

**City of St. Petersburg**  
**Committee of the Whole Agenda**  
**November 18, 2019, at 3:00 PM**  
**Sunshine Center Auditorium**

Members: Chair Charlie Gerdes, Vice-Chair Ed Montanari, Councilmembers Brandi Gabbard, Darden Rice, Steve Kornell, Gina Driscoll, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman and Amy Foster

Support Staff: Kayleigh Sagonowsky, City Council Legislative Aide

- A. Call to Order and Roll Call
- B. Approval of Agenda
- C. Approval of October 31, 2019 Minutes
- D. New Business
  - a. Grant Funding for Emerging Needs
    - i. Councilmember Amy Foster
- E. Review Referral List
- F. Adjourn

Next Meeting:

- December 12, 2019, at 1:30 PM
  - 2020 Calendar Setting
  - Selection of 2020 Chair and Vice-Chair

Attachments:

- October 31, 2019 COW Minutes
- COW Referral List
- New Business Item Support Material

**St. Petersburg City Council**  
**Committee of the Whole Report**  
**Meeting Minutes from October 31, 2019**

**Present:** Chair Charlie Gerdes, Vice-Chair Ed Montanari, Councilmembers Darden Rice, Amy Foster, Gina Driscoll, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman and Brandi Gabbard

**Also Present:** Deputy Mayor Kanika Tomlin, Jeannine Williams, Michael Dema, Elizabeth Abernethy, Derek Kilborn, and Lowell Atkinson

**Absent:** Councilmember Steve Kornell

**Support Staff:** Kayleigh Sagonowsky, City Council Legislative Aide

**New Business:**

**St. Pete 2050 Plan Update - Derek Kilborn, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Manager**

Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Manager Derek Kilborn introduced the St. Pete 2050 Plan as a city-wide discussion about the future of the city. He explained the purpose of his update was to provide an overview of the public engagement process.

In working with the consultant, Mr. Kilborn said primary community engagement strategies and public meeting dates have been identified. Outreach will include surveys, workshops, one on one listening sessions, and a mobile engagement tool. There will be a series of community workshops centered around the themes of “where we’ve been, where we want to go, and how we get there.” Attendees will have two date options to choose from for each workshop theme. The first workshop is planned for November 7th at the James Museum or November 9th at the Center for Health Equity. Mr. Kilborn the final product will be a visioning plan that identifies themes, priorities, and recommendations for the city based on community feedback.

Councilmember Montanari said he hopes for effective and productive community outreach and does not want the plan to just sit on a shelf. He proposed the creation of a steering committee consisting of one community representative from each district. Other councilmembers expressed concerns that a steering committee may prevent people from participating in discussions. Councilmember Gerdes asked staff to schedule an additional kickoff meeting somewhere west of 34th Street to which Deputy Mayor Kanika Tomlin agreed. Councilmember Gerdes reminded Councilmembers how the Vision 2020 Plan was tweaked along the way. Similarly, the 2050 Plan will be a working document. Council agreed there is time for the approach to be adjusted along the way, if necessary.

**Residential LDR Updates - Liz Abernethy, Director of Planning and Development**

Zoning Official Jenni Bryla provided an evaluation of the changes to the Neighborhood Traditional code which were implemented in July 2017. The changes were intended to limit the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of new single-family homes and allow for FAR bonuses. Ms. Bryla reminded Councilmembers that FAR is typically defined as an enclosed space above the design flood elevation line. In NT-1 and NT-4, the maximum FAR is .50 and in NT-2 and NT-3, the maximum FAR is .40. Applicants are allowed to request up to .20 FAR if certain design criteria are met. She explained 42.8% of the homes built since the code change applied for bonuses.

Bonuses currently range from letters A to O. Ms. Bryla presented photographs illustrating each bonus and made recommendations to modify some of the bonuses. For example, Bonus A can be earned by building a one-story covered front porch with a separate roof structure with a minimum width of 60% of the facade. Ms. Bryla recommended increasing the minimum width to 80%. She also suggested eliminating Bonus E regarding roofline heights because the effect is not noticeable. Ms. Bryla said she has been meeting with stakeholders about these proposed changes and asked for Council feedback.

Councilmember Foster proposed making Bonus L, which requires consistency with the architectural style of the neighborhood, mandatory to use before other bonus options are allowed. Ms. Bryla said she would support the proposal but noted it would likely increase costs to home buyers. Councilmember Montanari asked what constitutes a “large tree” in Bonus M. Attorney Michael Dema stated it means a minimum of a 100-gallon container. Councilmembers Montanari and Driscoll asked what stakeholders have been contacted so far and what their feedback has been. Councilmember Gerdes expressed concerns with eliminating Bonus E since it has been so popular. He also stated support for incentivizing greater use of Bonus L.

Ms. Bryla said more stakeholder outreach is needed and that changes will be incorporated into the next residential LDR package which is part of the department’s 2020 work plan.

### **Storefront Conservation Corridor Plan - Lowell Atkinson, The Greenhouse**

Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Manager Derek Kilborn returned to provide a summary of the Storefront Conservation Corridor Plan (SCCP) project applications his department has received. He stated two projects have been approved, two projects are in process, and three projects are currently being researched. He then reviewed the calculations used for the two approved projects MISRED and SaltLight.

Next, Economic and Workforce Development Manager Lowell Atkinson provided an update on the grant component of the SCCP. The program was very popular and received 56 individual requests for funding totaling more than \$899,000, far exceeding the total grant funding of \$175,000. Of the 56 applicants, 10 business owners and 1 property owner were awarded funds. Mr. Atkinson told the story of local business owner James Ryan who was forced to relocate due to rising rent prices but was able to stay in business thanks to the SCCP grant.

Next, Mr. Atkinson discussed areas for potential growth such as modifying the first-come, first-served application process and revising some of the eligible uses for the grant money. Councilmember Foster expressed concerns with the allowable use of purchasing inventory and raw materials. She also mentioned many awardees received funding from other grants and suggested limiting overall city funding in the future. Councilmember Montanari asked for clarification about the property owner who was awarded funds with no required uses. Mr. Atkinson explained the property owner used the funds to keep rents affordable. Overall, Council members were supportive of the SPPC and said they look forward to helping more businesses in the future.

Item	Topic	Return Date and Time	Referral or Prior Dates	Referred By	Staff	Notes
1	Emerging Needs Grant Fund	11/18/19 at 3:00 PM	10/17/19	Foster		Referred from BFT on 10/24/19
2	2020 Calendar Setting	12/12/19 at 1:30 PM	Annual	Annual	Sheppard	Selection of Chair and Vice Chair
3	FY21 Budget Priorities	1/23/20 at 10:00 AM	Annual	Annual	Makosfke	
4	Facilities Maintenance Plan	TBD	5/9/19 PSI	Foster	Glover-Henderson	Will return to PSI before being scheduled for a COW.
5	Tropicana Field	TBD	2/17/19	Montanari	DeLisle	
6	Business, Housing, and Grocery Co-Ops	TBD	1/10/19 BFT 1/17/19 CC 8/1/19 CC	Gabbard Driscoll		At BFT, CM Driscoll referred business co-ops to a COW. During the BFT report at Council, CM Gabbard asked to add housing co-ops. On 8/1/19 Gabbard asked to add grocery co-ops.
7	Residential LDR Updates	TBD	Annual	Annual	Abernethy Bryla	

# CITY COUNCIL AGENDA NEW BUSINESS ITEM

TO: Members of City Council  
DATE: October 4, 2019  
COUNCIL DATE: October 17, 2019  
RE: Discussion about establishing emergent needs funds and process

---

**ACTION DESIRED:**

Respectfully requesting a discussion at an appropriate committee regarding the creation of a procedure to manage funding requests for emergent needs in order to maintain the integrity of grant and annual budget processes.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

*Draft* emerging needs funding procedure and scoring rubric for discussion.

Council Member Amy Foster  
District 8

## **Draft Emergent Needs Funding Procedures:**

To request City funding of \$5,000 or more outside of established grant procedures and annual budget requests, non-profits must demonstrate an emergent need for a well-designed project to benefit St. Pete citizens. The following procedure must be followed in order for an agency's project to be considered.

1. A Councilmember or the Mayor must submit a written request to City Council that a project is referred to a committee for consideration. Requests should include a project summary and rationale of urgency. Additionally, requests should include a cost estimate, project objectives, clearly defined outcomes and records of past performance, and demonstration of attempts to secure other funding. (See emergent needs rubric for more details).
2. Committee members will use the attached evaluation rubric to aid in the analysis of projects and to assist in determining whether a project will be funded. Projects must earn a minimum average score of \_\_\_\_ to be considered.
3. City Council shall consider and take formal action on a project recommended by a committee within thirty days.

## Emerging Needs Funding Evaluation Rubric

**Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_ / 30

	<b>5 Excellent</b>	<b>4 Above Average</b>	<b>3 Adequate</b>	<b>2 Somewhat Adequate</b>	<b>1 Inadequate</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Urgency</b>	Project is extremely time-sensitive and a lack of funding would be detrimental to the community	Project is time-sensitive and a lack of funding may impact the community	Project is urgent and would be impacted by not being funded	Project is not urgent but would be negatively impacted by not being funded	Project is not urgent and would not be negatively impacted by not being funded	Not addressed
<b>Goals</b>	Project proposal outlines specific and ambitious goals aligned to established city priorities	Project proposal outlines specific goals aligned to city priorities	Project proposal outlines goals aligned to city priorities	Project proposal lists unclear goals	Project proposal lists goals disconnected from city priorities	Not addressed
<b>Design</b>	Project provides direct services to clients with little/no funding for administrative purposes	Project provides direct services with some funding for admin. purposes	Project provides funding for essential capital improvement projects	Project provides funding for non-essential capital improvement projects	Proposal requests funding for ongoing operations	Not addressed
<b>Budget</b>	Project cost is itemized and reasonable. Ample efforts to secure funding have been made with some success	Project cost is itemized and reasonable. Efforts to secure other funding are explained	Project cost is explained. Efforts to secure other funding are explained	Project cost is reasonable but not explained. Efforts to secure other funding are not explained	Project cost is unreasonable and not explained. Efforts to secure other funding were not made	Not addressed
<b>Outcomes</b>	Project outcomes are clearly defined and measurable. Past performance outcomes are exceeded	Project outcomes are defined and measurable. Past performance outcomes are met	Project outcomes are listed. Past performance outcomes are adequate	Project outcomes are listed. Past performance outcomes are poor	Project outcomes are unclear. Past performance outcomes are poor	Not addressed
<b>Agency Standing</b>	Agency is in excellent standing with the city and Check-A-Charity reports show excellent allocation of revenue	Agency is in good standing with the city and Check-A-Charity reports show proper allocation of revenue	Agency is in okay standing with the city and is registered in Check-A-Charity	Agency is in poor standing with the city and Check-A-Charity reports show poor allocation of revenue	Agency is in poor standing with the city and not registered in Check-A-Charity	Not addressed