

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF JUNE 2, 2010
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS,
210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

Chair Linda DeBorde called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

23
24
25
26
27
28

Answering to roll call:

**Linda DeBorde
Steve Dennis
James Kosmas
Cynthia Lybrand
Charles Belote
Doug Hodson
Thomas Williams**

Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Project Manager Michelle Martin; CRA Coordinator Noeleen Foster; Administrative Specialist Claudia Soulie and CRA Attorney Mark Hall.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting May 5, 2010

Mr. Williams asked that the minutes from the May 5, 2010 meeting be amended as follows: Page 8, lines 361 – 364 *Mr. Williams suggested the CRA approve the seawall assessment/design. and maybe move forward with the parking upgrades and utility design as well as the site plan approval and permitting to get an overall idea on what to do with the Park area. He felt that the other design items, like the breezeway and restroom design would fall into place.*

B. Property Improvement Grant Application: 301 Flagler Ave – Jewelry of Joy

Mr. Belote suggested voting on item 3. B (“After-the-fact” Property Improvement Grant application for 301 Flagler Ave.) separately. All agreed. (Please see further detail below).

C. Property Improvement Grant Change Order: 113. S. Orange Ave – Panheads Pizzeria

D. Commercial Impact Fee Assistance Application: 203 Washington Street – United Church of Christ

E. Esther Street Stormwater Engineering

- 48 F. Mary Avenue Streetscape Project Phase I – 100% Construction Plans
- 49 G. Mary Ave Streetscape Project Phase I – Archaeological requirements

50
51
52
53
54

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the consent agenda with the above changes to the May 5, 2010 minutes and without item 3. B, seconded by Mr. Dennis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.

55
56
57
58
59
60
61

Mr. Belote commented on the guidelines for the Property Improvement Grant program and stated that he had conversed with previous recipients of this grant, who felt that the guidelines were clear in the fact that the improvements could not be started until the CRA had approved the application. Mr. Belote was reluctant to approve this “after-the-fact” application, as this may set precedent for others to claim that they misunderstood the guidelines.

62
63
64
65
66

Mr. Otte stated that he had been in touch with the applicant and that this was an unfortunate misunderstanding. Mr. Otte continued that the guidelines did not clearly state in bold type that “No work shall begin prior to CRA approval”, however, there was other verbiage indicating that pre-approval was necessary.

67
68
69

Ms. Foster stated that staff had since updated the Property Improvement Guidelines to indicate such in bold type to avoid any future misinterpretation.

70
71
72

Ms. Foster stated that the CRA never had to process a Property Improvement Grant application where the work had been completed prior to CRA approval.

73
74
75
76

A brief discussion ensued about verbiage in the guidelines giving indication of prior approval being necessary, being able to pick up the application documents from CRA staff and also being able to download it from the website.

77
78
79
80

Mr. Belote made the motion to deny the “After-the-fact” Property Improvement Application for 301 Flagler Ave.; seconded by Mr. Dennis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5 – 2 with Commissioners Hodson and Dennis casting the dissenting votes.

81
82
83
84
85

Mr. Kosmas felt that the City’s website served as giving constructive notice, as the applicant was not required to visit it, but once they did, this could be considered actual notice.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

86
87

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

88
89
90
91
92

Ms. Deborah Dugas, 200 N. Pine Street stated that she had done some research on the Exemption for Transportation Concurrency for the CRA area. Ms. Dugas felt that this exemption was not in the best interest of the City of New Smyrna Beach and inquired how this would benefit its tax-paying property owners.

93
94

Dawn Aberle, of Aberle Antiques, stated that she was opposed to having a loud speaker for the Canal Street (outside) sound system right in front of her business, as the contents

95 being broadcasted was not conducive to the ambiance she had created for her business.
96 Ms. Aberly stated that she was under the impression that the sound system was only
97 supposed to be turned on during special events and not Monday through Friday.
98

99 Ms. DeBorde understood where Ms. Aberly was coming from and stated that this item
100 would be discussed on this agenda under New Business and she was hopeful that a
101 mutually agreeable solution would be found.
102

103 Hearing no further requests, Ms. DeBorde closed the Public Participation portion of the
104 meeting.
105

PRESENTATION

107 A. None
108

OLD BUSINESS

109
110
111 A. Public Hearing on Sale of 207 and 215 Florida Ave Properties
112

113 Mr. Otte stated that the CRA was required by State Law to place an ad in a general
114 circulation newspaper as well as to hold a Public Hearing for the proposal to convey
115 public land. Staff placed an ad on April 29, 2010 indicating that the CRA will conduct a
116 Public Hearing to hear interested persons regarding the sale of CRA property at 207 and
117 215 Florida Ave.
118

119 Mr. Wade Mahood, 311 Florida Ave., stated that the relocation of the leased parking
120 spaces in the Florida Ave lots needed to be addressed more effectively.
121

122 Hearing no further requests to comment, Ms. DeBorde closed the Public Hearing on the
123 Sale of the Florida Ave. properties.
124

125 B. Consideration of the purchase and sale agreement for the CRA lots on Florida
126

127 Mr. Otte introduced Gregg Logan with RCLCO, the consultant retained by the CRA to do
128 the analysis of the financial and economic feasibility of the proposed hotel project. Mr.
129 Logan gave a brief summary of who RCLCO was and what their findings were pertaining
130 to a hotel market overview, average room rates and projected revenues for this specific
131 type of hotel at the proposed location on Flagler Ave.
132

133 Mr. Otte stated that the purchase and sale agreement reflected agreement points that CRA
134 staff and the respective legal counsels for the buyer and seller had compiled during
135 several meetings.
136

137 Mr. Glenn Storch, legal counsel for the developer, reiterated that the actual buyer was
138 HIHO, LLC; that they would provide the franchise agreement and that financing was in
139 their name. Mr. Storch agreed with the \$500,000 (sale price for properties) due at closing
140 and clarified that, on page 4 section 8, the buyer had resolved the parking issues and he

141 wanted it clearly reflected in the contract, that the buyer was waiving any rights that they
142 would have to public spaces.

143

144 Mr. Storch continued stating his verbiage preferences for the incentives sections 10 and
145 11 on pages 4/5 and that he would like the agreement to reflect that the buyer was aware
146 that the TIF may not be sufficient to fully reimburse the buyer.

147

148 Mr. Hall, CRA Attorney, stated that, should the CRA approve the agreement today; it
149 would go before the City Commission on June 8th for final ratification.

150

151 Mr. Belote inquired how the TIF calculations for the two (2) CRA owned properties were
152 derived. Mr. Hall stated that these were based on projections of what the future assessed
153 value would be once they were place on the tax roll.

154

155 A brief discussion ensued about the Florida Ave. parcels having a current assessed value,
156 but the actual tax bill being zero; calculations having assumed a fixed millage rate;
157 combining the three parcel identification numbers into one parcel identification number.

158

159 Mr. Belote inquired if the existing TIF contributions for the privately owned property
160 involved in the hotel project were included in the current contract calculations.

161

162 Mr. Storch clarified if Mr. Belote was inquiring if the TIF calculations were based on
163 total TIF from the start of the CRA or from the present and taking into account the
164 increase in value. Mr. Storch stated that staff would look into this and do additional
165 research. Mr. Hall felt that this was based on the total TIF as this would be considered
166 one single parcel.

167

168 Mr. Kosmas inquired if the developer would benefit from the existing TIF for the CRA
169 properties and who made that determination. Mr. Hall and Mr. Otte agreed and stated that
170 this agreement was reached by all parties involved.

171

172 Mr. Kosmas continued that the CRA needed to do research on how the existing TIF for
173 the privately owned property should be allocated, as this could have different result based
174 on a “worst-case” or “best-case” scenario.

175

176 Mr. Williams asked about the other taxing authorities for the CRA. Mr. Otte stated that
177 the Volusia County rate included all County taxing authorities.

178

179 A brief discussion ensued about the amount considered for reimbursement of one-half of
180 the impact fees being the incremental TIF (the amount in excess of today’s TIF dollars)
181 that his project contributed.

182

183 Mr. Storch stated that he preferred a simple deal were all the TIF generated by those
184 properties went to the developer as an incentive, as he felt that the NSB CRA was in a
185 state of flux with the SEVHD payment exemption situation and the CRA sunset of 2015.

186

187 Mr. Kosmas asked the CRA Commissioners if they would still approve this sale
188 agreement knowing that the CRA may not receive any reimbursement and if the answer
189 was “yes” than then he felt that it didn’t really matter who got reimbursed first.

190
191 Mr. Hall clarified that, the City as a party to this contract, was not obligated to fund
192 whatever was not reimbursed.

193
194 A brief discussion followed about using the total TIF generated from these parcels for
195 this project towards the reimbursement and the majority of the CRA Commissioners
196 agreed.

197
198 Mr. Kosmas cautioned on having a Hold-harmless clause in the contract, in the event that
199 any contamination was found to avoid the CRA being held liable for the cleanup.

200
201 Mr. Hall commented on an erroneous middle initial for Mr. Swentor on page 12 that staff
202 would correct.

203
204 Mr. Belote asked for a synopsis of the section “Assignments“on page 13 and inquired
205 what this would and wouldn’t allow the buyer to do. Mr. Hall stated that an assignment
206 was not an assumption and continued that he had conferred with the City attorney that
207 Mr. Swentor could be held individually liable, even though the project would be assigned
208 to HIHO, LLC, until some assurance of future performance was provided. Mr. Storch
209 interjected that HIHO, LLC and not Mr. Swentor was the buyer and all his documentation
210 was based on this fact.

211
212 A discussion ensued about Mr. Swentor or other members being able to transfer their
213 membership interests in HIHO, LLC; getting a guarantee from an individual who had the
214 capacity to perform and the Sale agreement identifying HIHO, LLC as being the buyer.

215
216 Mr. Storch suggested restricting HIHO’s management to transfer their interests out and
217 that this could be addressed to find a solution.

218
219 Mr. Kosmas asked Mr. Hall if he would legally object to removing Mr. Swentor as the
220 buyer if he (Mr. Swentor) signed a continuing guarantee. Mr. Hall suggested obtaining a
221 personal guarantee from all principals of HIHO.

222
223 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Swentor was named as the key person for the purpose of having
224 this project “CO’ed” and performed.

225
226 Mr. Dennis felt that there were a lot of controls imposed on this project. Mr. Storch
227 agreed and questioned what kind of liability seemed to exist, as this transaction involved
228 the conveyance of properties and in case of any default the buyer would stand to lose
229 their deposit.

230
231 Mr. Hall summarized the following revisions to be included in the Purchase and Sale
232 agreement:

233

- 234
- Page 4 section 8: Take out word substitute
- 235
- Page 4/5 Section 10 (top of page 5) – take out words that \$325,000 was an
- 236
- advance on the reimbursement
- 237
- Page 5 Section 11 – need Proof of the amount for total impact fee and developer’s
- 238
- payment of half
- 239

240 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to approve the Purchase and Sale Agreement subject**
241 **to the following revisions:**

- 242
1. **a Hold Harmless for any environmental contaminants or hazardous**
243 **materials that may be discovered;**
 - 244 **2. the restriction, that there is no transfer of the majority interest of HIHO,**
245 **LLC without the written consent of the seller;**
 - 246 **3. that the attorneys for the Seller and Buyer agree on a form of continuing**
247 **guarantee to be executed by one of the principals of HIHO**
 - 248 **4. as well as the changes to page 4 section 8 and pages 4 & 5 Sections 10 & 11 as**
249 **outlined and agreed to by the respective councils for the parties during this**
250 **meeting.**
- 251

252

253 **seconded by Mr. Denis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**

254

255 Mr. Storch thanked the CRA for their input. Mr. DeBorde thanked the audience for their

256 patience.

- 257
- 258 C. Budget Amendment: Recognition of Revenue and Encumbrance of funds for
259 Hotel Incentives, contingent on contract approval by the City Commission and
260 property purchase by the developer

261

262 Mr. Otte stated that the County had hired a consultant who was reviewing CRA budgets

263 and that the County Council would call a meeting in August to discuss the financial

264 reports from the CRA’s. Mr. Otte continued that staff had been working diligently to get

265 projects started and funds encumbered and suggested that the CRA amend its budget to

266 recognize the revenue and encumber the incentives in the hotel agreement, contingent on

267 its approval and developer performance. The revenue will be \$500,000, plus \$8,400,

268 minus closing costs.

269

270 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the budget amendment, seconded by Mr.**
271 **Belote. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**

- 272
- 273 D. Discussion of Washington St Business Incubator project

274

275 Mr. Otte stated that the CRA Master Plan update included a project for a Washington

276 Street business incubator to be located in the building at the corner of Washington and

277 Dimmick Street. Mr. Otte continued that staff had had several conversations with the

278 current property owners, (the adult children of Mr. and Mrs. Hill) and that the project

279 would have two (2) simultaneous tracks:

280

- 281 1. A Business Academy – which would offer classes to anyone who wanted to open
282 their own business; (classes could be held at the Babe James Center) and
283 2. the renovation of the building on Washington Street with CRA funds to possibly
284 house graduates of the Business Academy
285

286 Ms. DeBorde inquired about any possible grants from the State of Florida to assist with
287 such a program. Mr. Otte stated that, off-hand he was able to think of Community
288 Development Block Grant funds (CDBG), however, Mr. Otte felt that using funds
289 allocated in the Master Plan update could be the most economical way to go.
290

291 The CRA Commissioners were in favor of moving forward with the Business Academy,
292 but reluctant about spending any CRA funds on the renovations and suggested finding
293 prospective tenants first.
294

295 Mr. Kosmas suggested requiring prospective tenants to complete the Business Academy
296 first. Mr. Kosmas also was in favor of incentivizing this project without requiring
297 repayment.
298

299 Ms. Lybrand inquired if the City had building contractors that they could call upon. Mr.
300 Otte stated he would check into this.
301

302 A brief discussion ensued about developing a plan for the Washington Street building,
303 having to bring it up to code, monetary contributions of the property owners, treating the
304 CRA financial assistance as a Grant versus being reimbursable through a possible lease
305 agreement.
306

307 Mr. Otte clarified that the CRA was asking staff to
308

- 309 • require that prospective tenants had to complete the Business Academy and
310 • begin work on the getting leases from graduates that came out of the academy,
311

312 **Mr. Dennis made the motion instructing staff to develop additional details as**
313 **discussed in the meeting and bring the item back before the CRA; seconded by Mr.**
314 **Hodson. The motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**
315

316 Ms. DeBorde asked Mr. Otte to bring this additional information back before the CRA at
317 their August meeting.
318

319 Mr. DeBorde stated that she heard talk about the possibility of not having a July meeting.
320 Mr. Kosmas felt that there were a lot of items to be addressed to be off for the summer.
321

322 Ms. Soulie informed the CRA that the Commission Chamber would be under renovation
323 for the month of July so that an alternate location had to be found for the July meeting.
324

325 E. Brownfield Grant items:
326

- 327 a. Quality Assurance Program for Brownfield: contract with CTC

- 328 b. Site Specific Quality Assurance Program for 2 Foley Dry Cleaning
329 properties with CTC
330 c. Site Specific Quality Assurance Program for three (3) Hall's Machine
331 Shop properties with CTC
332 d. Two Phase One Environmental Studies: Foley Dry Cleaning, and Hall's
333 Machine Shop
334

335 Mr. Otte stated that recent environmental investigations indicated that the properties
336 occupied by Hall's Machine Shop (504 Downing St) and Foley's Dry Cleaning (225 S.
337 Dixie Freeway) contain sub-surface contamination. Mr. Otte continued that this condition
338 was typically referred to as a "brownfield" and that the City had received a US
339 Environmental Protection Agency grant last year to begin the process to address such
340 conditions. Mr. Otte stated that CRA staff had already started work on the Dunn property
341 (US 1 and Canal).
342

343 Mr. Kosmas asked for clarification on which specific lots were involved and why these
344 assessments were being done.
345

346 Ms. Foster stated that this was done to pin-point the exact locations of any possible
347 contamination to be able to better assess the total clean up costs and the outcome of this
348 assessment would determine the property owners' actions.
349

350 Mr. Kosmas inquired if the State could force an environmental study and request test
351 wells. Ms. Foster affirmed this question.
352

353 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve the total cost of \$18, 552 for Concurrent**
354 **Technologies Project Task Orders for these two properties, seconded by Ms.**
355 **Lybrand. The motion carried on a roll call vote 7 – 0.**
356

357
358

NEW BUSINESS

- 359 A. Property Improvement Grant Application – 114 Flagler Ave – Gnarly Surf
360 Bar
361 B. Commercial Revitalization Grant Application – 114 Flagler Ave – Gnarly
362 Surf Bar
363 C. Property Improvement Grant Application – 110 Flagler Ave – Gnarly Surf
364 Bar (parking lot)
365

366 Mr. Otte stated that the Gnarly Surf Bar was a new business opening up in New Smyrna
367 Beach and three applications had been received and staff was requesting approval and a
368 balance transfer in the amount of \$50,000 from the General Contingency fund to cover
369 any possible deficiencies.
370

371 Mr. Belote asked why these applications were not listed under the consent agenda. Ms.
372 Foster stated that, if all three applications were approved, the grant account would be
373 overdrawn and a balance transfer was necessary. Ms. Foster continued that, based on
374 verbiage in the grant guidelines, she needed direction from the CRA.

375 Mr. Dennis inquired if staff had received the results of the mid-year budget review and
376 how the CRA's budget was affected. Mr. Otte stated that this was still in the process and
377 that the CRA budget was not affected very much.

378
379 Mr. Kosmas needed clarification on the grant guidelines. Ms. Foster explained that the
380 CRA offered Commercial and Residential Property Improvement Grants as well as
381 revitalization grants. Ms. Foster continued that the Property Improvement grants were for
382 the outside work only and the revitalization grand was for the interior.

383
384 A brief discussion ensued about the total transfer amount needed and the balance left in
385 the grant accounts.

386
387 Ms. Lybrand noted that the PIG for 301 Flagler did not get approved and asked if Ms.
388 Foster needed to add that amount back into the "pot". Ms. Foster agreed.

389
390 Ms. Foster stated that she had received word that several other properties were planning
391 on submitting grant applications.

392
393 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve the PIG's for 114 Flagler Ave and 110**
394 **Flagler in the amounts of \$10,000 each and the Commercial Revitalization Grant for**
395 **114 Flagler Ave in the amount of \$10,000 without a funds transfer, seconded by Mr.**
396 **Hodson. The motion carried on a roll call vote 7 – 0.**

397
398 Ms. Foster asked for clarification and stated that the CRA had enough funds to cover the
399 PIG applications, but there was no money at all in the Commercial Matching Grant fund.

400
401 **Mr. Belote made the motion to transfer \$10,000 from General Contingency to the**
402 **Commercial Revitalization account, seconded by Mr. Dennis. The motion carried**
403 **on a roll call vote 7 – 0.**

404
405
406 D. Discussion on the Canal Street Sound System

407
408 Mr. Otte stated that the CRA had received a petition from the Canal Street Historic
409 District Merchants Association containing signatures to maintain the outside loud speaker
410 system on Canal Street with all speakers in operation.

411
412 Mr. Belote inquired when this became a CRA responsibility. Ms. DeBorde and Mr.
413 Dennis stated that this had been a CRA responsibility since its installation.

414
415 Mr. Dennis gave a brief history that this sound system was originally designed to play
416 background music on Canal Street. Mr. Dennis continued on some prior discussion points
417 on how to handle what was being broadcasted and any legal issues arising from playing
418 copy-write material in a public forum.

419
420 Ms. Cameron Sky, Soundwaves Technologies, informed the CRA about options for
421 simplifying creating playlists and suggested different equipment and associated costs.

422 Mr. Kosmas addressed Ms. Aberle and suggested that the Canal Street Historic District
423 Merchants Association create a committee to determine which music should be played
424 and during what times and suggested that Ms. Aberle become a member.

425

426 Ms. Aberle noted that suggestion and was in favor of finding a mutually agreeable
427 solution.

428

429 Mr. Williams felt that playing the local radio station did have its benefits.

430

431 The CRA arrived at the consensus to instruct staff to do some research on the American
432 Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP) fees and what type of
433 equipment to use.

434

435

436 E. An Exemption for Transportation Concurrency for the CRA area

437

438 Mr. Otte stated that Florida statutes now permitted Cities to exempt properties within a
439 CRA from the requirements for transportation concurrency and that this would encourage
440 development within the CRA and lower the cost of development. Mr. Otte continued that
441 the City of Sanford had already taken this step and asked that the CRA recommended to
442 the City Commission that a provision be made in the Comprehensive Plan to exempt
443 properties located in the CRA from the requirements for transportation concurrency.

444

445 Mr. Chad Lingenfelter gave a brief history on the Growth Management Act and the pros
446 and cons of a Transportation Concurrency Exemption Area (TCEA), such as allowing
447 development without having to adjust highway/roadway capacity. Mr. Lingenfelter stated
448 that a one-time mobility plan had to be developed within two years from adoption of a
449 TCEA.

450

451 Mr. Lingenfelter continued that staff was in the process of completely rewriting the
452 transportation portion of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDR) and stated that
453 language about the TCEA could be added.

454

455 A brief discussion ensued about locations within the CRA district that had possible traffic
456 constraints and the existing levels of service.

457

458 Mr. Lingenfelter stated that he would look into the CRA's sunset in 2015 and if the
459 TCEA for the CRA district would continue.

460

461 Mr. Kosmas would be interested in finding out how many parcels within the CRA district
462 could be impacted.

463

464 Mr. Otte stated that a TCEA would benefit anybody within the CRA with a large project.

465

466 **Mr. Dennis made the motion authorize staff to move forward with drafting a TCEA**
467 **and to recommended to the City Commission that a provision be made in the**
468 **Comprehensive Plan to exempt properties located in the CRA from the**

469 **requirements for transportation concurrency; seconded by Mr. Kosmas. The**
470 **motion carried on a roll call vote 7 – 0.**

471
472 Mr. Otte informed the CRA that three firms were shortlisted from the ten responses the
473 City had received following Request for Qualifications pertaining to the Gateway
474 landscaping/wayfinding.

475
476 Mr. Lingenfelter added that all three companies were highly qualified and gave some
477 examples of their work.

478
479 Mr. Kosmas asked if the triangle area on SR 44 and Canal Street was being considered in
480 the wayfinding. Mr. Lingenfelter agreed and stated that I-95/SR 44 and SR44/Canal
481 gateways were top priority and commented that staff was prepared to take advantage of
482 possible grant opportunities.

483
484

485 **1. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

486 **A. Director's Report**

487
488 Mr. Otte stated that the CRA had approved up to \$50,000 for the Flagler Ave. Boardwalk
489 seawall assessment at their May meeting and he was informed by Khalid Resheidat, Asst.
490 City Manager, that an additional \$13,500 was needed as allowances to complete this
491 assessment.

492
493 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to authorize an additional \$13,500 for Quentin**
494 **Hampton to perform Task One of the Flagler Ave. Boardwalk Seawall assessment;**
495 **seconded by Mr. Dennis. The motion carried on a roll call vote 7 – 0.**

496
497 Mr. Otte stated that the SEVHD had filed to be exempted from their contributions to the
498 CRA fund and that this item would be discussed on the June 22nd City Commission
499 Meeting. Mr. Otte inquired of the CRA if they would like to make a recommendation to
500 the City Commission pertaining to this item.

501
502 Mr. Hall stated that figures, on how much the perceived impact to the CRA budget would
503 be, were still being determined. Mr. Hall felt that an exemption would have a very
504 significant impact, as the SVHD's contributions made up more than 25% of the CRA's
505 budget and recommended the CRA deny SEVHD's request.

506
507 Mr. Williams felt that without the SEVD's contributions, the CRA would be severely
508 restricted in addressing the projects listed in the Master Plan update.

509
510 Mr. Kosmas recommended including a specific list of projects for this area that would not
511 be able to be completed without SEVHD funding.

512
513 Mr. Otte informed the CRA that he had had a meeting with Bob Williams, CEO of Bert
514 Fish, were Mr. Williams indicated interest in having certain projects completed to
515 beautify the hospital area.

516 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to recommend that the City Commission deny the**
517 **exemption request made by SEVHD; seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion**
518 **carried on a roll call vote 6– 1 with Mr. Dennis casting the dissenting vote.**
519

520

521

B. Commissioner Report/ CRA Attorney Report

522

523 None

524

525

C. Tracking report

526

i. Train station

527

ii. Repair of lighted bollards on North Causeway

528

iii. Rusted tree grates on W. Canal

529

530

D. Correspondence

531

532 None

533

534 **ADJOURNMENT**

535

536 **A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.**