

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
50
51

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF JULY 6, 2011
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

CRA Chair James Kosmas called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Answering to roll call:

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

Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Administrative Specialist Claudia Soulie; CRA Attorney Mark Hall and CRA Project Manager Michelle Martin. Commissioner Thomas Williams was (excused) absent.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – Regular CRA Meeting June 8, 2011

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the consent agenda item A; seconded by Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6–0.

B. Additional Grant time extension – Midtown Dogs – 440 N. Dixie Freeway

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the consent agenda item B; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6–0.

C. Approval of proactive news media activities for marketing of NSB Waterfront Loop assets

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the consent agenda item C; seconded by Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6–0.

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.

Wade Mahood, 311 Florida Ave inquired about the status of the proposed hotel on Flagler Ave pertaining to who the investors are; the timeframe for closing, meeting all

52 requirements and how the City Commission would handle the closing deadline, as there
53 are no City Commission meetings scheduled in July.
54

55 Mr. Mark Hall, CRA Attorney, stated that closing is to take place on or before July 27,
56 2011 and that the financing commitment is due five (5) days prior to the closing. Mr. Hall
57 elaborated that the Developer did not have to prove who the investors are, but rather that
58 financing is available and all requirements are met. Mr. Hall continued that no public
59 meeting or hearing was required prior to the closing and that any interested parties could
60 contact the CRA office for an update. Mr. Kosmas asked that an email be sent to the
61 CRA Commissioners informing them if the Developer met all the financing requirements.
62 Mr. Hall noted that request.
63

64 Mr. Mahood asked for clarification about when zoning changes would go into effect. Mr.
65 Hall stated that the ministerial acts would take place after closing.
66

67 Mr. Kosmas thanked Mr. Mahood for his questions.
68

69 Sally MacKay, 108 Lincoln Ave. informed the CRA of plans by Hub on Canal , LLC to
70 convert 120, 124 and 132 Canal Street into a multi-purpose facility to house hospitality
71 uses, a dance studio and artists. Ms. MacKay elaborated further on the organization's
72 plans and how she felt this facility could benefit the CRA and the entire community. Ms.
73 MacKay was hopeful that the CRA would consider this project under the proposed
74 Opportunity Site grant program, as rehab and renovation work would be necessary.
75 Numerous residents and supporters came forward to speak on behalf of this project and
76 how the Hub's recent open house had had a very positive impact for the businesses on
77 Canal Street.
78

79 Mr. Kosmas stated that this appeared to be a great opportunity for New Smyrna Beach
80 and felt that promotional funds may be available.
81

82 Ms. Cherie Coccia, 1300 W. Roberts, stated that she had attended a meeting with the
83 City's Planning Manager and Commissioner Plaskett about the zoning changes pertaining
84 to the proposed hotel and asked that CRA staff check with the Planning Manager about a
85 comment that was made during that meeting about potential legal actions by the hotel's
86 opponents.
87

88 Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA does not control the contractual requirements for the
89 hotel and that those questions posed today should be posed to the City Commission. Ms.
90 Coccia felt that, since the CRA owned the property, those questions should be addressed
91 by the CRA. Mr. Hall clarified that the spending power and disposition of real property
92 were expressly reserved to the City Commission under the enabling legislation.
93

94 Hearing no further request, Mr. Kosmas closed the Public Participation of the meeting.
95

96 Ms. Soulie read into record the FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT
97 completed by Commissioner Thomas Williams during the June 8, 2011 CRA meeting as
98 he is the Engineer of Record for the Dolphin View restaurant which was applying for a
99 grant during that meeting (see attached). Mr. Williams abstained from voting on this
100 item.

101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147

PRESENTATION:

None

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Kosmas stated that he would repeat motions made during the meeting before roll-call to avoid any potential misinterpretations. The CRA had no objections.

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

Ms. Holly Smith, CRA Marketing Coordinator provided the CRA with a brief update on her efforts to produce a CRA Strategic Marketing Plan for the purpose of branding the NSB Waterfront Loop. The goals of the plan include the defining of an image for the Loop; increasing the awareness of the Loop; increasing awareness and understanding of CRA Programs and to develop a business recruitment plan.

Ms. Smith continued that a steering committee was established, of which CRA Commissioner Schilsky was a member, and that they were working on finalizing the plan. Ms. Smith stated that it was anticipated that a final draft of the Plan can be presented to the CRA at their August 3 meeting and on August 9 to the City Commission.

Mr. Schilsky commented that he felt that the steering committee was very dedicated to the project and commended Ms. Smith on her efforts.

Ms. Smith commented on her pro-active media efforts and business releases that did not require any CRA funding. Ms. Smith elaborated on how the Sunshine law and record-retention rules may affect advertising through Social Media. Ms. Smith continued that she has been working with City staff to ensure that all rules and regulations will be followed, but cautioned that this could potentially delay the immediate use of Social Media once the Marketing Plan is approved.

Mr. Kosmas thanked Ms. Smith for her time.

B. Proposed Amendment to Flagler Boardwalk Project Scope of Work

Mr. Otte stated that the Flagler Boardwalk project is nearing the end of the design phase.

The project currently consists of:

- Repairs to the seawall, including a new cap, railing, and ramp
- A substantial modification to the existing pavilion, with new tile roofing and the elimination of bird nesting areas
- The demolition of the two restroom buildings, the small handicapped restroom, and the storage building
- the construction of a plaza with a new restroom building and showers
- Modifications to the parking lot to include an island to delineate parking spaces and add some landscaping. (The surface of the parking lot will remain as shell and not be paved.)

148 • This project is scheduled to begin construction in November, following the bid
149 process, review of bids, and the selection of a contractor.

150

151 Mr. Otte continued that since the design phase of this project began, it has been noted that
152 Flagler Ave has developed some depressions that are believed to come from a failure in
153 the stormwater system. The stormwater system was a part of the CRA streetscape project
154 over ten years ago.

155

156 Mr. Khalid Resheidat, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director stated that staff
157 is proposing to add a new scope of work to the above mentioned Flagler Boardwalk
158 project, which would include repairs to the stormwater system beneath Flagler Ave, and
159 resurfacing Flagler Ave from the bridge to the beach access and that the CRA should
160 direct staff to bring a detailed cost estimate to the August CRA meeting for further
161 review.

162

163 A brief discussion ensued about the landscape “bump-outs” on Flagler Ave. and that they
164 were being hit by motorists and took away potential parking spaces. It was suggested that
165 staff investigate how the public felt about those landscape “bump-outs” and how many
166 parking spaces could be secured by removing them.

167

168 Mr. Kosmas clarified that the CRA was not approving final funding of the project, but
169 just to get a cost estimate.

170

171 A brief discussion ensued about the possibility of widening Florida Ave in the future,
172 especially if the Hotel project comes to fruition.

173

174 **Mr. Kinney made the motion to direct staff to bring back a detailed cost estimate for**
175 **the proposed new scope of work including repairs to the stormwater system beneath**
176 **Flagler Ave, and resurfacing/stripping Flagler Ave from the bridge to the beach**
177 **access and to add this scope to the existing scopes for the Flagler Ave Boardwalk**
178 **project, seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion carried on roll-call vote 4–1, with Mr.**
179 **Peterson casting the dissenting vote.**

180

181 Mr. Schilsky had stepped away from the dais and was not present for the motion.

182

183 C. Impact Fee Assistance Grant and Request for additional funds – Clancy’s
184 Cantina addition – 301 Flagler Ave Unit 3

185

186 Mr. Otte stated that on March 3, 2011 Matt Clancy submitted an application for exterior
187 improvements to a building directly behind the restaurant intended for multiple uses
188 with the focus on selling restaurant related merchandise. The CRA approved that
189 application contingent on the applicant amending his Business Tax receipt to include
190 any additional seats. Mr. Otte continued that the applicant stated that, while evaluating
191 their business plan, their focus changed and that they are now planning on using this
192 space for banquets and meetings more often than originally anticipated and that this
193 change in use will trigger Transportation Impact fees in the estimated amount of
194 \$2,002.25, which the applicant is now applying for.

195

196 In addition, Mr. Otte stated that the applicant had informed staff that he became aware
197 of the City Commission directive that CRA staff combine the Exterior, Interior and

198 Impact Fee Assistance Grants into one program with a funding cap of \$20,000 and that
199 the applicant would like the CRA to consider increasing his previous grant award.

200

201 Mr. Kosmas felt that if the CRA allowed an increase in funds based on the proposed
202 new program guidelines, all the other proposed changes in the new program like “only
203 one grant per business per parcel regardless of how many businesses were on this
204 parcel” should also come into effect.

205

206 No representative was present on behalf of the Clancy’s restaurant.

207

208 A brief discussion ensued that an applicant who had received a grant under the existing
209 (\$10,000) grant program would be able to come back before the CRA with a new
210 application under the proposed new grant guidelines. The CRA agreed to defer the
211 application until the August CRA meeting.

212

213 **Mr. Kinney made the motion to continue this item until the next CRA meeting,**
214 **seconded by Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6 –0.**

215

216

217 D. CRA Grant Time extension and Request for additional funds – Heath’s
218 Natural Foods – 600 East Third Ave.

219

220 Mr. Otte stated that on August 4, 2010 the CRA approved a Commercial Property
221 Improvement Grant application for Heath’s Natural Foods to create an addition, a porch,
222 and an awning for the existing store. On September 8, 2010 approval was received for an
223 Impact Fee Assistance Grant.

224

225 On March 3, 2011 Mark Rakowski, the owner’s representative, submitted a request for a
226 time extension for construction to start by mid June 2011 due to the need of rebidding the
227 project, which was approved by the CRA. Mr. Rakowski informed staff that project
228 construction is now proposed to commence in July 2011, however, in case of further
229 unforeseen circumstances he is requesting an additional 90-day extension until September
230 20, 2011, which will be one year after the initial approval date. The owners now have a
231 contract for construction, which is still anticipated to be completed in early 2012.

232

233 Mr. Otte stated that Mr. Rakowski informed staff that he became aware that the City
234 Commission recently directed CRA staff to combine the Exterior, Interior and Impact Fee
235 Assistance Grants into one program with a funding cap of \$20,000 and that he would like
236 the CRA to consider increasing the previous grant award by \$5,480.86.

237

238 Mr. Otte stated that staff was recommending the CRA:

239

240 1) Approve the requested time extension contingent that the applicant re-submit the
241 application should there be any revisions to the plans that were reviewed and approved
242 by the CRA and

243

244 2) Approve the additional funds. Will also require City Commission approval in August.

245

246 Mr. Kosmas stated that he was able to distinguish this application from the previous one
247 in that there was only one building on this parcel. He inquired if somebody was present
248 on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Kosmas posed the question if the CRA was authorized to
249 modify grants that had already been approved under the existing grant guidelines and
250 asked Mr. Hall to comment. Mr. Hall stated that he was comfortable with staff's
251 recommendation pertaining to this amendment, especially since it was going to go before
252 the City Commission for ratification.

253

254 Mr. Otte stated that any grant requests approved during the transitional period have been
255 and will continue to be presented to the City Commission for ratification until the new
256 grant guidelines are approved.

257

258 Mr. Peterson felt that increasing the dollar amount to match the amount in the proposed
259 program, the applicant needed to be aware that he may be precluded from getting any
260 future grants.

261

262 Mr. Mark Rakowski stated that he was the owner's representative and that he did not
263 have the opportunity to discuss the ramification with his client. Mr. Rakowski felt,
264 however, that the owner would like to proceed with this application for the \$20,000 as
265 they were looking to move this project forward.

266

267 Mr. Kosmas reiterated that this would very likely preclude the applicant from receiving
268 any future CRA grants, but that they could withdraw their request prior to City
269 Commission approval in August.

270

271 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the time extension and the increase in**
272 **funds, seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6 -0.**

273

274

275 E. Change order request for Rosedale Building – 515 Canal Street

276

277 Mr. Otte stated that the applicant had submitted two individual grant applications where a
278 portion of the scope entailed demolition of existing structures necessary to install new
279 awnings at 509/511 Canal and 515 Canal Street.

280

281 Mr. Otte continued that the applicant submitted a letter he had received from his
282 contractor stating that the equipment to be used during the project would not be sufficient
283 for these tasks and using it could pose a potential safety risk, thus heavier equipment was
284 necessary. This unforeseen change increased the demolition work estimates by \$750.

285

286 Mr. Otte stated that the applicant is requesting the CRA consider funding the additional
287 \$375 (or 50% of \$750) incurred for the heavier duty equipment rental. Staff is
288 recommending approval of this request and would like to add the additional \$375 to the
289 total CRA award for 515 Canal Street. This would increase the amount from \$3,309.50 to
290 \$3,684.50.

291

292 A brief discussion ensued that the grant guidelines stated that any changes had to be
293 approved by the CRA prior to their execution and since the project had been completed,
294 the CRA agreed to deny the request for additional funds.

295

296 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to deny the request for additional funds, seconded by**
297 **Mr. Schilsky. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6 –0.**

298

299 F. Proposed increase in funds – Panheads Pizzeria – 113 S. Orange Street

300

301 Mr. Otte stated that the applicant was asking for an increase in their funding amount for a
302 property improvement grant that was awarded to construct a patio for their existing
303 restaurant.

304

305 Mr. Otte stated that construction of the patio was still underway when the directive was
306 given by the City Commission to combine the three grants for interior renovation,
307 exterior renovation, and impact fees for a total of available grant funds in the amount of
308 \$20,000 and that the applicant was now requesting a “change order” in their grant amount
309 as the patio project had unanticipated costs and the final cost was \$30,070.92. Mr. Otte
310 continued that staff recommended approval of this request.

311

312 Ms. Felicia Engles, proprietor was present and gave a brief history of the project.

313

314 The CRA inquired if the project was completed, which Ms. Engles confirmed.

315

316 A brief discussion ensued that since the work had commenced prior to CRA approval, the
317 request for additional funds could not be approved per the grant guidelines.

318

319 Ms. Soulie stated that the actual scope for this project had been approved by the CRA and
320 did not change from start of construction to finish and that the only change was to the
321 dollar amount of the project. Ms. Soulie inquired if this had any bearing on the CRA’s
322 decision.

323

324 Mr. Kosmas was concerned about opening up approved grants for any type of
325 modification.

326

327 Mr. Peterson stated that he wouldn’t be opposed to deferring this item to the next meeting
328 as he had some questions about the dollar amount requested.

329

330 Mr. Kosmas asked if he would be able to second a motion in his capacity as Chair. Mr.
331 Hall stated that Mr. Kosmas, for the purpose of seconding a motion, would have to step
332 aside from his position as Chair and have the Vice-Chair conduct the meeting.

333

334 Mr. Kosmas stated that he would step aside for this agenda item and hand the gavel to
335 the Vice Chair Mr. Peterson in order to be able to second a motion.

336

337 **Mr. Schilsky made the motion to deny the request for additional funds, seconded by**
338 **Mr. Kosmas. Motion carried on roll-call vote 4–2 with Mr. Peterson and Ms. Latty**
339 **casting the dissenting votes.**

340

341 G. Development of Grant Programs:

342

343 Mr. Otte stated that CRA staff had prepared a description for the CRA grant programs
344 listed below based on the discussion from the June CRA meeting:

345

346 1. Grant Program for:

347

348 a. The Large Grants (\$50,000) program was approved by the City Commission
349 on April 12, 2011 and no substantive changes were recommended.

350

351 b. The Opportunity Sites program is being discussed for grants in excess of
352 \$50,000, for the “opportunity sites” listed in the CRA Master Plan Update as
353 well as sites that could be added to the list.

354

355 2. The Combined Grant (\$20,000) Program for Commercial Exterior/Interior
356 Renovation and New Construction, and Impact Fees/Permit Fees entailed the
357 combination of three formerly separate programs, with several new features such
358 as allowing CRA funds to be used for any impact fees, not just City impact fees.

359

360 3. The Grant program for Small-Scale Improvements had been recently proposed
361 and discussed.

362

363 Mr. Otte continued that staff had prepared the grant descriptions into a “user friendly”
364 format as well as a CRA Grant Program summary in the form of an excel spreadsheet in
365 an effort to address how each of the programs are coordinated with one another, for
366 example:

367

368 • A building may be the subject of an “Opportunity Site” grant award, and may also
369 receive awards under the Combined Grant program (\$20,000).

370 • A building may receive a Large Grants (\$50,000) award, and may also received
371 awards under the Combined Grant program (\$20,000).

372 • A building may not receive both an Opportunity Site grant award and a Large
373 Grants Award.

374

375 Mr. Otte stated that, after CRA approval, these program descriptions had to be approved
376 by the City Commission. Mr. Otte continued that, since the City Commission would not
377 meet again in regular session until August 9, 2011, and the transition period for the
378 combined program is scheduled to end after that meeting, staff was proposing to present
379 the program descriptions to the City Commission at their August 23, 2011 meeting. If
380 there were any areas in which the City Commission had concerns, a joint CRA/City
381 Commission meeting could be called for October. Further, if the concerns were with the
382 combined program, CRA staff would request that the City Commission continue the
383 transition period until the proposed joint meeting.

384

385 Mr. Kosmas suggested that the discussion commence with the CRA grant program
386 summary spreadsheet and commented on the “How many grants can a building receive?”
387 column. Mr. Kosmas stated that he thought the CRA never discussed grants per building,
388 but rather grants per parcel and that the owner as well as a tenant could apply. Mr.
389 Kosmas continued that the CRA further discussed if there were multiple buildings on the
390 parcel that a parcel may only receive one grant per parcel if it was owned and operated by
391 the same entity. Mr. Kosmas suggested replacing the word “building” with the word

392 “parcel” as well as changing the verbiage to indicate that the parcel may also receive
393 \$20,000 per tenant space.
394
395 Mr. Hall clarified the matter by example of an owner of a large building could receive a
396 \$50,000 grant and each of the tenants could receive \$20,000 for the tenant spaces and that
397 staff’s thought behind this system was that the owner of the building would use the large
398 grant for the “rough-out” construction and the tenants for the interior (“trim-out”) of the
399 building.
400
401 A brief discussion ensued about the tenants having to present a lease in order to qualify
402 for a \$20,000 grant.
403
404 Mr. Schilsky stated that the guidelines preclude Non-profit organizations from being
405 eligible to receive any grants and that the group that was speaking on the “Hub” project
406 during public participation clearly stated that they were a not-for-profit organization.
407
408 Mr. Hall informed that staff had been discussing the fact that if a parcel was contributing
409 real property taxes to the district it should be eligible for grants, even if the tenant was a
410 not-for-profit group.
411
412 A brief discussion ensued if the “Hub” group was looking for CRA assistance for the
413 marketing versus construction of the project. Mr. Hodson stated that it was his
414 understanding based on a conversation with the “Hub’s” representative that the building
415 owner would potentially come forward to apply for grants to make changes to the
416 building to accommodate the project’s vision.
417
418 Mr. Kosmas asked if the CRA agreed to have staff amend the program allowing a not-
419 for-profit tenant to apply for a grant as long as the parcel is contributing real property
420 taxes to the district. All agreed.
421
422 a. CRA Combined Program
423
424 Mr. Kosmas summarized that staff had come up with an acceptable solution to the
425 discussion of whether or not to allow tenants in a multi-tenant building to pool together to
426 apply for exterior grants at \$20,000 each by creating a “significant façade” component
427 were the reimbursement amount is based on a per square foot of significant façade
428 formula with a cap of \$60,000.
429
430 Mr. Schilsky felt that it was important to allow tenants to apply for exterior grants and
431 agreed with staff’s recommendation.
432
433 Mr. Peterson asked if tenants would be precluded from applying for an interior grant if
434 they applied for an exterior grant. Mr. Kosmas felt that each tenant should only get either
435 an interior or an exterior grant.
436
437 Mr. Schilsky asked if a restaurant that was part of a multi-tenant significant façade
438 building would be allowed to apply for a \$20,000 grant (without involving other
439 businesses on that façade) to put up an awning over their restaurant to create outdoor
440 seating.

441 A brief discussion ensued that, should a single tenant apply for and receive a \$20,000
442 grant to be used for the interior of the building as well as to put up an awning over his
443 door (as an example), the portion used on the exterior would have to be deducted from
444 the total amount available for entire façade.

445

446 Ms. Soulie inquired if the CRA did not deem a façade significant, but there were three (3)
447 businesses housed on that façade, would each of these businesses be able to apply for a
448 \$20,000 grant to be used for interior/exterior improvements.

449

450 Mr. Kosmas felt that each of the tenants could apply for the \$20,000 grant and that the
451 building owner would not qualify for a significant façade grant, but could still apply for a
452 \$20,000 grant.

453

454 A brief discussion ensued that if a building owner applied for and received a significant
455 façade grant, that the tenants on this façade would still be eligible for a \$20,000 interior
456 grant, but no longer eligible to receive an exterior grant.

457

458 Mr. Peterson felt that the grants were being bogged down with minutia and he did not
459 agree with the tenants receiving a \$20,000 if the building owner was awarded significant
460 façade grant. Mr. Peterson also felt that this component was shaping up as its own
461 program and questioned if the CRA ever intended letting all the tenants “pool” their
462 available grants.

463

464 Further discussion ensued about a property owner being deemed a business for the
465 purpose of applying for a significant façade grant for large, multi-tenant buildings and
466 that this concept seemed to be the best solution as well as making this significant façade
467 portion a separate component to the proposed combined grant program.

468

469 Mr. Otte stated that he would amend the program as discussed during this meeting and
470 bring it back at the August CRA meeting for final CRA approval.

471

472 Mr. Kosmas summarized:

473

474 1. Make the significant façade portion a separate component in the proposed combined
475 grant program (A. being the \$20,000 grant and B. being the significant façade portion)

476

477 2. Allowing up to \$60,000 in CRA funding per significant façade

478

479 3. Allowing either the building owner to apply on his/her own or multiple tenants may
480 come forward.

481

482 Mr. Kosmas asked the CRA Commissioners if they had any additional questions or
483 comments pertaining to the proposed combined grant program.

484

485 Mr. Schilsky felt that the CRA needed to be very clear as to what was considered to be a
486 fixture and referred to the listing of potential fixtures in the combined grant guidelines.

487 Mr. Kosmas said that a legal definition spoke to a fixture as being a permanent part of a
488 structure where its removal would cause damage to that structure.

489

490 Hearing no further comments, Mr. Kosmas moved to the Opportunity Site Component
491 (included with the Large Grants (\$50,000) program.)

492

493 b. Opportunity Site Component

494

495 Mr. Kosmas suggested the following verbiage changes:

496

497 1. Page 4 of 11 under Program Objectives..... , ~~specifically to:.....~~ as follows:

498 2. Page 4 of 11 under Program Objectives.... Remove the word "To" for items 10. 11.
499 and 12.

500

501 No further comments from the CRA Commissioners. Mr. Kosmas commended staff for
502 their work with adding the Opportunity site component to the \$50,000 program.

503

504 c. \$2,500 No Match Program

505

506 The CRA Commissioners had no comments on the proposed small-scale project.

507

508 Mr. Kosmas proposed a motion to approve the Development Grant programs as presented
509 to the CRA with the modifications as discussed.

510

511 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to that effect; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion**
512 **carried on roll-call vote 6 -0.**

513

514 Mr. Kosmas thanked his fellow Commissioners for their input and comments in
515 establishing these grant programs.

516

517 **NEW BUSINESS**

518

519 A. Proposal for Security Cameras

520

521 Mr. Otte stated that the New Smyrna Beach Police Department proposes to partner with
522 the CRA to install surveillance cameras in the Canal St and Flagler Ave areas to increase
523 security.

524

525 Mr. Hall informed the CRA that he had discussed the matter with the City Attorney and it
526 was a legal venture justified in the CRA Master Plan update, but the CRA had to
527 determine if it was a good public policy decision as staff had received comments about
528 privacy concerns.

529

530 A discussion ensued about CRAs not being able to expend funds that could be considered
531 part of the City's realm of responsibility and felt this request was not clearly definable
532 and that this request did not meet the CRA's core function of furthering redevelopment in
533 the district. The majority of the Commissioners came to a consensus that they did not feel
534 comfortable in funding this request.

535

536 Mr. Peterson stated that he would be ok with funding the cameras, but not the monthly
537 cost associated with it.

538 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to deny the request; seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion**
539 **carried on roll-call vote 5 –1 with Mr. Peterson casting the dissenting vote.**

540

541

542 **REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

543

544 A. Director's Report

545

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

548

549 Mr. Kosmas felt that the Magnolia trees and flower planters installed as part of the West
550 Canal Streetscape were in poor condition. Mr. Otte stated that the CRA Project Manager
551 has been in touch with the contractor to rectify the situation.

552

553 Mr. Hodson inquired if the black fence (silt fence) around the Dunn Lumber site was a
554 requirement. Mr. Otte stated that it was required by the Florida Department of
555 Environmental Protection (FDEP) and updated the CRA that the decontamination efforts
556 of this site were moving forward and a meeting was scheduled for July 13, 2011.

557

558

559 CRA Attorney's Report

560

561 Mr. Hall stated that staff was hoping to close on the proposed sale of the Florida Ave lots
562 pertaining to the hotel matter on July 27th, 2011 and was open for further questions.

563

564 Mr. Kosmas asked if the CRA Commissioners had any further questions.

565

566 Financial Report

567

568 Ms. Soulie inquired if the CRA would like to continue receiving monthly print outs of the
569 CRA's budget. The CRA agreed that quarterly inclusion in the agenda was sufficient.

570

571 Commissioners Report

572

573 Mr. Hodson stated that he would be happy to volunteer his time in assisting with painting
574 the wall exposed by the demolition of the former Fox Firestone building on Canal Street.

575

576 Ms. Latty commented that moving the Courthouse and Public Appraisers office to the
577 former shuffleboard site would allow for the potential redevelopment of the corner of
578 Riverside Dr and Canal Street. A brief discussion ensued that several options of
579 redevelopment of these sites had been discussed and that the County had been contacted
580 in the past.

581

582 Mr. Schilsky commented on the continued parking issues on Flagler Ave. Mr. Otte stated
583 that staff was doing a parking study.

584

585 Mr. Schilsky felt that the Flagler Ave Boardwalk parking lot needed to be delineated
586 clearly, as it currently created rather chaotic parking conditions.

587

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

589

590 **ADJOURNMENT**

591

592 **A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm.**