

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

**MINUTES OF THE
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
SPECIAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 2010
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS,
210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

8 Vice-Chair Steve Dennis called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Answering to roll call:

**Steve Dennis
Doug Hodson
Charles Belote
Thomas Williams
James Kosmas**

18 Also present were Tony Otte, Interim CRA Director; Michelle Martin, CRA Project
19 Manager; Noeleen Foster, CRA Program Manager; Claudia Soulie, Administrative
20 Specialist and Mark Hall, CRA Attorney. Chair Linda DeBorde and Commissioner
21 Cynthia Lybrand were absent.
22
23
24

25
26
27
28

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the City Commission Resolution #11-89, a three-minute limitation will be imposed unless otherwise granted by the CRA Commissioners.

29 Hearing no requests, Mr. Dennis closed the public participation portion of the meeting.
30
31

32
33

OLD BUSINESS

34
35

A. **Presentation: Southeast Volusia Chamber of Commerce Historic Restoration**

36 Mr. Otte stated that Mr. Burt Bender with Bender & Associates, P.A. was the Architect
37 on record for the Chamber of Commerce Building Historic Restoration project. Mr. Otte
38 continued that Mr. Bender had compiled a Southeast Chamber of Commerce Building
39 Restoration Summary, which staff had posted on the CRA's portion of the City website.
40 The summary contained historic photographs and conceptual ideas for the restoration of
41 the Chamber of Commerce Building. Mr. Bender thanked the CRA for their time and
42 elaborated on the Chamber's general condition and his recommendations for a historical
43 restoration.
44

45 Mr. Otte stated that the project cost for Phase I (Exterior only) totaled \$574,200. A
46 Volusia County ECHO grant would cover \$382,800 and the CRA provided matching

47 funds in the amount of 191,400. Mr. Otte elaborated on the construction priorities within
48 Phase I.

49
50 Mr. Dennis commended Mr. Bender for his thorough research in order to come up with
51 such a comprehensive report.

52
53 Mr. Kosmas inquired about the reimbursement process. A brief discussion ensued about
54 reimbursable and non-reimbursable line items and a possible increase in the estimated
55 budget as the project moved forward. Mr. Bender felt that the Chamber building was a
56 very sound building.

57
58 Mr. Belote inquired when the original windows were taken out and Mr. Bender felt that
59 some work was done in the 80's and estimated that those replacement windows were only
60 about 20 years old. Mr. Bender commented on the pros and cons of demolishing and
61 replacing versus restoring and preserving historic values.

62
63 Mr. Williams inquired about the building being referred to as the Chamber of Commerce
64 building and cautioned that this might lead to a public misconception, as other
65 organizations were using this building as well. Mr. Dennis stated that it was built as the
66 Chamber of Commerce and felt that this was the only building still being used for what it
67 was originally built for. Mr. Bender stated that the best use was usually the original use.

68
69 Mr. Otte stated that the Planning staff needed a recommendation from the CRA so they
70 could move forward and present the summary report to the City Commission.

71
72 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to accept the Southeast Chamber of Commerce**
73 **Building Restoration Summary and authorize staff to move forward in making a**
74 **presentation to the City Commission, seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on**
75 **roll-call vote 5-0.**

76
77 B. Presentation: Riverside Park Improvement Plan

78
79 Mr. Kyle Fegley, City Engineer, stated that the City had a current contract with Quentin
80 Hampton, one of the City's continuing engineering consultants to design/permit the
81 replacement efforts for the bulkhead at Riverside Park

82
83 Mr. Fegley continued that this project originally only included improvements to the
84 bulkhead and the lights, but as other City Departments were giving their input it slowly
85 evolved to encompass the entire Riverside Park.

86
87 Mr. Fegley stated that staff had received a proposal from Quentin Hampton for \$10,700
88 to create a Master Plan addressing overall improvements for Riverside Park and was
89 asking the CRA for financial support.

90
91 Mr. Fegley also mentioned that staff was in the process of securing an additional proposal
92 from Quentin Hampton for a potential phase consisting of relocating the proposed
93 mooring fields from Riverside Park to Buena Vista Park and that staff would be back to

94 ask the CRA for financial support. A brief discussion ensued about the pros and cons of
95 mooring fields, the process of obtaining the necessary permits from various agencies and
96 the potential costs. Mr. Fegley continued that staff was researching all possible grant
97 avenues that were available to the City.

98
99 Mr. Kosmas stated that he wanted to see how the upcoming Redevelopment Plan update
100 addressed Riverside Park and to give due diligence to the overall scope of the plan before
101 he made a decision on this item.

102
103 Mr. Williams would like to see advancements made on the bulkhead/light issue as this
104 had been ongoing, but would agree with deferring any decision on the overall Park
105 improvements until after the Redevelopment Plan update was complete.

106
107 Ms. Foster gave a brief update on prior work and research CRA staff had done in
108 conjunction with the Utilities Commission in regards to the lights at Riverside Park. Ms.
109 Foster continued that a decision had been made to hold off on the light replacement in
110 order to use the allocated funds as matching grant funds. Ms. Foster felt that a decision
111 should be made soon, as these lights were in serious need of replacement.

112
113 Mr. Kosmas questioned where the funds for implementation would come from.

114
115 Mr. Fegley stated that this project could be implemented in phases over several years if
116 necessary.

117
118 **Mr. Belote made the motion to defer this item to the March , 2010 regular CRA**
119 **meeting, seconded by Mr. Kosmas. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5-0.**

120
121 Mr. Williams asked who had jurisdiction over Riverside Park. Mr. Dennis stated that this
122 property was owned and controlled by the City.

123
124 C. Demolition of the buildings on the Dunn Property – 533 Canal St.

125
126 Mr. Otte stated that the intersection of US 1 and Canal Street was a key intersection,
127 bringing visitors to the Canal Street shopping area from US 1 and SR 44. Mr. Otte
128 continued that the CRA owned the property at the northwest corner of the intersection,
129 formerly used as a lumber yard and still referred to as the Dunn property. The two
130 buildings on the property were an eyesore and presented a poor vista for visitors. The
131 code enforcement department had received a quote for the demolition of the building in
132 the amount of \$10,463.00.

133
134 Mr. Otte stated that this property had had a phase 1 and 2 environmental assessment and
135 some contamination had been detected. It was thought that perhaps grant funds could be
136 used to pay for the demolition of the buildings. Mr. Otte continued that he had discussed
137 this matter with Margaret Olson of the federal EPA in Atlanta, and she verified that it
138 may be possible to use grant funds for this purpose; however, those funds must be applied
139 for which could be a lengthy process. Therefore, staff recommended using CRA funds to
140 have the buildings demolished as quickly as possible.

141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187

Mr. Belote inquired if this was still within the scope of what the City Commission had approved previously. Mr. Otte said yes.

A brief discussion ensued about removing or keeping the slab as contamination had been found underneath and Ms. Foster stated that the slab could be removed.

Mr. Belote made the motion to move forward with the demolition, seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5-0.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Belote commented on the conceptual plan from FDOT addressing proposed improvements to the intersection on US1 and Canal Street and asked that staff keep the CRA updated, as the FDOT plan would utilize a portion of the Dunn Lumber property.

D. Capital Improvements budget in the CRA Plan Update

Mr. Otte stated that he had researched the CRA's Capital Improvement Budget and commented on his findings as they related to current and outstanding projects. Mr. Otte continued that an approved budget had to be inserted into the upcoming Redevelopment Plan update for final approval by the City Commission. Mr. Dennis recognized the City's Finance Director Carol Rogers and Mr. Otte thanked Ms. Rogers for her assistance.

Mr. Kosmas questioned a discrepancy between the estimated capital project funds in the draft plan update and the figure that was derived by Mr. Otte. Mr. Otte stated that during his budget research he discovered some projects that were already in progress but were not listed in the draft plan update and he was informed that they were included in the current FY 2009/10 budget. Mr. Otte continued that he had added the current year budget to the project list, and that the cost for all projects totaled \$26,164.500 instead of the \$21,100.000 originally estimated.

Mr. Dennis stated that he was under the impression that the Ave. Gateway had been removed from the project list. Mr. Otte clarified that this project was not in the recommended funding list.

Mr. Dennis inquired if the City had received any grants pertaining to the purchase of the Esther Street property as the City had promised to return the CRA's matching funds if grants could be obtained. Staff will investigate. Mr. Kosmas felt that the CRA's funds were for improvements and not the purchase of the property. A discussion ensued about the CRA's financial involvement in this project.

Mr. Williams felt that the CRA had a lot of projects on the books and inquired about the steps to extend the life of the CRA as there clearly was a need for that. Mr. Otte stated that the County Counsel would be considering two (2) resolutions in that regard in the near future, which would enable the CRA to go on beyond its sunset date.

188 Mr. Kosmas felt that the top three (3) items on the project list were put there by a
189 consensus during several meetings and suggested not making any changes to their
190 position or estimated project cost. Mr. Otte stated that it was the CRA's prerogative to
191 adjust/amend the budget as they saw fit.

192
193 Ms. Foster felt there were a lot of grants available and suggested hiring a qualified
194 company to research and secure grants for the CRA.

195
196 The CRA agreed to take \$200,000 out of the Esther Street funds to replenish the Policy
197 and Partnership budget.

198
199 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the proposed budget update contingent**
200 **upon \$200,000 being taken out of the Esther Street line item and transferred into**
201 **the Policy and Partnership line item, seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried on**
202 **roll-call vote 5-0.**

203
204 Mr. Dennis acknowledged Mr. Heist in the audience, who had signaled that he had a
205 question. Mr. Heist asked if there were any plans to improve the bathrooms at the
206 Chamber of Commerce Building. Mr. Dennis stated that the current phase only covered
207 the exterior.

208
209 Mr. Kosmas asked for an update on the funding situation with the SEVHD. Mr. Hall,
210 CRA Attorney stated that he did not have any updates yet, but anticipated new
211 information by the March CRA meeting and stated that the Hospital had a regular Board
212 meeting scheduled prior to the next CRA meeting. Mr. Kosmas inquired if the CRA
213 could be notified of this Hospital Board meeting. Ms. Soulie noted this request.

214
215 Mr. Williams stated that he had had a conversation with a local business owner in regards
216 to the proposed overlay district and was informed that there was positive feedback within
217 the business community supporting this idea.

218
219 Mr. Belote stated that the City Commission had voted on the parking lot lease agreement
220 for 411 Flagler Ave. at their February 2010 meeting and inquired if that topic had
221 previously been presented to the CRA. Mr. Otte mentioned that this agenda item had
222 been before the CRA at their August 8, 2009 CRA meeting.

223
224 Mr. Dennis inquired if staff would be able to give the CRA an update on the parking
225 lease agreement with Cormeth Methodist Church at the March meeting. Mr. Otte stated
226 that this was a possibility.

227
228 **ADJOURNMENT**

229
230 A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.