

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2011
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

CALL TO ORDER

CRA Chair James Kosmas called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Kosmas recognized former CRA Vice Chair Steve Dennis in the audience.

ROLL CALL

Answering to roll call:

**James Kosmas
Doug Hodson
Thomas Williams
Chad Schilsky
James Peterson
John Kinney
Melissa Latty**

Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Administrative Specialist Claudia Soulie and CRA Attorney Mark Hall. CRA Project Manager Michelle Martin had to attend at a different meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – Regular CRA Meeting May 4, 2011

Mr. Peterson made the motion to approve the consent agenda; seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.

Mr. Kosmas welcomed Ms. Latty to the CRA.

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.

Mr. Bob Wiley, property owner on Canal Street stated that he had questions and comments about an item to be addressed under Old Business and inquired if he should speak now or wait until the agenda item was up for discussion. The CRA agreed that he could wait until then.

Hearing no further requests for participation, Mr. Kosmas closed the public participation of the meeting.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

OLD BUSINESS

A. CRA Grant Programs Discussion – Significant Façade feature and other program issues

Mr. Otte stated that the City Commission had directed that only one CRA grant be awarded “per business”. The question has arisen if, in a large, multi-tenant building, the building owner could be considered a business for the purpose of improving the façade through a façade grant. Mr. Otte continued that during a recent Ad Hoc Committee meeting held May 25, 2011, the Ad Hoc committee stated that the building owner could be considered a business and could apply for a façade grant for up to \$20,000 per “significant façade”. Mr. Otte continued that the definition of a significant façade needed to be clarified by the CRA and stated that staff suggests that it could be a façade that faces a street or parking lot with a public building entrance on that side of the building and that some buildings may have more than one significant façade. Mr. Otte elaborated that the Ad Hoc Committee had also suggested only allowing the building owner to apply for exterior improvements and the tenant could apply for interior improvements plus exterior business signage, if necessary (with the property owner’s consent).

Mr. Kosmas stated that the Ad Hoc meeting was held for the purpose of facilitating the CRA grant programs and vetting out any possible uncertainties and he summarized some of the discussion points.

Mr. Williams stated that the CRA’s intent for establishing the grant programs was to improve its district and felt that limiting businesses or residents to only one grant was not conducive to fulfilling this intent, as in these current financial times applicants may have to make their improvements in increments. Mr. Williams suggested allowing applicants to apply multiple times until the CRA funding limit of \$20,000 has been reached.

A brief discussion ensued about the pros and cons of this suggestion; that offering this option could almost be considered as providing a \$20,000 business account and that this would not follow the directives of the City Commission of only allowing one grant per business.

Mr. Schilsky stated that the current guidelines granted an applicant 365 days from the date of approval in which to complete his project and suggested allowing the applicant to submit draw receipts for completed tasks. A brief discussion ensued that all grants were paid upon total completion and inspection of the project. Ms. Soulie stated that allowing draws was a suggestion in the proposed combined program. Mr. Hall commented that this would have to be a policy decision made by the CRA and the City Commission.

Mr. Hodson agreed with Mr. Williams’ suggestion of allowing multiple grants per business owner.

Mr. Otte summarized that there could be three possible options:

1. Allowing only one grant per business (current ruling)

- 97 2. Allowing an applicant to come back for an additional grant, if the prior grant was
98 obtained before the City Commission Directive was given on April 12, 2011.
99
- 100 3. Creating extra criteria, which, when met would allow an applicant to receive multiple
101 grants regardless of when the prior grant was obtained.
102

103 Mr. Kosmas was concerned about allowing applicants to submit grant applications
104 without having the combined grant guidelines approved. A brief discussion ensued that
105 the City Commission had granted CRA staff a ninety day transition period in which to
106 finalize the combined grant programs thus allowing staff to accept applications under the
107 “old” guidelines, but being able to use the proposed \$20,000 maximum in order not to
108 delay any projects.
109

110 Mr. Kosmas summarized that the consensus of the City Commission is to only allow one
111 grant per business and that the CRA’s consensus is to allow more than one.
112

113 **Mr. Peterson made the motion to recommend to the City Commission to allow more**
114 **than one (1) grant per business, not to exceed \$20,000; seconded by Mr. Hodson.**
115 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 6 –1 with Mr. Schilsky casting the dissenting vote.**
116

117 Mr. Kosmas commented on the question on how the CRA should define what is
118 considered a business and that it should be based on the occupational license. Mr.
119 Kosmas felt that this was an appropriate definition of a business as this would be a clearer
120 approach, especially when applicants belonged to a Condominium Association or are
121 tenants in a multi-tenant building.
122

123 Mr. Kosmas reiterated the suggestion of the Ad Hoc Committee to only allowing the
124 building owner to apply for exterior improvements and the tenant to apply for interior
125 improvements plus exterior business signage, if necessary (with the property owner’s
126 consent) as this would eliminate multiple tenants in a large building to be able to combine
127 their applications to receive astronomical amounts of exterior grant funding.
128

129 Mr. Schilsky suggested creating a list of exterior improvements a tenant could apply for.
130 A brief discussion ensued that improvements should be a joint effort between the
131 property owner and the tenant as well as the need to come up with a true definition of
132 what was considered a façade.
133

134 Mr. Peterson cautioned that the CRA needed to define its guidelines on the proposed
135 “significant façade” stipulation clearly, as he had issues with awarding grants on
136 subjectivity.
137

138 Further discussion ensued that the CRA’s goal for the grant program is to remove blight;
139 increase the tax roll/property values within the CRA district and not to make successful
140 businesses more successful.
141

142 Mr. Otte stated that the question to be answered is “Who is eligible to apply” and
143 summarized that for the \$20,000 grant program staff needed direction on:
144

- 145 1. Exterior improvements – Property owner only

146 2. Interior improvements – Property owner or tenant with property owner approval
147 3. Who is the applicant – the property, the property owner or the tenant.
148
149 A discussion ensued about a property owner holding occupational licenses for several
150 businesses within one building; making the guidelines too complicated and if a tenant’s
151 application would preclude the property owner from applying.
152
153 Mr. Kosmas summarized that it was his understanding that the CRA was recommending
154 to the City Commission that:
155
156 a) a business is defined by an occupational license
157 b) a business is separate from the owner of the parcel
158 c) either the property owner or the tenant can make an application for a grant under the
159 \$20,000 program and use the funds as they deem appropriate, subject to the guidelines.
160
161 The CRA agreed, but felt that some sort of funding cap was needed pertaining to owners
162 of multiple businesses and to define parcel or property.
163
164 Mr. Kosmas gave an example of a property with more than one building and asked if the
165 CRA intended to make these grants available to each building on the property and that he
166 was not in favor of giving grants per building.
167
168 Mr. Williams suggested giving only one grant per parcel, regardless of how many
169 buildings were on the property.
170
171 Mr. Kosmas stated that he wanted to clarify if the CRA was in favor of giving multiple
172 grants to multiple buildings on one parcel.
173
174 Discussion ensued about defining a business as holding an occupational license for a
175 particular parcel; grants being available per business notwithstanding the number of
176 structures that exist on one parcel; the need for a physical address to obtain an
177 occupational license and that both the property owner and the business owner could apply
178 for either interior or exterior grants.
179
180 Ms. Soulie asked for clarification of a proposed motion to read “*One grant per business*
181 *per parcel, even if multiple structures on parcel.*” Mr. Kosmas concurred and added that
182 a business was defined per occupational license and that this would not preclude the
183 property owner from applying for a grant.
184
185 Mr. Williams inquired if there are multiple businesses in a building would all of them be
186 able to apply for a grant. Mr. Kosmas stated that if they had an occupational license they
187 are considered a business and could each apply. Mr. Kosmas continued that he has an
188 issue with one person who owns four buildings coming in for four grants, however, if that
189 person owned four businesses he could apply for four grants.
190
191 Ms. Soulie asked if two separate businesses with two separate addresses on the same
192 parcel would be able to each receive a grant. Mr. Kosmas said yes. Ms. Soulie further
193 inquired if the property owner would also be able to apply for a grant and Mr. Kosmas
194 stated that the answer was clearly yes.

195 Mr. Kosmas asked Ms. Soulie to read the proposed motion again to avoid any
196 misunderstandings:

197

198 **One Grant per business per parcel, even if multiple structures on parcel. This does**
199 **not preclude the owner of parcel to apply for a grant; a business is defined per**
200 **occupational license. Mr. Schilsky so moved; seconded by Mr. Hodson. The motion**
201 **carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**

202

203 Mr. Kosmas clarified that the CRA had voted yes to staff's question of "May a business
204 that had previously received a grant be awarded a second grant at a later time to facilitate
205 an expansion?" All agreed and Ms. Soulie added that the total of these multiple grants
206 may not exceed \$20,000.

207

208 Mr. Kosmas continued if grant funds may be used as expenditure for equipment, and
209 what constitutes fixtures versus personal property. He stated that the Ad Hoc committee
210 was in agreement not to make CRA funds available for personal property, but to allow
211 fixtures.

212

213 A brief discussion ensued that a fixture is defined as something that is permanently
214 affixed to the building and that removing it would cause some type of damage to the
215 building, as well as the CRA having the final decision on what types of fixtures to
216 approve.

217

218 **Mr. Hodson made the motion exclude personal property as an eligible expense from**
219 **the grants; seconded by Mr. Peterson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.**

220

221 Ms. Soulie inquired if this motion would also apply to the \$50,000 grant and Mr. Kosmas
222 felt that it should.

223

224 Mr. Peterson commented on his recent suggestion to create a new \$2,500 no-match grant
225 program, which would allow for exterior building renovations to commercial or
226 residential buildings of the type allowed in the Commercial Property Improvement Grant
227 program and he summarized some of the approval criteria.

228

229 A brief discussion ensued about whether this should be a first come-first served program
230 and whether to create a new program or implementing it as a component of the Property
231 Improvement Grants;

232

233 **Mr. Peterson made the motion to approve the \$2,500 Non-Matching grant program**
234 **for both commercial and residential properties; exterior only within the guidelines**
235 **that have already been set for the program; one time only with no impact on any**
236 **other grant options; seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**

237

238 At 3:40 pm Mr. Hall suggested taking a 5 minute break. Mr. Kosmas resumed the
239 meeting at 3:45 pm.

240

241

242

243

B. Development Assistance and Incentives Program Discussion – "Opportunity Site" component

244 Mr. Kosmas gave a brief history on how this program was developed and that the CRA
245 would match up to \$50,000.
246
247 Mr. Otte stated that at their April 12, 2011 meeting the City Commission approved the
248 new “Development Assistance and Incentives Program” which provides up to \$50,000
249 in matching funds for interior and exterior renovations for retail, hospitality, and
250 residential infill to support development in the Canal Street, Historic Westside and
251 Flagler Ave areas.
252
253 Mr. Otte continued that the term “Opportunity Site” is used in the CRA Master Plan
254 Update to refer to the public and private sites within the CRA district that were deemed
255 worthy of special consideration and where staff feels that a \$50,000 matching grant
256 may not be sufficient. Mr. Otte elaborated that the Development Assistance and
257 Incentives Program description includes a reference to properties that are City or CRA
258 owned, which are governed by different requirements. Mr. Otte stated that staff was
259 given a directive that the city-owned properties had to be advertised through a Request
260 for Proposal and that staff could negotiate potential incentives with the Developer. For
261 the privately owned properties, however, a program had to be created, so staff is
262 suggesting incorporating these Opportunity Sites as a separate, more flexible
263 component to the \$50,000 program with a funding cap of \$200,000 to bring the shell of
264 the building up to code.
265
266 Mr. Otte continued that staff was asking direction on:
267
268 1. What types of projects does the CRA wish to incentivize in the Opportunity Sites
269 component of this program?
270 2. What level of funding does the CRA wish to include in this component?
271 3. How can the CRA funds be used?
272 4. Can sites be added?
273
274 A brief discussion ensued about creating a completely separate program for the
275 opportunity sites; the pros and cons of making a list of private properties to be included
276 as Opportunity sites; an application process for properties not included on the list and a
277 funding budget.
278
279 The CRA agreed that an approved list of properties was needed; that criteria had to be
280 established for a property to be added to the list; that this opportunity sites program will
281 be a separate component to the Development Assistance and Incentives Program;
282 requiring 50/50 dollar match and not to impose a funding limit per application, but that
283 the overall budget allocated for this program can’t be exceeded.
284
285 Mr. Kosmas clarified that an applicant may meet all grant criteria, but that the CRA can
286 collectively decide not to approve the application and that this applied to all CRA grant
287 programs.
288
289 Mr. Kosmas asked for consideration on how the CRA was going to “protect” their
290 investment and gave the hypothetical example of awarding a grant to a business and the
291 owner selling the property to a developer within a year of receiving the grant.
292

293 Mr. Wiley addressed the CRA and elaborated on his plans to purchase and redevelop a
294 property that is currently listed as an Opportunity Site. Mr. Wiley felt that applicants
295 should not be limited in the number and types of grants they can apply for when
296 tackling large development projects. Mr. Wiley continued that, while having a pre-lease
297 from potential tenants would be a best-case scenario, he would be in favor of
298 eliminating this proposed requirement from the guidelines.

299
300 Mr. Kosmas felt that a property owner receiving an opportunity site grant or a \$50,000
301 grant should not preclude tenants in this building from getting a \$20,000 grant, but he
302 was not in favor of applicants receiving an opportunity site grant in conjunction with a
303 \$50,000 grant. Discussion ensued and the CRA agreed.

304
305 Mr. Kosmas summarized:

- 306
307 1. If property owner received Opportunity site grant or a \$50,000 grant – tenants in
308 same building can only receive \$20,000 grant per business
309 2. Level of funding should remain open, but can't exceed allocated budget
310 3. Additional sites can be added by meeting special criteria established by staff
311 4. Make Opportunity sites a subcomponent of the Development Assistance and
312 Incentives Program

313
314 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to that effect; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried**
315 **on roll-call vote 7-0.**

316
317 Mr. Williams suggested keeping the definition on what staff considers an opportunity
318 site broad.

319
320 Mr. Ernie Johnson, Developer interested in the Badcock site thanked the CRA for their
321 efforts in assisting redevelopment through their grant programs and suggested
322 considering criteria such as location of the opportunity site, its size, impact on the
323 community, viability of developer and timely construction schedule.

324 325 NEW BUSINESS

326
327 Mr. Kosmas wanted the applicants of the grants on the agenda to be aware that the
328 Property Improvement guidelines were in a state of flux until approved by the City
329 Commission. Mr. Kosmas suggested either taking no action on these applications or
330 approving them contingent upon ratification by the City Commission.

331
332 Mr. Otte suggested having the CRA take actions on the grants today and that staff would
333 schedule any grant over \$10,000 to go on the City Commission agenda for June 28, 2011.

334
335 A. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Application – 113 Flagler Ave – Ta
336 Da Gallery

337
338 Mr. Otte stated that this applicant is proposing repairs to her business sign as well as
339 construction repairs to the front and side porches of her historic building, as they have
340 begun to collapse due to lack of footing support and rot.

341

342 A brief discussion ensued that the City Commission had granted CRA staff a ninety day
343 transition period in which to accept grants under the existing guidelines until the
344 combined grant guidelines had been approved.

345

346 Mr. Kosmas stated that he felt uncomfortable approving any grant without having
347 approved guidelines in place and asked the applicant to come to the podium.

348

349 Ms. Jenny Norado, owner of Ta Da Gallery introduced herself to the CRA. Mr. Kosmas
350 elaborated on some of his concerns of the possible impacts that approval under either the
351 existing or the proposed combined program could have on the property and asked Ms.
352 Norado if she would like the CRA to take action on her grant application today or wait
353 until the combined guidelines were approved.

354

355 A brief discussion ensued about this application being approved using the existing
356 guidelines that are in the transitional period; the CRA funding being way below \$10,000;
357 and the intent of the transition period.

358

359 Ms. Norado was in favor of having the CRA approve her grant application using the
360 existing guidelines.

361

362 Ms. Soulie stated that she had spoken with the property owner and he did not want to add
363 any additional items to this application and that she had also clarified that the Ta Da
364 Gallery was the only business on that parcel.

365

366 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve the application using the existing exterior**
367 **Property Improvement Guidelines; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on**
368 **roll-call vote 7-0.**

369

370

371 B. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Application – 402 Flagler Ave – Pat
372 Collado

373

374 Mr. Otte stated that this applicant is planning to incorporate the existing structure at 402
375 Flagler Ave. as the reception area for a proposed 2-story office building that will wrap
376 around 402 Flagler and that CRA staff recommends funding this application in the
377 maximum amount of \$20,000 contingent the applicant complies with the Planning
378 Department's requirement of joining the four (4) platted lots into one parcel.

379

380 Mr. Williams informed the CRA that he would abstain from voting on the item, as he is
381 the Engineer of record for this project.

382

383 A brief discussion ensued similar to the previous application, with the exception that this
384 application exceeded the existing funding limit of \$10,000.

385

386 Ms. Pat Collado, applicant, introduced herself and stated that she would also accept being
387 approved under the existing guidelines, which meant, in her case, that she would have to
388 go before the City Commission, since her application now entailed a \$10,000 exterior
389 Property Improvement Grant and an interior \$10,000 property improvement grant.

390

391 Mr. Jay Pendergast, Architect on record, stated that it would be in Ms. Colado's best
392 interest to be approved using the existing guidelines as they were proposing to add more
393 structures to the parcel in the future.

394

395 Ms. Latty raised the question if this property could be considered an opportunity site.

396

397 **Mr. Peterson made the motion to approve the application under the existing**
398 **guidelines as being a \$10,000 exterior and \$10,000 interior Property Improvement**
399 **grant contingent upon City Commission approval on June 28, 2011; seconded by**
400 **Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7-0.**

401

402

403 C. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Application for Wiley Building -

404 north façade

405

406 This application is the third and final phase of improvements to the Wiley Building at
407 the corner of Canal and Faulkner Street. The improvements are proposed for the north
408 façade facing the parking lot. The total project cost is \$123,000 and staff recommended
409 CRA funding assistance in the amount of \$20,000 based on the decision made by the Ad
410 Hoc Committee during the May 25, 2011 meeting that stipulated that façade
411 improvements should be capped at \$20,000.

412

413 Mr. Wiley stated that he was under the impression that he would be able to be considered
414 for \$60,000 in grant reimbursement by applying on behalf of the three tenants who have
415 entrances on this façade. Mr. Wiley stated that if he was only able to be approved for
416 \$20,000 he would not be able to start the project and would have to withdraw his
417 application.

418

419 A brief discussion ensued and Mr. Kosmas stated that he could not foresee the City
420 Commission necessarily rejecting the CRA's concept of allowing grants for tenants as
421 well as for the property owner. Mr. Kosmas continued that the only issue that he could
422 see would be the "One bite of the apple" type scenario, which he felt in Mr. Wiley's case
423 wouldn't be significant, so it seemed to Mr. Kosmas that if Mr. Wiley could wait he
424 would probably have more funds available.

425

426 Mr. Wiley clarified that assuming the City Commission approved the proposed program,
427 he would be able to submit three separate \$20,000 applications for this project. Mr.
428 Kosmas stated that based upon the CRA's recommendation to the City Commission, that
429 type of funding would be available to Mr. Wiley to improve his façade.

430

431 Further discussion ensued about how the City Commission's decision could affect Mr.
432 Wiley's project.

433

434 Mr. Peterson reiterated that Mr. Wiley had the following options:

435

- 436 1. Ask for \$30,000 (3 tenants at \$10,000 each under the existing guidelines), would have
437 to go before the City Commission for final approval
- 438 2. Ask for \$60,000 (3 tenants at \$20,000 each under proposed new guidelines, if
439 approved by City Commission)

440 3. \$20,000 per significant façade, if Ad Hoc Committee recommendation approved by
441 City Commission

442

443 Mr. Kosmas asked what the CRA would like to define as a significant façade and how it
444 would impact Mr. Wiley's project. Discussion ensued about developing criteria based on
445 high visibility from a public thoroughfare and estimating the total CRA funding award
446 based on square footage per façade.

447

448 Mr. Otte asked for clarification on how much money Mr. Wiley could expect for his
449 project. Mr. Otte stated that staff had submitted Mr. Wiley's application based on the
450 decision made by the Ad Hoc Committee during the May 25, 2011 meeting that façade
451 improvements be capped at \$20,000 per façade. Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA was
452 proposing that property owners as well as tenants could apply for either exterior or
453 interior improvements. Mr. Kosmas stated that tenants are usually leasing the interior of a
454 building, so the façade of their entrance would not appear to be limited to improvements
455 under these grants based on the criteria the CRA is sending back to the City Commission.
456 Mr. Kosmas did not think that the CRA ever restricted it to that, so theoretically if there
457 is no limit on the façade, multiple tenants could apply for a façade grant. Mr. Otte stated
458 that it was his understanding that the CRA was trying to avoid granting astronomically
459 large amounts to owners of multi-tenant buildings by limiting the tenant to \$20,000 for
460 interior improvements only and the property owner to \$20,000 per significant façade. Mr.
461 Kosmas stated that the CRA was recommending to the City Commission that tenants can
462 apply for exterior improvements as well.

463

464 Mr. Wiley inquired if the CRA could keep the owner of a multi-tenant building from
465 applying on behalf of all of his tenants. Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA needed to have a
466 rational basis for their decisions so not to give an appearance of approving one, but
467 denying another. Mr. Kosmas felt that, as it stood right now, there didn't appear to be
468 anything that would prohibit multiple tenants from applying as these wouldn't be under
469 significant façade grants, but rather just be under the \$20,000 renovations.

470

471 Mr. Wiley stated that he would withdraw his application until after the City Commission
472 has made a decision on the combined grant guidelines.

473

474 D. Development Assistance and Incentive Program Application – 107 N.
475 Riverside Dr. – Dolphin View

476

477 Mr. Williams informed the CRA that he would abstain from voting on the item, as he is
478 the Engineer of record for this project.

479

480 Mr. Otte stated that 107 N. Riverside (Dolphin View Restaurant) was the first
481 application to be submitted under the new Development Assistance and Incentives
482 Program approved at the April 12, 2011 City Commission meeting and that the program
483 has extensive guidelines and provides up to \$50,000 in grant funds on a 50/50
484 matching, reimbursement basis for projects in the Canal St and Flagler Ave areas for
485 retail, hospitality and residential infill.

486

487 Mr. Steve Dennis, former CRA Vice Chair addressed the CRA on behalf of the applicant
488 and gave a brief summary of the proposed project and of the steps they had taken to

489 complete the application. Mr. Dennis stated that he realized that creating a business plan
490 and having it reviewed by a third party was a more involved process that they had
491 anticipated, but that it was a positive experience.

492

493 This item will be scheduled for final approval by the City Commission at their June 28,
494 2011 meeting.

495

496 **Mr. Kinney made the motion to approve the application; seconded by Ms. Latty.**
497 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0. Mr. Williams abstained.**

498

499 Mr. George Richford, owner of the Dolphin View, thanked the CRA for their assistance.

500

501 Commissioners Hodson and Latty asked to be excused for personal reasons and left the
502 meeting at 5:45 pm.

503

504 E. Professional Service Contract for Architectural Services – Bender/Pendergast

505

506 Mr. Otte stated that CRA staff and the CRA attorney met with Jay Pendergast and
507 reviewed the standard Professional Services Agreement. This is the standard contract
508 that includes items such as the rate sheet for different persons working in the firm,
509 insurance requirements, payment procedures, etc. There is no work called for in this
510 contract, it simply establishes the contractual relationship. Actual work to be done will be
511 described separately in “scopes of work” to be prepared and brought forward in the future
512 to describe projects and the cost. Mr. Otte continued that CRA staff anticipates that there
513 will be a number of projects in which architectural services will be needed. The first such
514 project is the Washington Street Business District/Incubator.

515

516 **Mr. Peterson made the motion to approve the Professional Service Contract for**
517 **Architectural Services with Bender/Pendergast; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion**
518 **carried on roll-call vote 4-0. Mr. Williams abstained.**

519

520 F. Mary Ave Streetscape – GAI Additional Services

521

522 Staff had requested GAI to perform some additional duties for the Mary Ave
523 Streetscape Phase I and Phase II Projects, and therefore GAI has submitted a Request
524 for Additional Services for the following tasks:

525

- 526 • Prepare an additional FDOT Permit for Phase I for \$4,265. Note: The original
527 FDOT Permit was used last year for the emergency pipe crossing across US1.
- 528 • Added construction administration for Phase I for \$2,500.
- 529 • Modify and complete the Phase II design for \$ 2,500.

530

Total = \$9,265

531

532 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve GAI additional services for Mary Ave**
533 **Streetscape in the amount of \$9,265; seconded by Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on**
534 **roll-call vote 5-0.**

535

536 G. Orange Streetscape – GAI Additional Services

537

538 Staff had requested GAI to perform some additional construction administration duties
539 for the Orange St Streetscape and Parking Lot Improvements Project, and therefore GAI
540 has submitted a Request for Additional Services for this task for \$1,000.

541

542 **Mr. Kinney made the motion to approve GAI additional services for Orange Street**
543 **Streetscape in the amount of \$9,265; seconded by Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on**
544 **roll-call vote 5-0.**

545

546 A. CRA Strategic Marketing Plan – Report on Preparation of Plan

547

548 Ms. Smith commented on a recent survey that was distributed which allowed the CRA to
549 look at its district as a whole, instead of by the larger streets, such as Flagler Avenue,
550 Third Ave or Canal Street. The survey was asking people to describe how they felt when
551 they go to or think of these areas, what experiences they've had there and the character of
552 those districts. Ms. Smith continued that the intent of the marketing and the branding is
553 not to take away the identity of the different character districts, but to provide a common
554 thread between them.

555

556 Ms. Smith stated that the survey information will be reviewed by a focus group that will
557 meet several times to develop marketing information for the NSB Waterfront Loop; the
558 approved name to be used in the branding of the CRA and that the next step is to develop
559 a branding and marketing campaign.

560

561 Ms. Smith elaborated that she will be providing a report at the July 6 CRA meeting and
562 at the July 27, 2011 City Commission Budget meeting.

563

564 Mr. Williams asked if it was possible that any material Ms. Smith was going to present
565 could be provided to the CRA Commissioners prior to the next CRA meeting.

566

567 Mr. Kosmas thanked Ms. Smith for her time and was looking forward to her report at
568 the July 6, 2011 CRA meeting.

569

570 **Additional Agenda Item:**

571

572 Mr. Kosmas asked if the CRA Commissioners had received an agenda item for the
573 awarding of the N. Myrtle Ave Improvement Bid to D2 Paving in the amount of
574 \$188,995. The portion of the improvements that are within the CRA district costs
575 \$159,120 and the City's portion is \$29,875. This item is scheduled to go before the City
576 Commission on June 14, 2011

577

578 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve awarding the contract to D2 Paving for**
579 **the N. Myrtle Ave Improvements; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on roll-**
580 **call vote 5-0.**

581

582 **REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

583

584 A. Director's Report

585

586 Mr. Otte stated that he had nothing to add to the Director's report, but was available for
587 any questions that may have arisen.

588

589 B. CRA Attorney's Report

590

591 Mr. Hall stated that he had booklets on Parliamentary Procedure and Government-In-
592 The-Sunshine Manual for each Commissioner and that he was available for questions.

593

594 Ms. Soulie stated that she would send out a flyer on the 2011 Florida Redevelopment
595 Conference that will be taking place in October.

596

597 Hearing no further comments, Mr. Kosmas entertained a motion to adjourn.

598

599 **ADJOURNMENT**

600

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