

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2010
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

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

11
12
13

Answering to roll call:

14
15
16
17
18
19
20

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

21 Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Project Manager Michelle Martin;
22 CRA Administrative Assistant Claudia Soulie and CRA Attorney Mark Hall.

23
24
25

CONSENT AGENDA

- 26 A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting August 4th, 2010
27 B. Commercial PIG: 310 – 312 Julia Street - \$7,925
28 C. Commercial Impact Fee Asst.: 600 East Third Ave - \$4,519.14
29 D. Commercial PIG: 113 S. Orange Street - \$8,350
30

31 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to approve the consent agenda items, seconded by Mr.**
32 **Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.**

33
34

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

37 Ms. Adele Aletti, Business owner at 113 Flagler Ave. and president of the Merchants of
38 Flagler Ave. informed the CRA that the merchants association was looking to upgrade
39 their existing Holiday decorations as they had been in use for the past 13 years and were
40 starting to disintegrate. Ms. Aletti presented the CRA with a brochure and price list of the
41 selected new decorations and asked if the CRA would be willing to fund the total cost of
42 \$44,210.52 from the CRA contingency line item.

43 A brief discussion ensued that the monies could come from either the Grants & Aids
44 account or the Marketing line item; and only buying a few sample items to assure
45 pleasing aesthetics.

46 Mr. Hodson inquired if the CRA was able to take a vote on this item as it was presented
47 under Public Participation. Mr. Hall stated that this was possible.

48 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the request of the Flagler Merchants for**
49 **the purchase of three (3) samples of the “Wave of Stars” pole decorations and the**
50 **entire necessary garland in an amount not to exceed \$10,000. Motion carried on**
51 **roll-call vote 7 –0.**

52

53 Mr. Fielding Cooley, with the Marine Discovery Center (MDC), stated that he was asked
54 to appear on behalf of Grey and Pat Wilson, organizers of the 10/10/10 Energy EXPO
55 concerning CRA assistance with some of the costs for printing promotional materials for
56 this event, in particular the 2 street banners. Mr. Cooley continued that this event would
57 be held at the MDC and was intended to educate people about energy conservation.

58

59 Ms. DeBorde suggested that the organizers get with Mr. Otte to see if they could find a
60 mutually agreeable arrangement. Mr. Cooley thanked the CRA for their time.

61

62 Mr. Williams felt that there was a possibility that some members of the audience were not
63 aware that the CRA grants had been approved under the consent agenda and suggested
64 naming the individual grants. Mr. Otte read the addresses as being 310 – 312 Julia Street
65 Commercial PIG, 600 East Third Ave Commercial Impact Fee Asst. and 113 S. Orange
66 Street Commercial PIG.

67

68 There being no further request, Ms. DeBorde closed the Public Participation portion of
69 the meeting.

70

71 **PRESENTATION:**

72

73 **A. Quentin Hampton – Flagler Boardwalk Seawall Report**

74

75 Mr. Otte stated that at their May 2010 meeting the CRA approved Quentin Hampton’s
76 Scope of Services and Engineering fee estimate for the Flagler Ave. Boardwalk, which
77 covered professional services associated with preparing surveys, field investigations,
78 plan, specifications and bidding assistance for improvements to the Flagler Ave.
79 seawall.

80

81 David Dacar and Ted Williamson with Williamson, Dacar Associates, Inc. were present
82 to give a brief summary on their report. Mr. Dacar stated that the report did not include
83 the results of the soil borings as they were expected to be delivered within the next few
84 days.

85

86 Mr. Dacar stated that they focused mainly on the seawall assembly and the seawall cap.
87 Mr. Dacar continued that he was of the opinion that the seawall assembly was put in
88 place in 1952 and he felt that it was in fairly good condition. However, the seawall cap
89 was cracked and rusting so Mr. Dacar suggested replacing the cap and possibly putting
90 in new tie-backs. Mr. Williamson stated that their investigation was not 100%
91 completed, but concurred that an overall replacement of the assembly was not
92 necessary at this time.

93

94 Ms. Lybrand inquired about a statement in the report that a new composite wall
95 assembly should be installed adjacent to the existing wall. Mr. Dacar explained that this
96 was only necessary if the beach sand would not be re-nourished.

97
98 A brief discussion ensued about the materials to be used and their potential costs; the
99 relationship of the seawall to the Boardwalk; level of water table behind the wall; how
100 possible modifications to the Boardwalk could affect the seawall repairs and the
101 seawall repairs being done in sections.

102
103 Mr. Dacar mentioned that there would be additional cost for the replacement of the
104 railing, which could be wood or stainless steel cabling; as well as the replacement of a
105 handicap ramp that could better withstand any future hurricanes. Mr. Williamson stated
106 that they could supply the CRA with a cost breakdown for the seawall repairs and any
107 additional costs for review and discussion at their next meeting and that today they just
108 wanted direction on “armoring” the whole structure or just fixing the cap as indicated in
109 their report.

110
111 Mr. Williams felt that the CRA needed to review the submitted report in further detail
112 before making any decision and continued that local architect Kevin Schweizer had
113 been commissioned by the CRA a few years ago to create a plan that addressed the
114 overall Boardwalk structure. Mr. Williams continued that this report contained ideas for
115 items that were being discussed today, such as the handicap ramp and also listed
116 interesting designs ideas for the pavilion structure.

117
118 Mr. Kosmas stated that a public meeting was necessary to inquire if the public was in
119 favor of renovating the existing structure or replacing it with a new design. Mr. Kosmas
120 also suggested having this project (seawall repair/Boardwalk Park) completed in
121 simultaneous stages.

122
123 The CRA came to the consensus to accept the seawall report and have staff bring a
124 formal proposal back at the October 6th, 2010 meeting and to schedule a public meeting
125 in the evening to get public input on the Boardwalk. Ms. DeBorde suggested having the
126 City Commission present and Mr. Kosmas concurred in order to ensure that everybody
127 was on the same page.

128 129 130 B. Presentation on the Badcock Building

131
132 Mr. Otte stated that the proposed redevelopment of the Badcock building continued to
133 move forward and said that the party interested in buying the property wished to make a
134 presentation to the CRA to discuss their progress to date, which included the following:

- 135
136 1. Discussing the project with business representatives who may be interested in
137 leasing space. The business interests include a print and copy store, an optical
138 store, and an engineering firm. A bank looking for space in the New Smyrna
139 Beach area would also be contacted.
140 2. Having an architect prepare several conceptual drawings.

141 3. Having a general contractor provide a draft budget for the renovation of the
142 building. The cost of the basic building renovation was on the order of
143 \$640,000.
144

145 Mr. Otte stated that there wasn't an existing CRA program to cover this level of
146 expenditure.
147

148 Mr. Ernie Johnson, Broker stated that he felt the Badcock Building and Streetscape were
149 the most important elements to the successful revitalization of the Historic Canal Street
150 District along West Canal, US1 and the entire City of New Smyrna Beach. Mr. Johnson
151 continued that the building was derelict and set an unattractive perception of New
152 Smyrna Beach and he felt that their plans to renovate this building were a win-win
153 situation for everybody involved. Mr. Johnson continued that they intended to attract
154 tenants such as Talbot's, Bonfish, Books A Million among others. Mr. Johnson stated
155 that the deteriorated condition of the building had created an increased cost (roughly
156 \$650,000) to bring it up to normal standards and that the market rents on Canal Street
157 would not support this level of investment which created a financial gap.
158

159 Mr. Johnson stated that they were working with Kevin Schweizer on a design that would
160 cost around \$750,000 to realize. Mr. Schweizer, Architect, elaborated on his design,
161 which included an outdoor café; atrium, interior window shopping and various other
162 enhancements to the alley walk, parking lot and landscaping.
163

164 Ms. DeBorde felt that this was a wonderful concept but questioned if the CRA was
165 currently in a position to get financially involved in such an expensive project.
166

167 Mr. Kosmas was also in favor of this project but would like to see the applicant provide
168 letters of commitment from potential tenants (preferably a bank, post office and coffee
169 shop) and more specific budget numbers, so that the CRA Commissioners could decide
170 where any potential funds could be best phased in (like buying down interest rates for
171 example).
172

173 Mr. Johnson stated that he would be more successful in getting letters of intent from
174 potential tenants if he was able to show them the CRA's commitment and was hoping to
175 work a deal structure with the CRA on a "if this... than that" basis, so that the CRA could
176 protect their investment, should the project not meet their expectations.
177

178 A brief discussion ensued about creating an assistance program to suite larger projects;
179 and available monies in economic incentives specifically earmarked for development.
180

181 Mr. Williams suggested that the applicant search the Florida Redevelopment
182 Association's website for examples of how other cities tackled a large project like this.
183

184 Ms. Lybrand stated that it was the CRA's mission to entice investors who stood to have
185 the greatest risk.
186

187 Ms. DeBorde stated that the CRA was in favor of this project and thanked Mr. Johnson
188 for their presentation.
189

190 C. Request for a new program: Dolphin View Restaurant

191

192 Mr. Otte stated that the owner of the Dolphin View Restaurant was seeking CRA
193 funding for an expansion of his business; however, there was currently not a CRA
194 program in place that could assist him at the level he was seeking.

195

196 Mr. Otte continued that the Dolphin View restaurant was located on the river between
197 Canal St and Julia St. The restaurant was completely dependent on favorable weather,
198 as seating was outdoors or under a covering without the benefit of heating/air
199 conditioning.

200

201 Mr. Otte informed the CRA that the restaurant owner wished to renovate a portion of
202 the building to create an inside seating area that would be heated and cooled. The total
203 project cost was on the order of \$100,000 to \$120,000. The property owner had
204 discussed the possibility of contributing \$25,000 cash as well as reducing the
205 restaurant's lease payments \$28,000 over three years.

206

207 Mr. George Richford, owner Dolphin View Restaurant and General Manager Lorna
208 Maniscalco were present. Mr. Richford stated that he felt his restaurant was an anchor
209 on the east side of Canal Street which attracted a lot of out-of-town customers to this
210 area. Mr. Richford continued that he intended to expand his business to stay open
211 longer and attract even more business all year round and that the proposed heated/air
212 conditioned indoor seating area was crucial to realize this vision. Mr. Richford stated
213 that his restaurant served roughly 120,000 people its first year and gave a brief
214 summary of the project scope which included enclosing some of the already existing
215 seats, thus, allowing the restaurant to operate even during inclement weather.

216

217 Mr. Richford stated that he had invested several hundred thousand dollars to date in
218 upgrading this facility.

219

220 Mr. Dennis stated that one option for CRA participation could be structured as a
221 construction loan which was paid out in phases.

222

223 A brief discussion ensued about the tenant's as well as the property owner's financial
224 commitment; the tenant reinvesting the dollars saved by the rent reduction back into the
225 project or the property owner reimbursing the CRA every first of the year versus
226 reducing the tenant's rent.

227

228 Mr. Williams stated that he did the design work on this project and that he would not be
229 able to vote on it when the time came.

230

231 The CRA came to the consensus to have staff work with the applicant and bring a more
232 detailed proposal back before the CRA at their October meeting.

233

234 **OLD BUSINESS**

235

236 A. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Change Order - 304 Flagler Ave -
237 Island Collection

238

239 Mr. Otte stated that on July 7, 2010 the CRA denied Island Collection's change order
240 request 5 – 1 with the reason that the additional work had been performed without prior
241 approval, which was not in compliance with the grant guidelines. The CRA suggested
242 that the applicant get with CRA staff.

243

244 Mr. Otte continued that on July 28, 2010 Mr. and Mrs. Carpenter submitted a letter to
245 staff for inclusion in the August 4, 2010 CRA agenda. Staff suggested that the
246 Carpenters address the CRA during the Public Participation Portion of the meeting,
247 which they did. The Carpenters asked the CRA to re-visit their "case" with the
248 reasoning that they were never told by CRA staff that they had to actually reapply for
249 the additional funds. The CRA asked staff to prepare an agenda item for further review
250 at the September CRA meeting.

251

252 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to approve the PIG change order request for 304**
253 **Flagler Ave. in the amount of \$9,467.71 based on the information received; seconded**
254 **by Ms. Lybrand. Motion carried on roll-call vote 4 –1. Ms. DeBorde casted the**
255 **dissenting vote and Mr. Williams had stepped out of the room after the previous**
256 **agenda item.**

257

258

259 B. Canal Street Historic District – FY 2009/10 Grants & Aids Reallocation Request

260

261 Mr. Otte stated that on July 15, 2009 the CRA approved Canal Street Historic District's
262 (CSHD) Grants & Aids application in the amount of \$25,000 for Fiscal Year 2009/10.
263 Ms. Cindy Jones, President of the CSHD appeared at the August 4, 2010 CRA meeting
264 during Public Participation, stating that one of the events (Biking) included in the
265 approved application did not take place and that she would like to reallocate a portion
266 of the \$14,569.23 remaining on the grant for new events that would attract more foot
267 traffic to Canal Street. The CRA suggested that Ms. Jones get with CRA staff and to
268 bring the request back at the September meeting.

269

270 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the Grants and Aids change order request**
271 **for the Canal Street Historic District in the amount of \$6,227; seconded by Mr.**
272 **Dennis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 - 0.**

273

274 C. Form-Based Code Selection Consultant

275

276 Mr. Otte stated that on April 28, 2010 Planning staff advertised a Request for Proposals
277 for a Form-Based Code. Ms. Gail Henrikson, Planning Manager submitted an agenda
278 item listing the short listed firms for the CRA's review and recommendation to the City
279 Commission.

280

281 1. Land Design Innovations

282 2. Dover Kohl

283 3. AECOM

284

285 Mr. Otte stated that CRA and Planning staffs were requesting that the CRA recommend
286 to the City Commission that staff be allowed to begin contract negotiations with the top-
287 ranked firm.

288

289 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to recommend to the City Commission that staff be**
290 **allowed to begin contract negotiations with the top-ranked firm (Land Design**
291 **Innovations); seconded by Mr. Dennis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6 – 1 with**
292 **Mr. Williams casting the dissenting vote.**

293

294 Mr. Williams explained that he had attended AECOM’s presentation and that they would
295 have hired a local talent which was a request in the RFP.

296

297

298 D. Bids proposal report for South Orange St. and Mary Ave. Streetscapes

299

300 Ms. Michelle Martin, CRA Project Manager had to leave the meeting at 4:30 pm.

301

302 Mr. Otte stated that the Orange St Streetscape and Parking Lot Improvements Project was
303 designed for complete reconstruction of the stormwater system, potable water system
304 with new 8” water main system and fire hydrants, complete reconstruction of the
305 roadway and sidewalks, new streetlight system, landscaping, irrigation, and complete
306 reconstruction of the CRA parking lot, from Lytle Avenue to Canal Street.

307

308 The Utilities Commission (UC) was committed to partnering with the City by funding the
309 design and reconstruction of the potable water system and fire hydrants, however near the
310 completion of the design stage of the project the UC advised in a May 2009 meeting that
311 they were no longer going to participate with the funding of this project. In an effort to
312 keep the project moving forward, Staff drafted a Memorandum of Understanding
313 between the City and the Utilities Commission, proceeded with completing the design
314 and construction bid documents, placing the UC infrastructure line items as bid
315 alternates, and advertised the project for bid proposals. The bid opening for the Orange
316 St Streetscape and Parking Lot Improvements Project was conducted on July 27, 2010
317 and the following were the results (base bid + bid alternates):

318

319 Masci Corporation \$ 785,151.70

320 ThadCon LLC \$ 799,047.50

321 Britt Construction, Inc \$ 1,091,224.00

322

323 Masci Corporation was the lowest responsive bidder. Staff had completed a thorough
324 review of Masci Corporation’s references. Staff recommended awarding the contract to
325 Masci Corporation, however due to a recent email from the UC General Manager/CEO,
326 the bid alternate line items (new 6” water main system and fire hydrants) would not be
327 constructed.

328

329 A brief discussion ensued about the references received; bid amounts with or without bid
330 alternate costs and the Memorandum of Understanding.

331

332 Ms. Lybrand suggested the need for receiving executed Memorandum of Understanding
333 prior to the commencement of a project.

334 **Mr. Belote made the motion to approve the Orange Avenue Streetscape bid to Masci**
335 **Corporation in the amount of \$771,601.70; seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion**
336 **carried on roll-call vote 4 – 3 with Mr. Dennis, Mr. Hodson and Ms. DeBorde**
337 **casting the dissenting votes.**
338

339 Mr. Otte stated that the Mary Avenue Streetscape Project – Phase I was designed for
340 complete reconstruction of the stormwater system, upgrading a section of the potable
341 water system with new 6” water main system and fire hydrants, complete reconstruction
342 of the sanitary gravity sewer system, complete reconstruction of the roadway and
343 sidewalk, new 8 FT multi-use trail, new streetlight system, landscaping, and irrigation,
344 from N Myrtle Avenue to US1.
345

346 The Utilities Commission (UC) was committed to partnering with the City by funding the
347 design and reconstruction of the potable water system, fire hydrants, and the sanitary
348 gravity sewer system, however near the completion of the design stage of the project the
349 UC advised in a May 2009 meeting that they were no longer going to participate with the
350 funding of this project.
351

352 In an effort to keep the project moving forward, Staff drafted a Memorandum of
353 Understanding between the City and the Utilities Commission, proceeded with
354 completing the design and construction bid documents, placing the UC infrastructure line
355 items as bid alternates, and advertised the project for bid proposals. The bid opening for
356 the Mary Avenue Streetscape Project – Phase I was conducted on July 27, 2010 and the
357 following were the results (base bid + bid alternates):
358

359 Masci Corporation	\$ 871,770.72
360 ThadCon LLC	\$ 950,030.50
361 Gomez Construction Company	\$1,094,205.04
362 Britt Construction, Inc	\$1,337,560.90

363

364 Masci Corporation was the apparent lowest responsive bidder. Staff recommended
365 awarding the contract to Masci Corporation, however due to a recent email from the UC
366 General Manager/CEO, the bid alternate line items (new 6” water main system and fire
367 hydrants, complete reconstruction of the sanitary gravity sewer system) would not be
368 constructed.
369

370 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to approve the Mary Avenue Streetscape bid to Masci**
371 **Corporation in the amount of \$729,270.72; seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion**
372 **carried on roll-call vote 5 – 2 with Mr. Dennis and Ms. DeBorde casting the**
373 **dissenting votes.**
374

375 Mr. Williams inquired about possible pros and cons of a company being awarded two (2)
376 projects at the same time. Mr. Otte stated that he was hopeful this would be a beneficial
377 scenario and staff would monitor the outcome.
378

379
380 E. Independent Retail Move-in Incentive Program
381

382 Mr. Otte stated that the proposed Independent Retail Move-in Incentive Program was
383 intended to provide an incentive for independent retail businesses from outside the City
384 to locate to vacant leasable spaces within the CRA. This program was discussed at the
385 July and August CRA meetings as well as a meeting held August 17 with Canal St
386 property owners and Ned Harper of the Small Business Development Center, Daytona
387 State College. Suggestions received for this program were as follows:

388

389 • Rent reasonableness needed to be assured. Staff suggested that the property owner
390 justify the rent as measured against other comparable space rents as well as a history of
391 rents charged for that space.

392 • The program's funding breakdown should be as follows: 50% from the tenant; 25%
393 from the property owner; 25% from the CRA;

394 • The program should be limited to a list of target business types, such as retail businesses
395 listed in the CRA Master Plan Update. In addition, the program should be limited to
396 independent retailers.

397 • The program should be adopted for a one year trial basis, with an evaluation at year end
398 to determine if the program is worth continuing. This will also eliminate the requirement
399 proposed earlier for a minimum lease term of two years.

400 • Rather than put restrictions as to the number and type (full-time or part-time) of
401 employees, simply have the business owner sign a statement that they will comply with
402 all applicable wage laws.

403 • On the question of whether there should be a prohibition against new or start-up
404 businesses, Ned Harper of the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) proposed
405 that a new business would be acceptable if it were properly capitalized. The business also
406 needed a business plan. Mr. Harper offered the services of the SBDC to review
407 applications to give an opinion on compliance with these criteria. The program must be
408 streamlined to enable a business to get approval quickly with a minimum of paperwork.

409

410 A brief discussion ensued about:

- 411 • listing a maximum contribution amount from the CRA;
- 412 • a cap on how much money the CRA would be willing to invest during the one
413 year trial period;
- 414 • what was considered as an independent retailer or franchise;
- 415 • the pros and cons of limiting this program to retail only versus other uses and
- 416 • creating a ranking system that would allow higher points for a business which
417 would best suite the program's intent.

418

419 Ms. DeBorde felt that the focus should rest on retail. Mr. Otte stated that he would check
420 into what was considered an independent firm, a franchise and work on a ranking system.

421

422 The CRA, by consensus, deferred this item until the next CRA meeting.

423

424 F. Washington Street Incubator – contract for design services

425

426 Mr. Otte stated that Ed Maurice is a registered architect with over 25 years of experience
427 in managing capital projects, including the planning, design, and construction of over
428 100 institutional buildings in Florida and that he had now opened an office in DeLand.

429

430 Mr. Otte continued that staff wished to contract with Mr. Maurice to work as a
431 consultant for the Washington Street Business District (business incubator) project. This
432 project proposed to use the building at the NW corner of Washington and Dimmick
433 Streets as a business incubator. A lease would be prepared for this purpose, with the
434 building leased at an agreed upon rate and the term would be until the cost of the
435 renovations were exhausted.

436
437 Mr. Otte stated that the City Attorney and Assistant City Manager were consulted
438 regarding the process and contractual limits for the hiring of an architect for the above
439 tasks. It was anticipated that the first phase of work (analysis and cost projection) would
440 take about 1 month and the second phase (Design-built Request for Proposal) about 2
441 months.

442
443 A brief discussion ensued about creating a Request for Proposal for local architects; cost
444 projections for consulting fees and getting commitments from possible participants in the
445 incubator program before renovating this building. Mr. Otte stated that staff had hired a
446 consultant that was in the process of establishing the business academy aspect of this
447 project.

448
449 The CRA, by consensus, decided to have staff draft up a RFP for architectural services.

450
451

452 G. Esther Street Park - Seawall Design Proposals

453
454 Mr. Otte stated that the City had purchased four (4) parcels at the eastern end of Esther
455 Street between May 2007 and August 2008, and now had a couple of conceptual ideas for
456 an off-beach parking and recreational area, known as Esther Street Beachfront Park.

457
458 Mr. Otte continued that the existing seawall was severely damaged by Hurricanes
459 Frances and then Jean, and later demolished for safety reasons. Mr. Otte stated that it
460 would be necessary to replace the seawall before any parking and recreational
461 improvements could be made to this property and that staff had asked the City's rotating
462 engineering firms to provide quotes for designing a buried seawall armoring system with
463 planted vegetation to look and function as a natural dune. The following were their
464 quotes:

465
466 Tetra Tech \$ 39,000
467 Quentin L Hampton Associates, Inc \$ 49,838

468
469 Mr. Otte continued that staff recommended entering into a continuing services agreement
470 with Tetra Tech and having them begin the design of the new seawall armoring system
471 right away to keep the beachfront park project moving forward.

472
473 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to approve staff's recommendation to accept Tetra**
474 **Tech's proposal in the amount of \$39,000; seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion**
475 **carried on roll-call vote 7 - 0.**

476
477 Mr. Kosmas questioned that the CRA was being asked to pay for a lot of improvements
478 to the Esther Street project. A brief discussion ensued about the CRA having budgeted

479 improvements for the Esther Street park project and that the seawall design/construction
480 was included in this budget figure.

481

482

483 H. Washington Street Streetscape – Shortlisted Firm Rankings

484

485 Mr. Otte stated that the CRA Master Plan Update 2010 listed the Washington Street
486 corridor as a priority for a streetscape project. Staff had a topographical survey prepared
487 for the corridor to aid in the design process, and then advertised an RFQ for the
488 streetscape design. Nine (9) proposals were received from various engineering firms, and
489 of those firms four (4) were shortlisted who then made presentations to the Selection
490 Committee on August 30, 2010. All firms had good proposals of how to improve the
491 corridor, but one stood out from the rest, Anderson-Dixon, whose concept focused mostly
492 on the west side neighborhood by promoting the Washington Street Business District as
493 well as the Washington Street Business Incubator, increasing mobility and pedestrian
494 activity.

495

496 The shortlist of Engineering Firms for this project is recommended as follows:

497

- 498 1. Anderson-Dixon
- 499 2. Parker Mynchenberg
- 500 3. GAI
- 501 4. Zev Cohen

502

503 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to recommend to the City Commission that staff be**
504 **allowed to begin contract negotiations with the top-ranked firm (Anderson-Dixon);**
505 **seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 – 0.**

506

507

508 I. Dunn Lumber property demolition proposal

509

510 Mr. Otte stated that the City had received standard pricing for the demolition of
511 buildings. This pricing was obtained in an effort to accelerate the demolition of
512 buildings that qualified for demolition as a result of the code enforcement process.

513

514 Mr. Otte continued that CRA staff had an inspection of the property completed by a
515 certified asbestos inspector. The report found asbestos in the building which needed to
516 be removed prior to demolition.

517

518 City staff had now received a price quote for the demolition work from DBI Demolition
519 using the standard pricing for the structures on the Dunn Lumber property, which
520 included the following:

521

- 522 1. Removal of the asbestos found in the main building;
- 523 2. Demolition of the main building following asbestos removal;
- 524 3. Demolition of the pole barn building;
- 525 4. Demolition of a concrete slab generally located to the north of the main
526 building;
- 527 5. Demolition of a concrete slab generally located west of the pole barn;

528 6. Compliance with the restriction placed on this work by the environmental
529 engineer, that no dirt shall leave the site; and
530 The contractor needing to comply with the conditions placed upon the work by
531 the terms of the City's demolition permit and the FDOT permit for closing a
532 portion of FDOT property (including the sidewalk adjacent to the building)
533

534 Mr. Otte thanked Mr. Knotek, City of New Smyrna Beach Building Official for his
535 assistance which allowed for a speedy process.
536

537 Mr. Kosmas inquired about a time line for this demolition and stated that he would like to
538 see an agenda item to have the sidewalks and curbs redone from US1 to as close to the
539 railroad tracks as possible.
540

541 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to recommend approval of the demolition estimate for**
542 **533 Canal Street by DBI Demolition in the amount of \$34,266.49; seconded by Mr.**
543 **Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 – 0.**
544

545 Mr. Otte stated that he was planning on submitting the demolition item for City
546 Commission approval at their September 28, 2010 meeting.
547

548 **NEW BUSINESS**

549 N/A
550

551 **REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

552

553 B. CRA Attorney's Report

D. Tracking report

554 C. Capital Projects Report

E. Correspondence

555

556 A. Director's Report
557

558 Mr. Belote inquired about Mr. Otte's proposed role as the City's Economic Development
559 Director and cautioned that the forward momentum of the CRA projects may slow when
560 the CRA had to share its Director with the City.
561

562 Mr. Otte stated that this change had been suggested by the Economic Development
563 Advisory Board. A brief discussion ensued that the CRA should have had an opportunity
564 to discuss this topic, as the CRA had a lot of projects to complete before it sunsets in
565 2015.
566

567 Ms. Lybrand cautioned that time records needed to be kept per the Auditor General.
568

569 Ms. Brangaccio, City Manager, stated that the additional duties would be paid for by the
570 City's General fund; that Mr. Otte would keep a running total of his hours and that the
571 budget for this expense could be adjusted in March 2011 during the Mid-year budget
572 adjustments.
573

574 Ms. Brangaccio stated that this type of arrangement would be beneficial to the City as
575 well as the CRA.

576

577

D. Commissioner Report

578

579 Mr. Williams stated that he loved the new and improved Commission Chambers and the
580 CRA agreed.

581

582 Mr. Kosmas inquired about a timeline for the completion of West Canal Streetscape. Mr.
583 Otte stated that it was scheduled to be completed by the end of October.

584

585 Mr. Kosmas also inquired about visible lining on US1. Mr. Otte stated he would check
586 into this and report at the next CRA meeting.

587

588 Ms. DeBorde stated that she was retiring and closing her Real Estate office and that this
589 would be her last CRA meeting as she had resigned from her position of CRA Chair
590 effective October 1, 2010. Ms. DeBorde informed everybody that she was planning a
591 retirement celebration on Thursday, September 30, 2010.

592

593 ADJOURNMENT

594

595 **A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.**