

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

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 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
James Peterson
Chad Schilsky
John Kinney**

Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Administrative and Program Specialist Claudia Soulie, and CRA Attorney Mark Hall. Commissioner Melissa Latty arrived at 2:55 pm. Commissioner Tom Williams was not present as he had turned in his resignation effective 12/2/11.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – Regular CRA Meeting November 2, 2011

Mr. Hodson made a motion to approve the Minutes as written; seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5–0.

B. CRA 2012 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Kinney made a motion to approve the CRA 2012 Meeting Schedule with the exception that the December meeting is to be held on December 5, 2012; seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5–0.

Mr. Kosmas thanked everybody in the audience for coming to this CRA meeting. He stated that he wanted to set the public record straight in regards to recent actions pertaining to a CRA grant he had received in 2009. Mr. Kosmas continued that he does not agree with the findings of the CRA and City Attorneys, that having received a grant while serving on the CRA constitutes an ethical conflict; and that the attorney Mr. Kosmas had retained was of the same opinion as Mr. Kosmas. Mr. Kosmas stated that he has since returned the entire funds awarded to him in 2009, but wants to be clear that by making such a refund he, in no way, acknowledges any wrongdoing whatsoever and continued to state that his actions were legal and ethical. Mr. Kosmas felt that just the very act of questioning the legality of his grant has already subjected him to scrutiny from the media and general public.

Mr. Kosmas elaborated that he would continue to serve on the CRA despite the recent events.

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
97
98
99
100

Mr. Schilsky stated that he would not be able to stay for the duration of the meeting, as the Grand Opening for one of his new restaurants was scheduled for today, but he felt that it was important to also make a statement. (Mr. Schilsky was awarded a grant for his restaurant on Flagler Ave. in 2011, but never requested or received reimbursement as he later withdrew his grant request). Mr. Schilsky continued that he felt that this situation was handled poorly. He stated that he followed proper procedures for his grant and that he had gone through the proper channels. Mr. Schilsky felt that volunteers on City Boards should have the same rights as any other community member and completely disagrees with the decision that Board members are not allowed to apply for grants. Mr. Schilsky stated that the responsibility should not rest with him and Mr. Kosmas, as they followed every procedure that was in place. Mr. Schilsky continued that he is very passionate about New Smyrna Beach and that he had made a decision to stay on the CRA despite the recent actions. Mr. Schilsky was hopeful that something is to be learned from this situation.

Mr. Schilsky left at 2:20 pm.

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. George Richford, Owner of the DolphinView Restaurant at 107 Riverside Dr. (who had recently been awarded a Large Grant) updated the CRA on the progress his project by showing a brief slideshow. Mr. Richford thanked the CRA for their support.

**

Mr. Eric Lumbert, Paddleboard NSB, whose organization had recently been awarded CRA funding to aid in the advertising needs for their first-time paddleboarding event held in November, thanked the CRA for their support and updated the CRA of the event turnout. Mr. Lumbert felt that it was a very successful event due largely to the CRA's support.

**

Mr. Jim Russell, 235 N. Causeway, stated that he is representing the owners for Sale/Lease of 132 Canal Street (proposed location for The Hub). Mr. Russell continued that they are in discussions with representatives from The Hub to finalize the lease and he informed the CRA that the owners of the building were in favor of the CRA modifying its current Rent assistance program (agenda item under Old Business B.)

**

Ms. Ellen Darden, President of NSB Board of Realtors spoke out in support of modifying the current CRA Rent assistance program. Ms. Darden also stated that she is in favor of The Hub as an effort to revitalize the downtown district.

**

Mr. Bill Preston, Board of Directors member of The Hub, asked all those in the audience in favor of The Hub to please stand and show their support (a large number of people present at the meeting stood up). Mr. Preston urged the CRA to consider expanding the current rent assistance program.

Hearing no further requests, Mr. Kosmas closed the Public Participation portion.

OLD BUSINESS

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
148

A. Event Insurance

No quorum – Withdrawn by staff

B. Discussion of Expansion on the Independent Business Rental Move in Program

Mr. Otte recapped that representatives of an organization known as the Hub have been discussing the possibility of obtaining CRA funding for their project for months. The concept is to open small, leasable spaces for a variety of art endeavors, including spaces for artists to create and sell art, a small theatre for art films, an area for dance lessons, etc. The building space may also include one or more conventional businesses, such as a coffee shop and a restaurant.

Mr. Otte stated that the representatives of the Hub project are now requesting that the CRA modify and expand the current Independent Rental Assistance Move-in Program to better fit the needs of The Hub project. Mr. Otte summarized points from the current CRA “rent incentive” type program and stated that the proposed expanded program would resemble some aspects of a “Rent Subsidies” program from Boca Raton, which would allow for a higher assistance amount than the CRA’s current program. Mr. Otte continued that staff requests discussion on this item.

A brief discussion ensued about the program being per tenant or per project.

Mr. Kosmas stated that he would like find out the reason why Boca Raton requires a business to be in existence for two (2) years in order to qualify for their program and why the business has to be a Target industry as identified by the State of Florida. Further, he feels the need to have an accurate financial feasibility analysis for a proposed business.

Mr. Peterson inquired if this program fits within the criteria of the CRA’s enabling statutes. Mr. Hall stated that he feels comfortable discussing the program at this point.

Mr. Hodson commended staff on the preparation of a very comprehensive program development summary and also raised the questions about the 2 year requirement, which would certainly eliminate every business under 2 years old. Mr. Hodson felt that if the CRA felt that a business was worthy of supporting, why wait for 2 years to do so. Mr. Hodson would like to find out what the ramifications would be to not have this “2-year” stipulation in the guidelines.

Mr. Kinney stated that he was in favor of The Hub and felt that the CRA should find a way to support it. Mr. Kinney continued that the CRA needed to be able rely on CRA and City counsel to determine what the CRA was allowed to offer to stay within the law. Mr. Hall stated that the proposed new rental program will require a thorough legal review and that the County legal counsel would also be contacted. Mr. Hall further informed the CRA that a joint CRA/City Commission meeting has been scheduled for January 18, 2012, where this program would be discussed further and suggested having the district’s County Council member present at this meeting.

149 Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA had to offer development incentives to entice
150 revitalization and felt that the CRA Commissioners will need direction from the City and
151 the County before making any money commitments. Secondly, Mr. Kosmas questioned the
152 reason as to why such substantial revisions to the existing rental move in program needed
153 to be made. Mr. Kosmas felt that the current CRA program may already offer the assistance
154 that The Hub is seeking.

155
156 Ms. Sally MacKay commented on the 2 year stipulation in the Boca Raton program and
157 stated that New Smyrna Beach is branded as one the 100 best artistic communities in the
158 United States and that the Board of Directors has been in touch with CRA staff for the last
159 2 years. Ms. MacKay further summarized who the potential tenants are and how The Hub
160 would benefit the downtown.

161
162 Mr. Kosmas stated that he was in favor of pursuing to assist The Hub, but not in favor of
163 providing large amounts of rental subsidies to artist businesses whose financial feasibility
164 had to be determined.

165
166 Commissioner Latty arrived at 2:55 pm.

167
168 Ms. Joyce Pierce Riddle, 137 Sea Street felt that the modification of the existing program
169 would allow one master tenant to apply for a grant versus coming forward individually,
170 which could potentially be more costly. Ms. Pierce Riddle also was of the understanding
171 that the prospective tenants are established businesses that just want to move their
172 enterprise to a central location.

173
174 Mr. Peterson felt that some modifications may need to be made to the existing program, as
175 currently no applications had been brought forward.

176
177 Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA would like to defer further discussion and actions on this
178 agenda item to the January , 2012 Joint CRA/CC meeting.

179
180 Ms. Latty stated that she may have a conflict of interest in this matter, as she has shown the
181 property to a client that may become a tenant. Mr. Hall informed that this was good
182 information to disclose, but no voting action was going to take place today.

183
184 Mr. Kosmas called for a short recess.

185
186 Meeting re-convened at 3:20 pm.

187
188 **NEW BUSINESS**

189
190 A. Bid Award for Flagler Ave Stormwater pipelining– Miller Pipeline

191
192 Withdrawn by staff

193
194 B. US1 at Canal Street - Proposal to Design Hardscape Improvements – Metric
195 Engineering

196

197 Mr. Otte stated that as part of the FDOT improvements to US1 and Canal Street, staff had
198 asked Metric Engineering to submit a proposal to incorporate a gateway feature design at the
199 intersection. The proposal, in the amount of \$38,544.85, includes Hardscape Aesthetics,
200 Structural Design (Mast Arm) and Project Management & Coordination. This proposal
201 piggybacks on the FDOT Contract with Metric Engineering.

202

203 Mr. Otte stated that this design feature, if approved, would go into the FDOT bid package,
204 but that there was no specific date as to when construction would start, as FDOT currently
205 only had funds budgeted for the design and not the construction of this project.

206

207 A brief discussion ensued about the high cost for a design that may or may not get
208 constructed; possibly doing the design work in-house and getting drawings of the CRA
209 portion of this intersection. Staff stated that they would bring the requested items back at a
210 future CRA meeting.

211

212 The CRA took no action on this item.

213

214 C. Washington St Streetscape Sidewalk Project - Options on FEC Portion

215

216 Mr. Otte stated that the Washington St Streetscape project is close to 100% design. In the
217 meantime, the improvement at the FEC pedestrian crossing is up for discussion. The cost of
218 construction for this portion is approximately \$500,000 and that includes sidewalks on both
219 sides of the streets with the proper safety pedestrian features. TPO funds may be available,
220 but are not guaranteed. Staff is requesting discussion on installing sidewalk on the north side
221 only including the FEC pedestrian crossing at an estimated cost of \$300,000 and applying for
222 a TPO grant for the sidewalk on the south side and construct when funding is available.

223

224 The CRA asked for graphic drawings and a better breakdown of the cost figures. No action
225 was taken and staff will bring back more information at the next CRA meeting.

226

227 D. Small Scale Improvements Grant –

228

229 1. 214 N. Orange Street – Napa Auto Parts

230

231 Mr. Otte stated that the applicant is proposing to landscape his property by trimming Oak
232 trees and Sabal Palm trees; parking lot repairs as well installation of plants and mulch at a
233 total cost of \$2,770. The contractor is a local business from New Smyrna Beach.

234

235 The application has received the necessary points to qualify for consideration and staff
236 recommends approval in the grant amount of \$2,500 contingent that permits are obtained.

237

238 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve the Small Scale improvement grant for 214 N.**
239 **Orange Street; seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5–0.**

240

241 E. Combined Grant –

242

243 1. 600 W. Canal Street – Kim’s Food and Gas, Inc.

244

245 This applicant is proposing improvements to the parking lot and business sign as well as
246 painting of the building. The estimates for the scopes of work total **\$11,277** (CRA funding
247 request **\$5,638.50**). The applicant was informed that staff will require receipts from the
248 contractors for all work performed and from the Building Department showing the actual
249 cost for permit fees.
250

251 Staff has met on-site with the applicant and pertinent City personnel and the scope of work
252 was conceptually accepted.
253

254 The application has received the necessary points to qualify for consideration and staff
255 recommends approval. Approval is contingent upon the applicant obtaining the necessary
256 permit(s).
257

258 A brief discussion ensued if an environmental assessment was required if a gas station was
259 paving over underground gas tanks. Mr. Appenzeller informed the CRA that the gas tanks
260 had been removed some time ago and that he also has paperwork documenting that his
261 property had been inspected.
262

263 **Mr. Hodson made a motion to approve the Combined grant for 600 Canal Street;**
264 **seconded by Mr. Peterson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5-0.**
265

266 3. 306/308 N. Orange Street
267

268 Mr. Kosmas asked that this item be moved ahead of 208 Magnolia Street as he would not be
269 able to vote and Mr. Hodson had to leave by 4:00 pm and that this action would ensure a
270 proper quorum. All agreed.
271

272 Mr. Otte stated that staff was approached by Ms. Marla Nance with a proposal to convert a
273 building at 308 N. Orange from the previous use as a print shop to professional office space
274 to house her three (3) separate, long-standing enterprises. The project will stretch over two
275 (2) conjoined parcels (306 and 308 N. Orange) which have separate parcel ID numbers. Both
276 have recently been acquired by Ms. Nance. The application was placed on the November 2,
277 2011 CRA agenda, but Ms. Nance decided to withdraw her application during the Public
278 Participation portion of that meeting, so no action was taken by the CRA Commissioners.
279

280 Ms. Nance has now submitted three (3) separate applications under the Combined Grant
281 program on behalf of the businesses that are to be housed in the new location. Ms. Nance
282 feels that, based on the current Combined Grant Guidelines, tenants as well as the property
283 owner are allowed to apply for exterior/interior assistance (see excerpt below):
284

285 *Eligible Applicants: Applicant eligibility depends on the proposed use of funds, as follows:*

- 286 • *Exterior Improvements: Property owner or tenants with property owner consent.*
- 287 • *Interior Improvements: Property owner or tenants with property owner consent.*
288

289 The scope for this project includes only exterior work like landscaping, creation of parking
290 areas, Signage, electrical work, design assistance, installing/painting of hardie board siding,
291 trim, bead board soffits, replacing of exterior windows and exteriors doors, as well as a
292 storefront door. The cost of these scopes totals \$128,654.70 and the applicant is requesting
293 CRA reimbursement in the amount of \$60,000 (\$20,000 per tenant business and
294 owner/tenant) under the Combined Grant program. The total cost includes \$25,200 for a new

295 roof, which is not specifically allowed nor prohibited in the CRA Grant Guidelines. Staff
296 does not feel that a new roof should be an eligible expense, thus reducing the cost for eligible
297 items to \$103,454.70.

298

299 Upon review of the Grant guidelines and consulting with the CRA Attorney, staff is
300 recommending that the CRA approve only one of the Combined Grant applications with
301 CRA funding in the amount of \$20,000. It has been determined that, with tenant businesses
302 being owned by the property owner, they cannot be considered “bonafide” applicants for the
303 program. Therefore, only one (1) grant is recommended.

304

305 The applicant was present to explain her reasoning as to why she would like to have the CRA
306 consider her applications as submitted (Three Combined Grants with a CRA funding amount
307 of \$20,000 each) and stated that the three businesses are separate entities that could be
308 located anywhere.

309

310 The Planning, Engineering and Building Departments have reviewed and conceptually
311 approved the proposal. It is anticipated that, based on City practices, the Planning
312 Department will recommend the applicant do a Unity of Title Agreement to join the two
313 parcels together, or just combine them under one tax ID # (simpler than the Unity of Title).

314

315 The project has received the necessary points to qualify for consideration and staff
316 recommends approval of one (1) Combined Grant in the CRA funding amount of \$20,000.
317 Approval is contingent upon the applicant obtaining the necessary permit(s) and meeting all
318 Planning and Building Department requirements.

319

320 Mr. Peterson felt that the CRA had defined what comprises a business and stated that Ms.
321 Nance’s businesses were longstanding enterprises and was in favor of approving all three
322 grants. Mr. Hodson agreed.

323

324 Ms. Marla Nance, applicant, gave an update on her existing businesses and the length that
325 each of those businesses has been in existence. Ms. Nance clarified that MTN Resources is
326 the owner of the property, but not the owner of the other two businesses.

327

328 Mr. Kosmas made Ms. Nance aware that the one application would be approved as an owner
329 and two as tenants, which will preclude her (as the owner) from receiving future CRA grants.

330

331 A brief discussion ensued and the CRA agreed to approve Ms. Nance’s three applications as
332 submitted, including the cost for the roof. Further discussion ensued if the applications had to
333 go before the City Commission. Mr. Kosmas informed Ms. Nance that staff would check into
334 that option and get back with her.

335

336 Mr. Kosmas abstained from voting as he had an apparent conflict of interest.

337

338 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve the Combined grant applications for 306/308**
339 **N. Orange Street, including the new roof; seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion carried on**
340 **roll-call vote 4–0. Mr. Kosmas abstained.**

341

342 Mr. Hodson excused himself at 4:10 pm.

343

2. 208 Magnolia Street – Fender Mender

344

345 This applicant is proposing to construct a new wall that will match his existing building
346 with electrical roll-up bay doors and shutters to protect the east side of the “outdoor” bay
347 from inclement weather. Additionally, the applicant feels that this wall would make the
348 area more aesthetically pleasing in the evening, as closing it will block the view to the
349 work areas.

350

351 The estimate for the scope of work totals **\$43,750** (CRA funding request capped at
352 **\$20,000**). The applicant was informed that staff will require receipts from the contractor for
353 all work performed. Staff has met on-site with the applicant and pertinent City personnel
354 and the scope of work was conceptually accepted.

355

356 The application has received the necessary points to qualify for consideration and staff
357 recommends approval. Approval is contingent upon the applicant obtaining the necessary
358 permit(s).

359

360 Mr. Kosmas elaborated on the CRA’s purpose with these grants and inquired how certain
361 projects tie in with the CRA’s goal of eliminating blight.

362

363 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve the Combined grant applications for 208**
364 **Magnolia Street; seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion carried on roll-call vote 3–1 with Mr.**
365 **Kosmas casting the dissenting vote.**

366

367 F. Opportunity Site Designation Request –

368

369 1. 426 Canal Street

370

371 Mr. Otte stated that CRA Staff was approached by Mr. Richard Rosedale, who is proposing
372 to construct a new building at the corner of Canal and S. Orange Streets. This lot used to
373 house a building that had to be demolished due to damage suffered in a 2008 fire. This
374 project would entail a two (2) story building and Mr. Rosedale envisions Retail, Restaurant
375 or office on the first floor and office space on the second.

376

377 Mr. Otte continued that the applicant is asking for a designation as an Opportunity Site
378 program, as he feels that this corner is a prominent location on Canal Street and an
379 important entrance to S. Orange Street with its recently completed Streetscape.
380 Furthermore, Mr. Rosedale feels that the current vacant lot is very unsightly.

381

382 Staff agreed that the proposed project would fill an unsightly corner on Canal Street and
383 recommended that the CRA consider Mr. Rosedale’s request to have 426 Canal Street added
384 to the list of Opportunity sites.

385

386 Mr. Rosedale was present and gave a brief summary why he felt this property should be
387 considered an opportunity site. Mr. Rosedale also showed pictures of what was previously
388 on this site.

389

390 Mr. Kosmas gave his interpretation of what he felt an opportunity site should be and was
391 concerned of the direction that this program was taking.

392 A brief discussion ensued about whether or not this property should be added as an
393 opportunity site. Some Commissioners felt that it should be up to the City Commission to
394 determine if a property should be added to the list of Opportunity sites.
395

396 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to add 426 Canal Street to the list of opportunity sites;**
397 **seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion failed on roll-call vote 2–2 with Mr. Kosmas and Mr.**
398 **Kinney casting the dissenting votes.** (please refer to [page 9 line 425](#) for additional
399 information about this agenda item).
400

401 2. 529-533 Washington Street
402

403 Mr. Otte stated that the building at 529 Washington Street is located at the NW corner of
404 Washington and Dimmick and presently houses a barbershop. In the past this was a mixed
405 use building housing a number of businesses including the barbershop as well as a restaurant,
406 dance hall, and beauty salon and residential dwelling unit. CRA staff and Attorney have been
407 working with the family who owns the building on a concept of having the CRA pay for
408 renovating the building and then lease the building back for the value of the improvements.
409 The CRA hired an architect for this purpose.
410

411 Mr. Otte continued that the family has recently notified CRA staff that their plans have
412 changed and that they now wish to proceed on their own to develop a “Westside Cultural
413 Arts and Business Cooperative Center, Inc”. The family wishes to apply for CRA funding
414 under the Opportunity Site Grant Program for funds to renovate the building and then use it
415 for the program as described, which includes spaces to be leased to small businesses and both
416 visual artists and performing artists. Due to the prominence of the building in the Historic
417 Westside, staff recommends that it be designated as an Opportunity Site.
418

419 Mr. Kosmas felt that this will be a great opportunity for the Westside and felt that this type
420 of project is a great example for an opportunity site.
421

422 **Ms. Latty made a motion to approve add 529/533 Washington Street to the list of**
423 **Opportunity sites; seconded by Mr. Peterson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 4–0.**
424

425 Mr. Kinney inquired of Mr. Hall if he could reconsider his vote for item F. 1. Opportunity
426 Site designation for 426 Canal Street. Mr. Hall stated that this would be allowed and the
427 CRA agreed to revisit this item prior to the end of the meeting. (please refer to page 11 line
428 519 for the final action pertaining to this agenda item).
429

430 G. Riverside Park Improvements Project – Utility Commission cost for
431 Lighting
432

433 Mr. Otte stated that the Riverside Park Improvements Project contains lighting that will be
434 installed by the contractor and also by the Utilities Commission. The contractor will install
435 the new fishing pier lighting, the entrance bollards, and the up-lighting for the 2 monuments.
436

437 Mr. Otte continued that the Utilities Commission has agreed to install and maintain the
438 remaining park lighting, which includes the main lighting along the boardwalk and within the
439 interior of the park at a cost of \$104,581.18. Staff recommends approving the Utilities
440 Commission costs.

441 **Mr. Kinney made a motion to approve the Utilities Commission costs; seconded by Ms.**
442 **Latty. Motion carried on roll-call vote 4-0.**

443

444

H. CRA Grants Conflict

445

446 Mr. Hall commented on his memo dated 11/22/2011 about issuing of grant money to CRA
447 Commissioners. The memo requests adopting a bright-line policy prohibiting current CRA
448 Commissioners or staff members from applying for or receiving grant money from the CRA
449 on which they sit. Mr. Hall stated that the City Commission had already adopted the
450 recommended action at their meeting on November 29, 2011. This verbiage would be
451 included in the current CRA Grant guidelines.

452

453 Mr. Otte explained that this action stemmed from a County Council Member's question
454 during the November 3, 2011 CRA presentations, if any CRA Commissioners had received
455 grants, and if so than this needed to be looked into.

456

457 A discussion ensued about this type of policy potentially discouraging very able business
458 owners and residents from becoming CRA Commissioners, which would have a negative
459 effect on the CRA.

460

461 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to deny adopting the policy; seconded by Ms. Latty.**
462 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 4-0.**

463

464

L. Riverside Park Bids

465

466 Mr. Otte stated that a total of four (4) bids were received for the Riverside Park Seawall Pier
467 and Lighting Replacement Project and staff is recommending awarding the contract to C&L
468 Landscape, Inc. in the amount of \$912,725.

469

470 **Mr. Kinney made a motion to approve staff's recommendation; seconded by Ms. Latty.**
471 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 4-0.**

472

473

474

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

475

A. Director's Report

476

477

Mr. Otte stated that

478

479

- the Capital improvement project budget had to be adjusted by \$655,428 and gave updates on completed, proposed and started Capital projects.

480

481

- A joint CRA/City Commission meeting will be held on January 18, 2012 at 4:00 pm in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

482

483

484

B. CRA Attorney's Report

485

486

Mr. Hall stated that he had nothing new to report expect for the fact that he, Mr. Otte and Mr. Peterson had decided not to meet on the subject of special event funding as suggested at a previous CRA meeting.

487

488

489

C. Capital Projects Report

490

491 No discussion

492

493 D. Commissioner Report

494

495 Ms. Latty asked for an update on the status of the hotel on Flagler Ave. Mr. Otte stated that
496 he had been in touch with the Developer's representative and that this representative would
497 make a presentation at that January 2012 CRA meeting.

498

499 Mr. Kosmas inquired how Public records requests and questions are being addressed. Mr.
500 Hall stated that Public records requests are being handled and disseminated to the proper
501 department by the City Clerk. Mr. Hall is of the opinion that all requests are being handled
502 satisfactorily.

503

504 Regarding the hotel project on Flagler Ave, Mr. Kosmas asked for a summary of outstanding
505 post-closing contract obligations, if any. Mr. Hall stated that all closing requirements had
506 been met and clarified that the incentives would only be dispensed when the hotel has been
507 built and has received its certificate of occupancy, but would create that summary as
508 requested.

509

510 Ms. Brangaccio stated that both the CRA and City Attorney were present at the closing and
511 that the City no longer owns the properties and that this is now a private construction project.

512

513 No further comments from the Commissioners.

514

515 E. Tracking Report

516

517 The commissioners had no comments or questions.

518

519 Mr. Hall stated that, as a point of order earlier in the meeting, Mr. Kinney had requested to
520 reconsider his vote made for item F.1. Opportunity Site designation request for 426 Canal
521 Street where he had originally voted in favor of denying the request. Mr. Hall asked Mr.
522 Kinney if he wanted to change his vote.

523

524 **Mr. Kinney moved to reconsider his vote on this item; seconded by Ms. Latty. Motion**
525 **carried on roll-call vote 4-0.**

526

527 Mr. Hall turned over the floor to Chairman Kosmas for further consideration of this agenda
528 item.

529

530 Mr. Kosmas entertained a motion to approve adding 426 Canal Street to the list of
531 opportunity sites.

532

533 **Mr. Peterson made a motion to add 426 Canal Street to the list of opportunity sites;**
534 **seconded by Mr. Kinney. Motion carried on roll-call vote 3-1 with Mr. Kosmas casting**
535 **the dissenting votes.**

536

537 Mr. Kosmas thanked staff for putting together this CRA agenda. Hearing no further
538 comments, Mr. Kosmas entertained a motion to adjourn.

539

540 **ADJOURNMENT**

541

542 **A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 5:42 pm.**