



Presented by
ASSOCIATION TO PRESERVE THE EATONVILLE COMMUNITY, INC. (P.E.C.)
 344 E. Kennedy Blvd. Eatonville, FL 32751
 E-mail: ny@preserveeatonville.org ♦ Website: www.zorafestival.org
 Phone: (407) 647-3307 • Fax: (407) 539-2192

February 16, 2024

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OFFICERS

Winfred Chad McKendrick
President

Tadayuki (Tad) Hara, Ph.D.
Vice President

Joshua Smith-Benson, PharmD.
Treasurer

Rasheeda Garricks, MBA
Secretary

Marie-Jose Francois, M.D.
Immediate Past President

MEMBERS

Ava K. Doppelt, Esq.

Harietta Finley White

Winnie Hurston

Reginald Lewis

Reginald B. McGill

Johnny Rivers

Jenneil Ross

ZORA!™ Festival National Planners
 (Mrs) N. Y. Nathiri, Chair

Julian C. Chambliss, Ph.D.
 Michigan State University

Jose B. Fernández, Ph.D. (Emeritus)
 University of Central Florida

The Honorable Johnny Ford
 Tuskegee, Alabama

Vivian Geary, CMP
 Universal Orlando Resort

Prof. Lonnie Graham
 Pennsylvania State University

Maryemma Graham, Ph.D.
 University of Kansas, Lawrence

Michelle Bachelor Robinson, Ph.D.
 Spelman College

Trent Tomengo, MFA
 Seminole State College of Florida

Eleanor Traylor, Ph.D. (Emerita)
 Howard University

Public Comment Request by N. Y. Nathiri, *N.Y. Nathiri*
 Re: Conceptual Master Planning Proposal submitted by Baker Barrios

1. The proposal item summary states the following:
 “The Town Attorney, Administration, Planning, and National Trust of Historic Preservation have reviewed the proposal and after several revision we have the final revision attached for consideration.”

Can the Town provide an overview of the specific timeline and steps in the review process? Was the proposal solicited as an “exclusive” executive request, or were requests for proposals (RFP) solicited through public open market advertisement? Can the Town indicate which representative, or office, of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) reviewed and approved the proposal?

2. The online “experience portfolio” of Baker and Barrios Architects, Inc. (BBA) does not include historic preservation. There is no indication that they have the necessary expertise, or experience to engage a significant historic preservation project of the scope and sensitivity of the Town of Eatonville.

3. The proposal itself is “generic in nature.” The work and outcomes are not specifically tailored to the context or conditions that are unique to Eatonville. Inclusion of a “Master Developer Partner” dismisses opportunities to create local enterprises, cultural sensitivity, and physical sensitivity. “Interior Design” (ID) is listed as an “additional service.” A tailored proposal should not include disciplines such as these.

4. The “project description” specifically identifies the “70ac OCPS property (Hungerford Site) as an element to be included in the “master planning” work. It is presumptuous to even mention the Hungerford parcel since it has not been formally, or legally, transferred back to the Town. Starting a public planning process without having legal custody of the property could jeopardize good faith negotiations with OCPS.

5. Proposal “key issues” list (page 10) does not include historic preservation. This is another indication that this is not a coordinated and tailored proposal to meet the critical needs of Eatonville.

6. Landscape architecture is not included in the basic scope of services in the proposal. The landscape is one of the primary historic resources in Eatonville. The basic concept plan could not be considered comprehensive, authentic, or legitimate if landscape architecture must be addressed as an “additional service.” The overall approach should be an integrated interdisciplinary methodology.

7. The proposed 6-month schedule does not include legitimate community capacity building. This will not be enough time for the community to absorb and process concepts which are presented.

8. Inclusion of the “Optional Service: National African American Museum” seems to be the ulterior motive of the proposal. If that is the case, the entire process will sacrifice the integrity of the entire town for a future bid for the “national museum.”

9. The proposal is structured so that the “additional services” will be very expensive. The representation that the cost will be “\$0” is highly misleading.

At the request of P.E.C., this analysis was provided by a licensed professional architect, and licensed professional landscape architect with 44 years of experience with local municipal, state agency, federal agency, national organizations, commercial and historic preservation projects.

2024 ZORA! Festival Season (January - October)
“The Reunion”