I. Citizen Advisory Committee and Staff Introductions

II. Approval of October 2, 2018, CAC Meeting Minutes (Vote)

III. Request for CRA Funding from St. Petersburg Housing Authority (Info)

IV. CAC Recommendations on South St. Petersburg CRA Programs, Processes and FY2018/2019 Budget (Vote)
   A. Proposed New and Amended CRA Programs funded by South St. Petersburg Tax Increment Financing
   B. Revisions to Scoring and Evaluation System for Commercial Matching Grant Programs
   C. FY2018/2019 Budget for South St. Petersburg CRA Redevelopment Trust Fund

V. Public Comment and Correspondence (3 minutes per speaker)

VI. New Business

VII. Remaining 2018 Regular Meetings December 4th

VIII. Adjourn
The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. Citizens Advisory Committee and Staff Introductions

Introductions were made by each Committee Member and City Staff member.

II. Approval of September 11, 2018, CAC Meeting Minutes (Vote)

The September 11, 2018 minutes were approved as written by a consensus vote.

III. Request for CRA Funding from St. Petersburg Housing Authority (Vote)
Rick Smith stated that he had received a request to take all public comments in advance of Agenda item III and will require a vote.

*Committee Member Nurse moved and Committee Member Howard seconded a motion to take public comments after hearing the presentations by staff and the Housing Authority.*

*Motion was approved by a consensus vote.*

Mr. Smith gave a presentation regarding the request made by the St. Petersburg Housing Authority for CRA funding for the renovation of Jordan Park Housing Complex. The original request included $2.06 million to renovate 206 residential units. The total projected construction costs are $12.043 million with the request based on $10,000 per unit drawn from the current CRA Multifamily Residential Improvement Program. Mr. Smith qualified that by saying that the current program has an award cap of $90,000 per project; the requested funding amount would not be eligible under the current rules. The original request was to fund new roofing for all units, redesign kitchens and replace appliances in the remaining 50% of the units not included in the current scope, add termite treatment, install gutters and downspouts, replace an additional 292 toilets, and install a CCTV/surveillance system. The Housing Authority has since modified their request requesting that Administration amend its recommendation by increasing CRA funding from $885,000 to $1.095 million, which is a reduction of a little under $1 million from their original request. The revised award will fund window replacements, asphalt roofing shingles on 50% of the units, kitchen layout revisions in 60% of the units, and sidewalk repairs. Administration is recommending that the CAC appropriate $885,000 in TIF from 2018/2019 budget to pay for the window replacements in the 206 residential units, to authorize the execution of a grant agreement between the City and SPHA with conditions (requirement of grant award only after the completion project, issuance of Certificate of Completion, and actual costs of window replacements are documented; and authorize annual inspection of the residential units by Codes Compliance Assistance Dept. for a period of five years subject to tenant consent). The rationale behind Administration’s recommendation was given. The recommended award is approximately 16% of the 2018/2019 $5.4 million budget, representing 7% of the total $12.043 million construction costs, and is consistent with the proposed amendments to the Multifamily Residential Property Improvement Grant Program.

Rob Gerdes further explained the role of the Codes Compliance Assistance Dept. regarding the condition of the interior units being inspected on a yearly basis for five years with tenant consent. A form will be provided for the Housing Authority to provide to the tenant authorizing Codes to inspect the unit. This is required to protect the 4th Amendment Constitutional rights of the tenant; the tenant has a right to not allow government into their unit if they so choose. The five-year inspection period is based on the affordability guidelines from the Federal Home Program and is typically based on the amount of money contributed to a project; however, the CAC may, at their discretion, increase the inspection period if the funding request is approved with no objection from the City.

Tony Love, CEO of the St. Petersburg Housing Authority gave a presentation in support of the request. His mission is to provide a variety of safe, sanitary, accessible, decent, and affordable housing for eligible residents of the City of St. Petersburg while enhancing and promoting resident self-sufficiency. Mr. Love stated that the residents of Jordan Park not only deserve it, it’s their time; maximum funding commitment to this project is essential to the overall bringing that community back to a competitive market edge. It will be affordable for at least 50, if not 99 years in the future, it will address the local disadvantaged business enterprise as well as giving opportunities to residents of Jordan Park as local entrepreneurs and as local labors. Mr. Love then introduced
Michelle Ligon and Brian Evjen, Development Director of Norstar USA (collaborative partner and co-developer in revitalization for Jordan Park).

Ms. Ligon provided information pertaining to the disadvantaged business enterprises with a concerted effort from North Star to ensure the participation of local trades solicitated from both sides of the bay. The next meeting is October 17th at 3:00 p.m. at the Midtown location for St. Petersburg College with the hopes of opportunities for residents within the Jordan Park community.

Mr. Evjen provided an overview of the family rehab aspect of the revitalization plan justifying why they think the necessary renovation and the partnership with CAC is worthy of the $1.095 million for affordable housing in south St. Petersburg. Their primary concern is the residents when they undertake a rehabilitation project, such as this; they try to identify everything that is in critical need and everything else that needs to be replaced or repaired to ensure the longevity of the community. The secondary concern is when they go out to find investors in their projects, they want to see that they are making a substantial investment in the community, so they know it will be sustainable as well. These structures have some exterior stability issues and roofs needing replacement as well as interior issues (flooring, doors, windows). They are very appreciative of the recommendation of $885,000 to fund the window replacements but they would also like to suggest that if the CRA were to provide another $210,000 towards the asphalt shingles, it would free up other funding for them to address more of the roofs as well as perform some kitchen renovation/remodeling in some of the units and also address some current sidewalk disrepair issues. Mr. Evian then addressed some statements made earlier regarding contractor procurement and the potential procurement of contractors who worked on previous renovation or construction projects; they were not involved at that point nor was their general contractor but will be happy to work with the Housing Authority to identify any subcontractors that were involved. They typically have an open book process, putting the entire project out for bid, receive at least three contractor bids for each division of labor and analyze those alongside the Housing Authority before moving forward with anything. Part of their contract with the Housing Authority requires them to make efforts and have specific goals set for their Section 3 and WMBE hiring of local and disadvantaged and minority businesses (with the assistance of a firm in Tampa). In regards to the contingency and what happens if those funds are not used, typically part of those funds get used up for change orders (there are always surprises) and the remainder, if any, is either accepted as project savings and roll it back to reduce one of the funding sources or they add scope at that point if there is a wish list of additional items needing to be done.

Questions:
How does the firm in Tampa help with local business association? The consultant is based in Tampa and they work extensively in St. Petersburg and Pinellas County; the company is called Aerial Business Group run by Thomas Huggins.

What would be the check and balance system to ensure that some of St. Petersburg local businesses get some of those contracts? The check would be the checks being written after the work is completed verifying that the hiring goals have been met.

Which figure is correct for the asphalt shingle roofing replacements, 50% of the units or 206 units? The current construction budget of $210,00 will address 30% of roofs on site.
Do you know how many years of life those less critical roofs have left? There is a report outlining the remaining life span of those roofs but do not have that information with me. A replacement reserve is required ($300 per unit per year) for any needed repairs that may arise.

Are you willing to include the installation of insulation and a modern toilet in your inspection process since the City had passed the ordinance? If there is an ordinance, yes.

Are the toilets being replaced? Not all toilets are 20 years old and consideration has been given to most of the toilets; energy star products have been purchased and installed. The low flow toilets are not currently included in the base scope.

Are gas hot water heaters currently being used and will they be replaced? There are some gas hot water heaters now and the Maintenance Dept. has been replacing them with electric on an on-going basis. There is some question about whether to include in the scope or continue to replace by the maintenance team on an on-going basis.

How can the hot water heaters be replaced with the hybrid hot water heaters? We can take another $500,000 from CRA, it’s all about the costs.

What changed to go from $2.06 million to $1.095 million? The original request still stands and is their preference but when they realized the recommendation would be for $885,000, an alternative proposal was made with items that were more critical.

Did you (Mr. Love) ever visit and have conversations with any of the families living at Jordan Park when you came on board in 2016? I visited Jordan Park on January 6, 2016 and met Ms. Fletcher at that time. We visited her house and talked about getting the garden started for the rest of the senior residents; so yes, I did two days after I came to this town.

What was your impression of Jordan Park at that time? Did you think their living conditions were ok? My impression of Jordan Park is that the Housing Authority should be in control; they can increase the visibility in the community and help the families improve their livability in the units.

What was the outcome of the Richmond Group when they wanted to sell Jordan Park back to you and we understood that the conditions were pretty bad then? Was there a plan or anything put into place upon that transaction to move forward before this? My first mission was to get control of Jordan Park.

Has a property manager been designated? There is a management arm from Rise Development Corp (501-3-C LLC) that is now and has been managing Jordan Park since the Housing Authority purchase in March 2017.

Do they answer to the Board? It has its own Board of Directors; the members are the same people as the Board with the LLC has the records and the Housing Commissions are the Commissioners.

How do we know they are doing their job? There is oversight from the Florida Finance Housing with inspections.
If this money is not funded, will it kill the project? We hope that would not be the case; it would lessen some of the enhancements they have planned for the families.

Comments/input/concerns were noted by staff.

Public Comments:
Grady Terrell, 2067 1st Ave N – focus on having a viable private/public partner here, non-profit based wanting to serve the residents of Jordan Park; Mr. Love, since taking over Jordan Park, has fulfilled his role and living up to the SBE standard. An SBE goal should have been included in the grant package. Several names that he holds responsible for a project like this were recited. Don’t kill a good idea with perfection.

Terry Scott, member of the St. Petersburg Housing Authority Board – things have gotten worse in Jordan Park over the past two years and the question is why; where was the oversight and where was the concern? She is concerned about safe, decent, sanitary housing conditions for the families of Jordan Park with accountability and oversight. At what point do they need the physical need assessment? On what basis was North Star elected as the contractor and what was their responsibility as a result of them being elected?

Was the physical needs assessment provided to the City? Mr. Smith stated it was not. The physical needs assessment is needed to help make a decision and how/why North Star was selected.

How many people have been placed on a job through PERC? Mr. Smith stated that they are tracking that and will provide the data to the CAC by the end of the week.

Steve Kornell, City Council Member – why should this entire process be changed for one entity? One entity (Norstar) had bid on that contract. Who was it released to? How was it publicized? There is a host of questions that need to be answered. Had the Housing Authority accepted the City’s invitation to meet and discuss that, I could have asked those questions then, but now will ask those questions when it goes before City Council. A letter was sent by the Housing Authority essentially saying that the City really does not control them and should stay out of their business and he has a problem with that when asking for large sums of public money. He then stated that one reason LLCs are set up is to limit the liability and if this money is given, he wants somebody to have the right to go after if they don’t spend that money in an appropriate way on the residents. As an example, Boley built new units at $60,000 per unit through CDBD funding and this rehab of 16-year old units is costing more money than brand new units being built by Boley. This is not the only option for affordable housing. Ms. Moore from the St. Petersburg Times provided more oversight for Jordan Park than the Housing Authority Board and staff, and that to him does not say let’s find another Million Dollars to put into this with major questions unanswered.

SBE hiring goals (e.g. 25%) and inspection rates (e.g. 10 years) can be set and request to include in the provision of installation and modern toilets. With those provisions he would move to recommend the $1.095 million.

Committee Member Nurse moved and Committee Member O’Hara seconded a motion to recommend $1.095 million with the SBE hiring goal of 25% and inspections of the units for 10 years for Jordan Park only and implementing the ordinance of inspecting attic insulation and modern toilets City-wide.
What Committee Member Nurse is suggesting should have been included in the staff’s recommendation and feels that the SBE goal should be 35% to 40%. Committee Member Nurse stated his agreement with any number the CAC is comfortable with but needs to have a hard, measurable number.

**Committee Member Davis moved and Committee Member Hunter seconded a motion to table Committee Member Nurse’s motion.**

*Motion was approved by a consensus vote*

Mr. Smith asked that all questions from the CAC be directed to him by Thursday morning, he will then package them and forward to the Housing Authority by Thursday afternoon.

**IV. Public Comment and Correspondence (3 minutes per speaker)**

No additional speakers present.

**V. New Business**

No new business.

**VI. Remaining 2018 Regular Meetings** November 6th and December 4th

All meetings to be held at 5:00 p.m. in Room 100 located at City Hall.

**IX. Adjourn**

With no further items to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.