’s Policy for Citizen Input (Policy No. 01-5, IX. A.), stating that “the Board recognizes the importance of protecting the right of all citizens to express their opinions...and encourages citizen participation in the local government process,” the Commission should take every step to ensure that it is easy and safe for citizens to provide real-time feedback by providing the option for real-time virtual public comment at all Commission meetings, workshops, and public hearings going forward.

It is difficult for many citizens to take time from work and family obligations to drive and park downtown when we have viable options to allow for meaningful citizen participation via Internet based technologies. The disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to enhance the public participation procedures in the Commission’s meetings, workshops, and public hearings. Our laws and policies predate the internet era and do not take into account modern tools for public engagement. This should be permanently rectified by providing procedures for real-time virtual public comment during all BOCC meetings, workshops, and public hearings. In an effort to enhance the public’s ability to participate in local government decision making it only makes sense to put in place clear, accessible, and transparent procedures providing a mechanism for real-time virtual comments that are broadly communicated to the public.

Your constituents are asking that you amend your Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Leon County Board of County Commissioners (Policy No. 01-05) to provide a mechanism and procedure for providing real-time input virtually during all scheduled public comment opportunities.

On Behalf of the Board of Directors,

Sincerely,

Greg Youchock, President

Jeff Blair, Governmental Affairs Committee Chair

The following Citizen Comments were received for
Item 33 - Human Trafficking Awareness Training Program and Inclusion
of Human Trafficking Awareness in the County's Procurement Process

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 33 - Human Trafficking Awareness Training Program and Inclusion of Human Trafficking Awareness in the County's Procurement Process	Name: David Grimes
Lobbyist: No	Address: PO Box 876, TLH, Florida, 32302
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 7:33:00 PM

Commissioners & Staff,

In the interests of full disclosure, in addition to being a Leon County resident, I am a board member for the Survive & Thrive Advocacy Center (STAC). I am writing today in support of Item 33 as proposed by the Survive & Thrive Advocacy Center.

While many folks equate human trafficking with sex trafficking, as this Commission knows, all too often adults and children are labor trafficked. And while many folks think human trafficking only happens in faraway cities and major metropolitan areas, as this Commission knows, it happens right here in Leon County. I did not always know these things and was not aware of this "invisible" crime happening in our backyard. I actually learned them at a STAC training that took place at my church, St. John's Episcopal. It was the beginning of my work with STAC but not the end. Since that time I have seen STAC work hard to meet members of the community where they are and educate them on identifying and responding to human trafficking.

The need for expanded training on trafficking is all the more pressing as a result of the COVID 19 Pandemic which exacerbated the vulnerability of so many individuals. I have been informed that since the onset of the Pandemic, STAC's caseload has increased threefold.

With that context in mind, while there are alternative human trafficking trainings available to business, they miss the unique localized circumstances surrounding trafficking in Leon County including issues generated by the massive influx of individuals into the community during Football season, graduation, and legislative session. The STAC proposal would address these important mechanics in our local community.

Additionally, the STAC proposal included a marketing and promotional campaign for the trafficking education and certification portal. As currently recommended, there would be no marketing or promotional component of the program. While Florida Statutes do require training for specified businesses, this mandate does not cover everyone. No matter how valuable alternative trainings may be, they will be of no value to our community if folks do not know they exist.

For these reasons I respectfully request your support for Agenda Item 33 as submitted by STAC. I believe it will be the most effective way to move towards the goal of eliminating human trafficking in Leon County.

Respectfully,

David Grimes

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 33 - Human Trafficking Awareness Training Program and Inclusion of Human Trafficking Awareness in the County's Procurement Process	Name: Susan Turner
Lobbyist: No	Address: 2821 Cline Street 32308
	Date Submitted: 7/11/2021 7:25:00 PM

As a STAC board member and a restaurant owner for 39 years in Tallahassee, I feel this issue is critical to Leon County, and am very grateful the two initiatives are on the agenda. Most residents and business owners do not realize how prevalent Labor and Sex trafficking is in our area because they do not know how to recognize it, and that education is the most important way to protect victims and to stop traffickers. DBPR does not provide training for all businesses in our area and what they do provide is minimal and not comprehensive and we can provide contact with their staff who disputes the commissions staff findings. STAC's mission is training for awareness with depth and years of experience and can provide a program training protocol which is something LCSO and TPD would like to see happen. Costs would cover online training, development, certification and extensive promotion . We would appreciate your strong support of this issue and feel free to contact me with any questions.

The following Citizen Comments were received for
Item 35 - Development of a Policy and Criteria for Designating New
Canopy Roads

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 35 - Development of a Policy and Criteria for Designating New Canopy Roads	Name: John Outland
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1562 Tung Hill Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/8/2021 11:17:00 AM

I have several issues with Item 35, Policy and Criteria for designating new canopy roads.

Under background “environmental” should be added to the list of eligibility criteria.

The proposed policy formalizes a process for determining eligibility based on a scenic and historical assessment, road attributes, and landowner and community support.

The item describes the process used to designate our existing canopy roads as **“While no formal process was described in code or policy, records indicate that the Board directed staff to examine the roads for designation, and that a combination of surveying affected landowners and/or holding public meetings was used to determine community support for the designation of these roads.”**

The key wording here is that **affected landowners were surveyed** and public meetings were held to designate our existing canopy roads.

I would also note that the Board's environmental Strategic Priorities Initiatives states “Conserve and protect environmentally sensitive lands and our natural ecosystems.” And further add that Canopy Roads are designated as Conservation Areas under the Land Development Code and has the authority to designate conservation areas “Conservation areas (altered wetlands, altered floodplains, closed basins, high quality successional forest, active karst features, canopy roads and special development zones)” without the affected land owners approval.

Finally, and most important is the proposal to require that 60 percent, as recommended by the CRCC or 100 percent, as recommend by legal staff, of support by affected landowners before a canopy road could be designated. Although Canopy Roads add value to the land and provide a variety of environmental and social benefits, you can't get 100 percent support on anything!

In other words, the 100 percent requirement essentially means that it is unlikely that we will be able to designate new canopy roads.

I also do not understand the legal staff concerns about the 1995 Bert Harris Act and subsequent amendments and referred this issue to an environmental and land use lawyer with over 40 years of experience in this field and offered the following:

“In order to prevail on a Bert Harris claim, the landowner has to show that the regulation is an “inordinate burden.” How is a canopy road designation a burden? It could be argued that it actually makes their property more valuable, not less. No one is taking anything from them.

In Florida, the case law shows that, in order to prevail under Bert Harris, a business would need to show that it had an ongoing long-term business in that specific location that was profitable, fully permitted and vested (development permits, by their nature, are never vested) and that the new regulation kept the company from

making any other profitable uses of their land. This means that the litigant would have to show that, but for the new regulation, he would have been able to get all necessary federal, state and local permits (speculative) and that he would have been able to successfully made a sustained profit (also speculative.) Courts do not award money judgments based on speculation. They award money judgments based upon a demonstrated track record and documentation of prior sustainable earnings.

As for residential property, (non-commercial property) what exactly is the loss to them? They can still build a home or homes (depending on the underlying zoning). The only thing they can't do is remove certain trees. However, these protected trees would be in the area that would be required as set-back anyway, I believe. I don't see any loss, let alone an "inordinate burden."

Also, keep in mind that our Florida Constitution, Section 7 states:

It shall be the policy of the state to conserve and protect its natural resources and scenic beauty. Adequate provision shall be made by law for the abatement of air and water pollution and of excessive and unnecessary noise and for the conservation and protection of natural resources.

In other words, natural resources like trees and scenic beauty are constitutionally protected rights.

The Bert Harris Act is sort of a bogeyman that developers like to throw around as a threat to intimidate government officials. The truth is that it is rarely sued under, there are very few reported cases, the government wins the VAST majority of the cases filed (virtually all of them except in a very small number of extreme situations), and the reciprocal attorney fee provision scares off most lawsuits."

Regards and thanks for listening,

John Outland

The following Citizen Comments were received for
Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment
Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Steven Bohl
Lobbyist: No	Address: 5979 Thornton Lane
	Date Submitted: 7/8/2021 10:24:00 AM

My Name Steven Bohl, and my Lisa have lived at 5979 Thornton Lane for nearly 19 years. As a resident of Tallahassee for over 36 years and a homeowner near **Leon County Fulfillment Center, also known as "Project Mango,"** I want to express my concern that this development is moving too quickly. While I did attend two recent Leon County meetings, it was clear that the project is moving forward with little concern for public input.

I do not oppose Project Mango however, believe that a more suitable location such as Innovation Park is a better place for this distribution center because of its access to the airport and the main post office on South Adams. Another suggested option was the Tallahassee Mall because of its location near the interstate.

Residents in this area have legitimate concerns regarding traffic, noise, environmental impacts, and the influence these factors will have on home property values. The value of property is greater when a neighborhood has a higher standard of public health, comfort, and safety, so having a nearby factory, complex flight paths or a nearby airport create an external incurable depreciation on property values in the residential neighborhood¹.

Planning for future development of a community is an important task of government. Such planning should include protection of the integrity and character of existing neighborhoods, while planning providing for additional uses of undeveloped areas. Poor planning for recreation facilities, schools, service areas, and other needs of residents may lead to neighborhood disintegration.²

While I am admittedly opposed to this project's location, these mitigating considerations should be applied if the project proceeds in its current location.

Road:

Street Patterns are an important man-made physical element which can affect value. Traffic within any neighborhood should move easily and slowly.

A traffic calming element should be installed along Thornton Road such as speed humps like those found on Richview Road. Both roads are approximately the same length and go through residential areas that connect into high traffic roads. The speed limit on Thornton Road is 30 mph and in my experience most people do well above the posted limit. In addition, many cyclists including myself use Thornton Road as a connection to the Miccosukee Greenway. With the development of this distribution center, Thornton Road is going to see a significant increase in vehicle traffic and calming devices will be essential to reducing traffic speed and installing a wide paved path or sidewalk the entire length of the road will provide safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Thornton Lane, the only paved residential neighborhood off Thornton Road, and because more traffic may try to use this road as a short cut to other roads or turn around road. This will put more burden on the homeowners who are currently responsible for road maintenance.

Noise/light/view:

While a noise study was conducted, it does not appear that it took into consideration the multiple air conditioners running 24-7. This will significantly impact the noise level already associated with the distribution center. I believe an independent study needs to be conducted to ensure there is a valid evaluation on the impact to residents within the project area and any adverse environmental issues due to light and noise.

In addition, the proposed vegetative buffer is not sufficient to shield from view a 4 to 5 story building along the western side (Thornton Road). A tall physical buffer, like the wall structure located along the eastern end of Blair Stone Road adds separation between the traffic and the residents of Melody Hills.

While the current proposal states that there is no signage on the western side of the building, I want to propose no large standalone signage on the northern end of the facility as it still faces residents in that area. Any "Tenant" signage should have minimal impact to surrounding residents and limited light emissions.

In conclusion, my hope is that all County Commissioners consider the major concerns this distribution center will have on the landowners in this area before a final decision is made.

Steven Bohl, 5979 Thornton Lane, Tallahassee, FL 32308

President, Thornton Hills Subdivision

Florida Real Estate License No. 056566

¹ Neighborhood Analysis, Appraisal Residential & Income Properties

² Neighborhood Analysis, Governmental Factors, Planning and Zoning Regulations, Appraisal Residential & Income Properties

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Craig Brown
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1949 Vineland Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 12:20:00 PM

As county commissioners, you are going to be asked to vote on a project that includes the largest enclosed structure ever constructed in Leon County on July 13th. The project Mango Amazon fulfillment center project will have a massive impact on the nature of Leon County and it should not be approved under its current plan.

During the previous ARM and DRC meetings several unresolved issues with this project were brought before county staff and there is a petition with over 880 signatures requesting the county move this project to an appropriate site:

<http://chnng.it/6fp9t5DJvF>

There are at least two land development companies that have appropriately zoned land in an appropriate industrial area available for this fulfillment center:

St. Joe Leasing (Part of St. Joe Paper Company)
 Contact: Samantha at 850-231-6531
samantha.walton@joe.com

<mailto:samantha.walton@joe.com>

Meyer Development, LLC
 Contact: Heather Richmond Cell phone 754-264-4633c, Office telephone (561) 689-6601
heather@meyerdev.com

<mailto:heather@meyerdev.com>

Both of these companies are ready to provide more suitable locations for this project and several of these locations already have the infrastructure in place to support the fulfillment center. Why aren't appropriate sites being considered for this project?

County commissioners have not been made aware of the issues that make the current site inappropriate for this project. The following are four examples of issues that have not been properly addressed for project Mango:

1. **Incompatible Zoning:** A "fulfillment center" is a particular type of warehouse. The intent of the Leon County comprehensive plan and zoning ordinances is not to allow a warehouse in a High-Intensity Activity Center (zone AC). The intent of AC zoning was to provide retail shopping, banks, recreation, and rental businesses. There is no mention of "warehouses" in the AC

zoning municipal code.

When this land was rezoned to AC zoning in 2012, the current landowner stated the request was for “**site located at the intersection of Interstate 10 and State Highway 90 for use as a regional shopping and activity center.**” This area was never planned or approved for a warehouse.

Warehouses are permitted and specifically named for M-1 Light Industrial District zoning. This project belongs in an area zoned M-1. The residents of this area are not asking that Amazon be excluded from our community; we are only asking Leon County Staff and County Commissioners to honor the intent of the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinances by moving the site for Project Mango to a current industrial park or a parcel with M-1 zoning. Other sites available in Leon County are a much better fit for this project and could cost Amazon significantly less in build-out expenses because the roads already exist, there is no wetland to mitigate, no need for a noise buffer, and the utilities are already in place. It would cost only a phone call to Meyer Development, LLC or St. Joe Leasing (contacts provided above) to procure an appropriate site for this project.

2. **Total Square footage for this project has been intentionally misrepresented throughout the ARM and DRC process:** The site plan shows a 634,812 sq. ft. 1st floor, which is its footprint. This footprint figure has been quoted in project documents as though it were the total building square footage. The architectural drawings show an additional 4 floors plus a penthouse above the 5-floor structure (for a total of 6 stories in the building) for a total of at least 2.4 million square feet of structure. This will be the largest building in Leon County.

3. **Noise impact has not been established:** Two noise memos have been written by the applicant’s engineers assuring the noise level will actually be lower after the construction of the warehouse. This is not credible or realistic. A local resident has provided a study of the truck traffic at similar warehouse “fulfillment centers” at the DRC meeting and it is significant. A noise study of an existing warehouse “fulfillment center” by an unbiased third party to accurately determine anticipated noise levels was requested by local residents at DRC meeting and that study has not been completed. The Traffic Impact Analysis provided by the Agent company sites hundreds of “heavy vehicles” (which means diesel semi-trucks) and thousands of passenger cars every day; this amount of traffic can only produce levels of noise in excess of what currently exists. The inconsistencies and problems with the unrealistic claims provided in both noise memos were provided during the DRC meeting. It is reasonable for Leon County to require an unbiased noise level study be conducted on one of the Applicant’s existing warehouse “fulfillment centers” of similar size to determine the actual noise level that will be produced by this warehouse operation.

4. **Known impact to residential areas:** What we are dealing with is not a new or unique situation. There are hundreds of newspaper articles and TV news reports from around the country that document the problems and issues caused by warehouse “fulfillment centers” built in residential communities. This is why most of these types of structures are built in industrial or warehouse districts well away from residential areas. What are Leon County’s plans for dealing with the repercussions of incompatible placement of this warehouse in the middle of a residential area?

As elected leaders, you are the final hope to ensure a proper review of this project is conducted, the impacts to the community are properly mitigated, and the project is constructed in an appropriately zoned industrial area. Please put the welfare of your neighbors, constituents, and this county ahead of the profit of one landowner and the wealthiest corporation in the country and vote against the current project plan.

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Meta Calder
Lobbyist: No	Address: 3740 Ravine Drive
	Date Submitted: 7/9/2021 4:24:00 PM

JULY 13th County Commission Meeting

Item #37, FULLFILMENT CENTER SITE & DEVELOPMENT

PLAN APPLICATION

We want to say up front, that we are excited about this project and the potential jobs and economic impact it will bring to our city. However, as is to be expected, a project this large is bound to have a significant effect on many other aspects of our community including the environment. Representing Big Bend Sierra Club and the League of Women Voters Tallahassee, we would like to focus on and provide suggestions with respect to the project's environmental impact.

1. Being concerned with the project's environmental impact is entirely consistent with Leon County and the City of Tallahassee's demonstrated commitment to sustainability and doing our part to mitigate the threat of climate change. For example:
 - The county's development and 2019 adoption of an Integrated Action plan, which inter alia, commits to further reducing county greenhouse gas emissions from county operations by 30% by 2030. This is being achieved via a review and upgrade of aging county infrastructure.
 - The county's help with creating and now participating in the Capital Area Sustainability Compact, a collective sustainability effort comprised of the community's largest local public and private stakeholders, whose goal is to develop a joint strategy to minimize the community carbon footprint, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and drive sustainable action in the Capital Area. I would be fitting for the new Fulfillment Center developer to become part of this compact.
 - The county's installation of free-of-charge EV charging stations.
 - The county's increasing inventory of rooftop solar on county facilities from 3 in 2018 to 8 in 2020.
 - The county's successful management of a commercial and residential Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program that provides loans for energy efficiency upgrades, and which recently won a National Association

of Counties achievement award.

- The county's efforts to ensure that all new county building construction, renovation, and repair use sustainable design.
- The city and county implementation of a recycling program which both have committed to providing increased support despite current weaknesses in the recycling market.
- The city's operation of two solar facilities that, together, can generate up to 60 megawatts of electric power.
- The city's 2019 adoption of a Clean Energy Resolution, committing to:
 - i. By 2035, achieving 100% clean, renewable energy in city operations, which includes -
 1. Operating all city facilities using 100% clean, renewable energy
 2. Shifting city light-duty vehicles to 100% electric
 3. Shifting StarMetro fixed-route buses to 100% electric. Our StarMetro bus fleet already includes 19 all-electric buses, which provides transportation for all of FSU. In 2020 we were recognized as having one of North America's Top 50 Green Fleets.
 - ii. By 2050, achieving 100% clean, renewable energy community-wide, which means shifting all public and private uses of energy to 100% clean, renewable energy sources.
- The city met the 2025 Paris Accord targets in 2018 and has reduced its CO2 emissions by nearly 20% in the last 30 years, while servicing 57% greater customer demand.
- Last year the city approved the use of \$2 million for an electric vehicle charging station pilot project to support the shift to more electric vehicles. The pilot project will include the installation of up to four public electric vehicle charging stations.
- Just last month (June 21) the City of Tallahassee received Gold level LEED-certified City by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), joining an elite global network of 126 cities and communities.

In keeping with that commitment, we have a couple of "asks."

- We want to acknowledge and express our appreciation for the proposed projects request for the installation of EV charging stations as well the setting aside of a conservation easement. [Note: The EV charging stations could be accomplished with constructing solar panels in the parking lot which could power the EV charging stations as well as provide shade for parked cars.]
- We would also like to request that the fulfilment center be constructed in accordance with sustainable green building practices for warehouse space

such as LEED Gold standards or other similar standards. Note that the city just adopted a green building policy. To reach the city's goal of 100% renewable energy use by 2050, we must also encourage private developers to adopt similar standards and build as energy efficiently as possible.

- We would also like the developer to also commit to installing rooftop solar on their very large warehouse roof. As has been demonstrated over and over, any initial upfront construction expenses are quickly recouped by future savings in energy costs.
- One of the main concerns that has been raised is the effect trucks will have on our air quality. We would like to see the developer commit to converting to an all-electric local transportation fleet as soon as is technically possible by the year (2025? 2030? 2035?).
- We would like the developer to mitigate the heat island created by the proposed vast employee parking lot by planting twice as many trees in the parking area as is currently proposed in the planting proposals. We understand the truck loading and unloading area is a different creature altogether.
- We would like the developer to commit to restoring the adjacent degraded wetlands, and we suggest that they coordinate with the Apalachee Audubon Society and the Magnolia Native Plant Society to develop the area as a wildlife and nature refuge.
 - i. We also suggest that more than one conservation easement be overlaid on the property to ensure protection, one to the county and one to the Water Management District or to the Apalachee Land Trust.
 - ii. We would also like to provide for and include an allowance in the conservation easement for either the county and/or the Native Plant Society to maintain, restore and enhance the refuge.

If the popular rumor is correct that our potential new corporate partner is Amazon, we are optimistic that these requests will easily be honored as they dovetail with Amazon's expressed corporate commitment to addressing climate change (<https://sustainability.aboutamazon.com/>). Amazon believes that climate change is real and is a corporate leader in sustainability as was demonstrated in 2019 when Amazon, as the co-founder of the Climate Pledge, committed to reaching net-zero carbon use by 2040, thereby pledging to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement 10 years early. To achieve that goal:

<https://sustainability.aboutamazon.com/>

- Amazon has pledged to reach 80% renewable energy by 2024 and 100% renewable energy by 2030.
- As of 2019, Amazon launched 15 utility-scale wind and solar renewable energy projects that will generate over 1,300 MW of renewable capacity and deliver more than 3.8 million MWh of clean energy annually – enough to power 368,000 U.S. homes.
- As of 2019, Amazon installed more than 50 solar rooftops on fulfillment centers and sort centers around the globe that generate 98 MW of renewable capacity and deliver 130,000 MWh of clean energy annually. **As of June 2021, more than 90 of Amazon's fulfillment facilities are powered by on-site rooftop solar installations**, which generate as much as 80% of a single facility's annual energy needs.
- Has pledged to deliver 50% of Amazon shipments with net-zero carbon by 2030. To help meet that goal, **Amazon ordered 100,000 fully-electric**

delivery vehicles from Rivian, the largest order ever for electric delivery vehicles (a \$440,000,000 million investment). Amazon plans to have 10,000 of the new electric vehicles on the road as early as 2022 and all 100,000 vehicles on the road by 2030. In 2020, Amazon delivered more than 20 million packages using electric vehicles to customers across North America and Europe.

- Invested \$100 million in reforestation projects around the world to begin removing carbon from the atmosphere now
- In 2020, launched the Climate Pledge Fund, a \$2 billion investment program to support the development of sustainable and decarbonizing technologies and services.

Finally, the Fulfillment Center will be in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida, the capital of Florida, and should be an example to the state and the Legislature of what a corporation and community can do together. Even if Amazon is not the mysterious corporate partner coming into our community, we believe that any corporate entity listed as a Fortune 500 company can easily afford and would welcome an opportunity to step up and even outperform Amazon. A demonstrated commitment to environmental sustainability has become an increasingly important factor in how a business projects itself to its stockholders and consumers, plus the inclusion of these recommendations in its building plans will also serve as an important introduction to and positive beginning for the corporation's hopefully long-term partnership with our community.

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Wills Flowers
Lobbyist: No	Address: 3250 Apollo Tr.
	Date Submitted: 7/11/2021 12:05:00 PM

I oppose Item #37, approval for the "Leon County Fulfillment Center", and request you adopt Option 2 on this issue.

To begin with, despite your fictions about the identity of the future owner, we all know who the applicant is, as well as many of the local actors pushing this harmful project. The "Applicant" (whoever *they* are) has a worldwide reputation for predatory employment practices, and psychological war against its workers, from Alabama (whatever *that* is) to South Africa (wherever *that* is). To have our local government bowing and scraping to attract a giant exploitive multinational does nothing for our quality of live or prosperity. Worse, local government handing over 2 and a half million of our taxpayer's money to the richest man (whoever *he* is) on the planet is grotesque beyond description.

The "fulfillment center" and its numerous associated roads will convert 170 acres from vegetated open space to impenetrable asphalt and concrete. This will cause major disruptions to the local area drainage and to the people living in the area. It will also be one more stress on the Wakulla Springs Basin; that same basin that Leon County is spending large sums of money elsewhere to remediate. The local holding pond in the site plans is not likely to solve anything, particularly since it appears that a motivation for this project is to encourage further land clearing (under the guise of "development") in the area.

A final and more general objection to this project is that in this new reality of permanently rising temperatures, sea levels, and atmospheric contamination, NO activities that trade vegetation for concrete should be encouraged by public policy. The City has a "Clean Energy" plan which this and all similar projects will render irrelevant in the long run. Project Mango is a rotten fruit, which you should consign to the Option 2 dustbin.

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Darwin Gamble
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1248 HALIFAX CT
	Date Submitted: 7/9/2021 7:47:00 PM

The human cost of Project Mango will greatly outweigh any supposed benefit. This application should be rejected. If the company behind the project cared about our community and the people who live here, it would have revealed its identity months ago. However, publicly available evidence strongly suggests that the stealth company is Amazon.

Dangerous and stressful working conditions in Amazon warehouses are well documented, notably by the New York Times. Overall, employee turnover at Amazon facilities exceeds 100%. These are temporary, not permanent jobs. And Amazon fiercely opposes workers' efforts to organize and bargain collectively. Here are some links to what journalists have found.

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/06/15/us/amazon-workers.html>

<https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-warehouse-turnover-worker-shortage-2021-6>

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/amazon-worker-turnover-anti-union_n_60ca1b3ee4b0d2b86a818d1b

Further, Amazon represents the kind of growth that's killing us because it increases greenhouse gas emissions when we should be reducing those emissions. Leon County has been reducing greenhouse gas emissions generated by County operations since 2007. Approving a project like this one would be the latest in a series of land use decisions that will overwhelm and defeat the County's greenhouse gas emission reduction activities. Climate change is an emergency. It's time for the Leon County Commission to act like it.

Finally, the residents in nearby neighborhoods assert that they will suffer from the increased traffic, noise, light levels, flooding, and pollution. And they're right. The votes on this issue will let us know if our elected representatives are willing to sacrifice human health, safety, and welfare to serve the Growth God.

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Andrew Rasmussen
Lobbyist: No	Address: 1938 Vineland Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32317
	Date Submitted: 7/8/2021 5:00:00 PM

Dear Leon County Commissioners,

My wife and I are writing to express our concerns and opposition to the proposed development of the fulfillment center dubbed "Project Mango". Please carefully consider the negative impacts of this development on the east side of Tallahassee. A business of this size and type should not be placed adjacent to a floodway within an area surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Currently the two Amazon fulfillment centers closest to Tallahassee are in the Jacksonville area. Both developments are placed next to airports (Cecil and Jacksonville International) and away from residential areas and their associated roadways.

The 24/7 trucking and car traffic into and out of the facility would create significant traffic problems, along with air and noise pollution. Roadways severely impacted by the heavy trucking used in this business would include Vineland Drive, Thornton Road, Walden Road, and Mahan Drive. This increased vehicular traffic poses serious safety concerns for motorists and pedestrians using the area (including children using the school bus stops on Vineland Drive).

The location of the proposed development is next to a floodway that drains South through residential areas and then into Lake Lafayette. Storm water runoff from "Project Mango" poses a threat to aquatic ecosystems, residential properties, as well as drinking water of homeowners on private wells (us included). Lafayette Estates is particularly vulnerable to the negative impacts of storm water runoff from the Fulfillment Center site via at least 2 storm water conveyances that move water from the project site under Mahan Drive downslope and into the Lafayette Estates neighborhood. The storm water situation is complicated by the proposed 'Arbor Vineyards' development on a wooded parcel that currently functions to retain and absorb storm water in the watershed.

In conclusion, the site at Mahan near I-10 is inappropriate for the proposed development of a fulfillment center. We urge you to consider the negative impacts that this project would have on the health, safety and quality of life of those living on the east side of Tallahassee. An online petition in opposition of "Project Mango" is evidence that many citizens of Tallahassee feel the same way as we do. Please vote "NO" and seek more sensible development for the East side of Tallahassee.

Sincerely,

Andrew Rasmussen & Jenny Wang

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 37 - First and Only Public Hearing for the Leon County "Fulfillment Center" Type "C" Site and Development Plan Application	Name: Terry Sherraden
Lobbyist: No	Address: 2471 Thornton Rd
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 1:52:00 PM

To Leon County Commissioners:

I am concerned that the Leon County Planning Commission, an entity that is charged with protecting the quality of life of all Leon County citizens, is blindly approving the Project Mango development without the critical thinking necessary for a project with such far reaching impact.

Is it best practice to only consider studies that were **bought and paid for by the applicant themselves**? Shouldn't a project of this magnitude require independent studies requested by the planning commission? I ask this because there is abundant information to suggest a flawed analysis accepted by the planning commission could lead to disastrous consequences for the residents of Leon County.

I have enclosed links to a few of the myriad of news reports available online that discuss problems with noise and traffic in other cities where Amazon Fulfillment Centers have had a major negative impact on quality of life in their communities:

Amazon warehouse brings unwanted traffic to Philly's Bridesburg section

<https://www.inquirer.com/business/amazon-philly-bridesburg-septa-warehouse-traffic-congestion-20210614.html>

Amazon warehouse traffic causing gridlock

<https://www.fox5ny.com/news/amazon-warehouse-traffic-causing-gridlock>

'It's like this every day': Amazon fulfillment center in Dallas forces truck drivers to wait for hours to unload

<https://www.dallasnews.com/business/retail/2021/06/20/its-like-this-every-day-amazon-fulfillment-center-in-dallas-forces-truck-drivers-to-wait-for-hours-to-unload/>

The massive traffic generated by an Amazon fulfillment center

<https://legallysociable.com/2015/12/03/the-massive-traffic-generated-by-an-amazon-fulfillment-center/>

From white noise to extra bathrooms: Amazon tries to confront Milford complaints

<https://www.milforddailynews.com/story/news/2021/06/24/amazon-changes-warehouse-milford-traffic-trash-noise-complaints/5323972001/>

It's a big change': Amazon bringing complaints of traffic, noise to Carencro months before its arrival

https://www.theadvocate.com/acadiana/news/business/article_7d95e502-9fb4-11eb-8154-63da673496aa.html

Residents Complain Amazon Facility Causing Noise Pollution

<https://www.tapinto.net/towns/edison/sections/government/articles/residents-complain-amazon-facility-causing-noise-pollution>

It is critically important for the Leon County Commission to take time to properly evaluate these important issues of quality of life for the entire eastern part of Leon County before voting on this project.

In spite of the applicant provided studies, any reasonable person can see that with a minimum of 1000 car trips daily focused on two shift changes daily pouring out onto two roads, along with the exponentially increasing traffic already occurring from the growing residential complexes in the area creates the potential for a mini "FSU Football Game" type of congestion on a daily basis. There appears to be no discussion of concurrent road infrastructure improvements throughout the eastern part of the county to be completed **prior** to the completion of the facility. If staggered shift changes are presented as a response to the major increased traffic, **then this policy should be required as a condition of approval of this facility**. Best practice would be to commission an independent traffic study to properly address these major traffic issues to properly inform the commissioners before any vote is taken.

A more thorough assessment of the significant potential for sound pollution is also needed. The current submitted **applicant sponsored** sound study placed sound monitoring equipment in an empty pasture and then used a computer program to model and predict the impact of multiple trucks coming and going daily. Best practice would mandate an independent study that would go to a number of actual operating Amazon Fulfillment centers and use those same microphones to measure the actual sound levels present at these facilities. Then commissioners will be better able to assess the likelihood of sound pollution impact on the residents of Leon County, and mandate sound mitigation projects **before** any vote is taken.

I am looking for evidence that the Leon County Commissioners are actively and carefully evaluating the long ranging ramifications, both positive and negative, that are inevitably going to occur with approval of a project of this magnitude. Critical thinking **before** approval with processes in place to mitigate negative impacts to the quality of life for a quarter of Leon County is mandatory for the eventual success of a project of this size. I saw no critical thinking from the Leon County Planning Commission who blindly without dissent accepted all of the **Applicant bought and paid for** engineering studies. It is up to the Leon County Commissioners who are elected to protect the interests of all county residents to finally supply that critical thinking. Has any commissioner or their staff thought to pick up the phone to call similar commissioners in other cities impacted by Amazon developments to discuss issues such as these?

I can't imagine that any County Commissioner would like to see the inevitable Tallahassee Democrat articles similar to the growing online presence of articles that outline the negative issues associated with developments of this size. You need unbiased studies to guide critical thinking **before** approval to address these issues whose management is essential for a successful facility that this city can be proud of. Once this project is approved, the Commission will lose their ability to mandate changes.

The Leon County Commission has a huge responsibility. Do not respond to pressure for premature approval of this project. Do not let the Amazon Genie out of the bottle until the all commissioners have had time to critically evaluate unbiased studies that will accurately give them the information needed to properly assess this Amazon application, and to plan for the future by providing proactive solutions to the inevitable problems that can be predicted.

Thank you very much,

Terry Sherraden

2471 Thornton Road

Tallahassee, FL 32308

The following Citizen Comments were received for

Item 41 - First and Only Public Hearing to Approve the Resolution Adopting the Fire Rescue Services Non-Ad Valorem Assessment Roll and Certification of the Entire Roll to Tax Collector

Board of County Commissioners, July 13, 2021 Citizen Comments

Item 41 - First and Only Public Hearing to Approve the Resolution Adopting the Fire Rescue Services Non-Ad Valorem Assessment Roll and Certification of the Entire Roll to Tax Collector	Name: Daniel Peuckert
Lobbyist: No	Address: 315 RIVER RD Carrabelle, FL 32322
	Date Submitted: 7/12/2021 2:44:00 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Daniel Peuckert and represent 3 properties in the unincorporated area of Leon County that is assessed with the Fire Rescue Services Assessment. I received a notice that this topic would be discussed at the July 13th meeting. Ever since this assessment was levied, I have felt that it is excessive, unfair and with no cost accountability to the select tax payers being assessed. Why is the rest of Leon County not billed this assessment and why don't our ever increasing regular property taxes cover this cost? Why doesn't this area incorporate into Leon County? It certainly is populated enough now. What fire stations are covered by these assessments and what are their actual cost of operations compared to the \$9M+ taken in? How many calls have they actually taken over the years? We should receive an annual accounting of actual vs budget. This appears to be another tax on top of a tax and is unfair to so many residents that just happen to live in an area of the County that should incorporate or otherwise equalize operations with the rest of the County to minimize this assessment that should be shared with the rest of the County who receive this service as part of their one and only tax property payment. Thank you for accepting this comment.