
The Quincy Community Redevelopment Agency Board met in regular session on Tuesday, February 13, 2018 with Chairman McMillan presiding and the following **present at roll call**:

Board Member Gay, Board Member Sapp

Also present:

CRA Manager Regina Davis, Attorney Brown

Call to Order

Chairman McMillan called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Approval of Minutes

Board Member Gay made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular board meeting from January 9, 2018 with any corrections if necessary. Vice-Chair Sapp seconded the motion. Motion carries with a vote of 3-0.

Member Elias enters.

Financials

According to the January 31, 2018 statement the beginning balance was \$361,562.15, there were three deposits, nine checks/debits as well as automatic withdrawals, in the amount of \$9,086.06. Interest paid \$15.31, leaving a balance \$352,683.31.

Member Elias has the following questions:

- Clarification on 7 checks – Noted this included EFTs and checks.
- \$2,000 to Chamber of Commerce – This was for two months (1 month behind because of delay in receiving invoice)
- Are Attorney Brown's invoices up-to-date? Attorney Brown then gave the Manager his invoice for December 2017 and will have January's invoice no later than February 15th.
- What was \$200 to DEO? Payment for annual renewal for the CRA
- What did the \$6,521 reflect? Manager's salary and benefits.
- Fee for account analysis? – Monthly charge by Capital City Bank based on the number of transactions they handle for us during the month.

Motion by Member Sapp to approve the financials. Seconded by Member Gay. Motion carries with a vote of 4-0.

The manager brought to the boards attention the request from the City of Quincy for payment under the Interlocal Agreement for financial services for last year and current year, totaling \$40,000. *Motion by Member Gay for the transfer of \$40,000 to the City of Quincy for accounting services. Seconded by Member Sapp. Motion carries with a vote of 4-0.*

Member Dowdell enters.

Development of the Kelly Lot Proposal/Discussion

Manager Davis – The board requested that the manager introduce this item to the public. She met with the advisory board and they hosted a design workshop. The advisory board chair is present to give a recap of the meeting.

Rob Nixon/CRA Advisory Board Chair – On February 6th we hosted a community charrette, which was comprised of input from individual citizens as well as representative(s) from the City of Quincy, Citizens for a Better Quincy, Gadsden County BOCC, Gadsden Chamber of Commerce, Quincy CRA, Quincy CRA Advisory Board, Quincy Historic Commission and Quincy Main Street. A charrette is an intensive workshop in which various stakeholders are brought together to discuss a particular design/issue. In this case the purpose was to create an environment in which citizens and stakeholders to come together to speak on what they thought they'd like to see as we moved forward on the development of the Kelly Lot. Of the 31 people in attendance, 28 actually participated in the charrette. Again they did not choose between competing plans but rather the opportunity was again to come up with opinions and preferences that they'd like to see. Manager Davis then provided handouts and gave a verbal overview of the downtown master plan to set the context because the goal was to provide as much information to the community so that we could solicit their input. Mr. Joel Sampson, who was a part of the preparation of the master plan, was on hand but declined an invitation to present on this particular overview but was supportive of the meeting. At that time the Interim County Manager presented the concept for a Veteran's Memorial and marketplace that is being currently vetted by staff. It's still in the preliminary stages, but she did provide that overview. At that time there was quite a bit of discussion, but I think that in the beginning the participants in their eagerness didn't recognize the opportunity to provide direct input. So there was a little bit of soapbox. So we heard some comments of choice between the county's plan and then the master plan, which was referred to as Joel Sampson's plan. Once we did undertake the discussion we got some great information and I'll share with you some of those ideas. The primary preferred attributes were in rank order:

- Parking with green spaces
- Parking and multipurpose area
- Sitting areas and picnic tables
- Beautiful landscaping with appropriate trees, flowers and vegetation
- Marketplace with kiosks-farmers marketplace
- Small business spaces with low rents
- Public restrooms
- Ample security lighting

Now the concept of the Veterans Memorial did come up and it was basically a split. Some preferred to have the site host a Veterans Memorial, others did not. So we did not leave with a determination of what the preference would be. There were some comments specific regarding the Veterans Memorial and some of those were regarding the details and we had some veterans that participated. Those comments were:

- Pavers should not be used for walkway
- Waterfalls would eventually damage plaque
- Torch could be a hazard or potentially misused
- Memorial and marketplace are incompatible
- There is a Veterans Memorial on the Courthouse Square that should be enhanced

- Veterans Memorial should not be the focus on the site
- There are some serious maintenance concerns with the plan proposed by the County

The general comments were very encouraging in that among all the participants the general feeling is that they want to see something positive done with the Kelly Lot and it should be something that can enhance downtown. Some of those comments include:

- Remember what CRA stands for
- Kelly Lot should be redevelopment to promote vitality in the downtown area
- The Lot should be a tourist attraction with a farmer's market, pop up shops and events
- Do not give or use CRA money to the North side
- We need multi-level parking garage on the site
- City should not donate the site for development

Despite some differences of opinion all of the participants want the Kelly Lot to be redeveloped to enhance downtown revitalization efforts and to provide venue for produce markets, events and feature greenspace. The primary categories can be summed up under the following headings:

- Additional downtown parking
- Greenspaces
- Business and event space

In conclusion, I think that it was a great opportunity to get a diverse group of people together. We were very excited about the turnout and the ideas were across the board in basically two camps. But feels there is a workable solution. I would suggest that as this board move forward deliberating on the fate of Kelly Lot that you do consider this input. The advisory board stands ready to host another meeting or to move forward to solicit additional input. I will entertain questions.

Member Dowdell – so it appears that there was a 50/50 split on what to do.

Answer: Specifically to the Veterans Memorial yes, the thought would be if that would be the best location for a Veterans Memorial given that it is kind-of off the beaten path and we do have the County's site which could be enhanced. Others thought that it would be fine. It was very clear that the citizens don't just want parking, there needs to be some consideration for open spaces, multi-purpose spacing as well as parking. Also there were requests to see kiosks for businesses and even art, anything that could enhance the downtown area.

Member Sapp – Expressed thanks to the advisory board for holding the charrette and helping to move this project forward. Asked where the memorial is that's been mentioned.

Answer: Refers to the one on the courthouse square.

Comments from citizens:

Mr. Sapp – Spoke passionately in support of the plan from the County which includes a Veteran's monument and marketplace. Was concerned that the veteran that attended the charrette was not from the area and therefore not vested. Feels this is a plan that the community deserves. The \$50K the county is offering is in a mute state. This will provide another facility that people coming in can look at. He questions how the proposed site can

be a hazard and to what community. Feels that those who have made the sacrifice deserve this site. In full support of this site even if the taxpayers have to put it on the ballot.

Commander representing Gadsden County VFW Post 12054 – Have been looking for a permanent home for their folks, for these veterans. We know that everyone knows about the veterans and the sacrifice they've made. I don't think they get enough recognition. We here in Gadsden County have the greatest percentage of veterans in the state of Florida and I think it robbery for the City/County to provide us with some type of facility or permanent home. We are not asking for ourselves, we just want to provide more services for our community. If you could find some place in your heart to approve this we would be indebted and appreciative.

Alex Sink/Quincy Main Street Executive Director – Appreciates the charrette held by the CRA.

- Disagrees with some of the information in the report providing by Mr. Nixon, specifically as it relates to the 50/50 split for the Veteran's Memorial. Feels the 50/50 split was hard to say based on the conversation we had. There was no way to quantitatively say one way or the other.
- Thinks that the preferred attributes and other recommendations on the report lean more towards economic development of the lot versus the Veterans Memorial and monument. Definitely would like to support the Memorial but doesn't feel that this is the correct location.
- Given the amount of commitment that the City has put into this lot and the amount of money invested by the City and the CRA, for a master plan and the purchase of the lot, we would like to see that lot developed toward the economic vitality of the downtown.
- Because of these findings he has reached out to citizens in the community. There is a commitment from a resident of Quincy who is willing to match the money that the County was going to put towards that lot if the City were to retain that lot and develop it economic development and vitality for the downtown, following what was in that master plan and using that as a guideline because that is what they would like to see. They are willing to bring \$50K to the table so the City does not miss out on that money because they say no to the County. I will work hand in hand with that person to make sure that this comes to fruition. This will be opportunity to make that happen to revitalize our downtown. The master plan was something that received a good number of votes with stickers during the charrette but it was not represented on the report. These preferred attributes all fall under what that master plan had in its design but I wanted to make sure there was a specific point on there that was in support of the master plan. I believe there were some 65 votes in stickers that this is what they would like to see.

Chair Nixon – Provided clarification on a couple points.

- There was a way for us to tally the determination as to whether we should or should not have a Veteran's Memorial. Those were collected by not just the comments that were made but from feedback that was solicited outside of the meeting.
- Each participant was given a number of stickers. They could place all of their stickers on one or spread it out. This was a way for participants to say I believe more strongly in this one. But I do think that Main Street Director has captured some of the essence

of his group and what some of the participants did say. There are a couple of ways that we did capture that.

- Recognized Ben Chandler as the facilitator, who did a wonderful job. Thanks also to our City staff that participated, the CRA attorney and Pam Tribue.

Member Dowdell – Asked Mr. Nixon what is in the preferred attributes that is not in the County plan.

Answer: In his review he did not see anything that was on the County concept that was not in the master plan. The other thing about that, when we saw the comments about supporting the downtown plan or Joel's plan there were several concepts that were positive. I think there were four and so participants were very specific. In both cases you'll find these common attributes.

Member Sapp – Question for Mr. Sink. In your commentary you mention someone that is willing to match the \$50K, can you elaborate on that?

Answer: They would like to bring that money to the table as an investment for the City moving forward following the master plan as closely as it can. They would like to stay anonymous in their donation. They would like to make that donation to Main Street and for Main Street to bring that to the table to the City so they can keep their anonymity. But they have made that commitment 100% if the City was to retain ownership and develop it towards the master plan vision. This falls in line with what the majority of the people at the charrette would like to see come to fruition out of that lot.

Member Dowdell – Asked Mr. Sink, what is in the preferred attributes that is not in the County plan.

Answer: As I stated before, I believe the preferred attributes follow pretty closely to what the design was in the master plan. As far as the county goes, the amount of space allotted to the different areas. There is a commerce area in the back alley way, it's on the other side of a brick wall, and it can't be used for commerce. The actual area for a marketplace is very small on that drawing. It's good proportion as far as green space and parking to marketplace. It also calls for 24-26 parking spaces and the master plan has 60-64 spaces. Meets the needs of the downtown a lot more. The master plan does not include a Veterans Memorial. The veteran that was in attendance at the charrette felt that having a marketplace and a Veterans Memorial in the same place did not match because they would want a place that would be more solemn. Veterans could come and pay tribute to their comrades that have fallen and have a time of remembrance without having to worry about being self-conscious about the people who are at the marketplace.

Member Gay – I don't think we made a lot of progress since our last meeting. To me there seems to be even more division. In our last meeting we sat here in the spirit of collaboration with the County to take the Quincy downtown masterplan and take the County's proposal and try to mesh it together. If we look back at the minutes from the previous meeting I see:

“Member Elias likes the idea of the opportunity to partner with the county on this endeavor. This is a beginning that we can work forward with the collaboration with the county to try to make this vision come to fruition.

Member Gay – Is glad to see the county and city will be working together. Looking forward to seeing collaboration between the CRA, City and BOCC.

County Commissioner Brenda Holt – Supports the project, suggests a collaborative meeting with all interested parties.

Member Sapp made a motion to have Manager Davis set-up a meeting with the interested parties to discuss the details and to come back with another presentation.”

So I think we have taken one big step back. What I get from the charrette is that we have divided this even more between the County plan and the downtown Quincy plan. Our instructions were for those who are vested in the County plan and those vested in the downtown masterplan to come together and see if they can take those two plans and mesh them into one and bring it back as a presentation to us. It seems like this meeting we are further apart then we were when it was first presented to us. So I'm a little confused by all this. I don't think we made much progress in meshing the County plan and the Quincy masterplan. The package comes to us with only the County proposal and not the downtown masterplan. In the downtown masterplan there were actually two proposals, one from Atkins, who actually did the masterplan and there was a Joel Sampson proposal in there as well. So there are actually three plans out there that this board should be being considered. Like I said I think we are further apart then we were. We still have several other variables that we need to consider tonight as well. We still have an environmental issue that hasn't been cleared yet. This hasn't gone before the County commission yet, it hasn't been voted on yet. So that's another big deal before we even consider moving this thing forward. I think the County commission needs to have a discussion and vote. So here we are, right back where we were a month later. I want to suggest again that whoever designed the County plan and the designers of the downtown masterplan, those stakeholders need to come together along with the CRA representatives, the City representatives and the County representatives; they need to come together and see if they can take these two plans and mesh them together for another option for us to consider.

Bernard Piawah/Planning Director – As the Planning Director for the City I was in charge of the preparation of the downtown masterplan. There are two concepts we had for that particular plan. As far as the City is concerned, that is the only viable open space for economic development we still have in the downtown. When we came up with the concept we had a purely economic development concept then we had a citizen, Joel Sampson, that insisted that his view be a part of that plan, which incorporated some aspects of the community. What we had in mind was, when it came time actually do the work, we would try to marry both concepts. The concept from the County is becoming the third concept. In my view there is something called land use compatibility. I have been thinking, how compatible is a Veterans Memorial with an active commercial site. Maybe if we study some more and try to be more creative we can make it work. But in my head, I kind of see it as incompatible.

Mr. Sapp – I am like Member Gay, I would like for this plan to be in perspective that there is money for this development. These other plans, I would like to see where the money is coming from for each of these developments. It would only exercise the right for it not to be another delay for a five year plan for some development in our city.

Member Elias – As I sat here and listened to everybody, I tuned in to what Member Gay was saying and what Mr. Piawah was saying. Member Gay stole some of my thunder, I had made some notes and I agree that given where we are right now, what started out as a seemingly good idea now I'm kind of leery of it. Kind of leery of giving up the property for

one thing. We spent right at \$200,000 for the property, we acquired the property, although I voted against it because it's contaminated (I'll come back to that). We acquired the property with something in mind. In the interim someone else has come up with something in mind and we thought we could mesh those things together. It seemed like a good idea. As I said before, I agree with the concept. Still in the forefront of my mind is that the property is contaminated. We're going to have to be very careful of what we put out there, whether it's a monument, whether it's a park, kiosks, whatever it's going to be, if we can put those things out there at all. Now if I remember correctly I thought we were supposed to hear something by the end of 2017 regarding the cleaning up of the property. Is that correct? Answer: Manager – That is correct.

Elias - Now to this date have we heard that the property is free and clear of any contaminants? Answer: Manager – They delayed it due to weather conditions. It is now set for April.

Elias - So, we're still discussing some things and we don't exactly know when they're going to have it cleared up. We started out with a plan, although I must admit that I disagreed with that plan, but we are where we are now. As I listen to the people who came up and I see who attended the charrette, who had the County, you had Main Street, you have veterans and citizens and maybe somebody from the City, and now we're losing control of what we started out with. Seems to me we might need to go back to where we started and start from the beginning and proceed with what we had in place. As it related to the monument, we are under no requirement to go forward, this was presented to us as an opportunity to work collaboratively with the county. It's a wonderful idea to work with the county on such an endeavor but we already had something in mind. Is a monument needed, would it be nice? Yes. Is this the proper time and place to put it? I'm not so sure about that now, but I do know we that we have a piece of contaminated property that we paid \$200,000 for, that's just sitting there and nothing is happening with it now. So be it right, wrong or indifferent, I think we need to proceed. We've heard from everybody else. We need to come together and we need to go ahead and make a final decision.

Member McMillan – He was the one that spearheaded the purchase of the property for the sole purpose of trying to move forward with the downtown master plan. We had letters from different people stating why we were buying the property, doing this for extra parking, doing this for extra green space downtown. We get the property bought and then the County wants to invest \$50,000 into it and take it over as their own. I attended the charrette, we were told in that meeting that \$50,000 would get that done. We were told earlier tonight by a speaker that we know where that money is coming from. Well \$50K isn't getting it done. Just to tear up that concrete on the existing lot is \$15K, you do the planning and you are almost at \$50K already. You can not do it for \$50K, anyone with construction knowledge knows that. We have been told also by our CRA Director that there are grant funds out there for us to be applying for and we've seen no movement there. A veterans memorial and a marketplace, I agree, are incompatible. The County in 2009 dedicated the courthouse square as a Veterans Memorial. Registered with the United States government as a Veterans Memorial. They have property they can invest their \$50,000 in right now. Why they want this property for free, I don't know, it doesn't seem exactly right. I don't feel like this data that came back to us is exactly accurate, I sat through the whole meeting and personally the overwhelming majority asked for what was currently in the downtown master plan, that we voted on to purchase the property on that basis. That is what was represented in the charrette. I don't agree with the way this was handled. I have pictures to prove it on my phone with exactly the recommendations of what everyone thought was positive and wasn't positive. I can

certainly provide that as public record if needed. We have a citizen that is willing to match the \$50K out of private funds into this project which we can leverage as a grant to finish the project. Then the county would have their \$50K to do this on another piece of property. In fact one county commissioner, I watched the meeting the other night, said specifically the County should not be in the business of giving away its property and they're asking us to do that. I can't agree with that whatsoever. Until some more things get ironed out I definitely can't vote positively for it. I would donate personal money towards a veterans memorial but I can't say that it is compatible with the marketplace vision that was put together. I went to those downtown master plan meetings. I was one of the only commissioners there for the city and county. The marketplace and parking was exactly what everybody wanted in those meetings. It was one of the few things in the downtown master plan that was achievable. This is something we can achieve, in my opinion we ought to trying to achieve that. For someone to come in here later after we have done all this leg work and tell us what we should do with our property or try to put pressure on us to do something with our property using the veterans as the purpose I don't appreciated it personally.

Member Elias – Pointed out that the funds are being donated to Main Street.

Mr. Sink/Main Street – Assured the board that the funds would be designated funds, earmarked for this project.

Member Sapp – I am just leery of someone wanting to donate private funds. Concerned this may come back to haunt us.

Member Dowdell – Feels this whole thing can be worked out but it takes people who are willing to work together. Needs to be a collaboration between everybody that's involved. Instead of just giving us the information like they did, they need to be coming up with what they want to see and how we going to do it. I don't think this \$50K from a private donor or county is going to make a difference until we decide what do we want. I don't know if we need another meeting or workshop or something, it needs to be a meeting of the minds with everybody that's involved. We asked you to go out and invite all these folks and you did exactly what we told you to do but we didn't give you direction as to what to bring back to us. I think right now we need to tell you what we expect and what we want.

Member Elias – I tend to disagree with Member Dowdell on this one, I think the first thing we need to decide if we want to partner with the county in this Veterans Monument thing. Last meeting we just talked about it, we didn't vote. We need to say yes or no, we need to say we are in for the long haul to make this happen, then I think we can give Ms. Davis some specific directions. But at this time we are spinning our wheels and seems like we are going in five different directions. So I think the first thing that we need to do is see if it's in the best interest of the CRA and the money we have expended and for the sake of the City, if that's what we want to do. I think that should be the first step and I think that is something we could probably do tonight.

Member Dowdell – I don't have a problem with that but I think if we ask around this table if we want to donate this land to the county that we would get a majority no. May be wrong but that's going to be the determining factor of whether or not this partnership is going to happen. I guess the county needs to come and say if we don't donate you the land would you still want to what you want to do, regardless. I don't see us donating the land. I guess

it's in the county's ballpark right now, maybe we need to take a vote on whether or not we are willing to donate the land to the county or to anybody.

Member Sapp – Asked for copy of County's Resolution regarding veteran's monument. Provided by Chair McMillan.

Member Elias – I think that Member Dowdell and I are saying the same thing in different ways. Does this board want to proceed with some type of collaborative partnership with the county as it relates to the Kelly property. Member Dowdell brought up the fact that in doing so we would probably have to relinquish that property. We are putting more pressure on ourselves than need be, this was a suggestion from the county. It sounded like a good idea, perhaps it's still a good idea. Maybe this property is not the property to put it and maybe this is not the time for the partnership to do the monument there. But we need to decide because if we don't decide tonight, this board only meets once a month and as Mr. Sapp said nothing is happening at this point. We need to leave here tonight after being here for about an hour with some sense of direction.

Chair McMillan asked for clear direction to the manager.

Motion by Member Gay to continue with the current plan found in the City of Quincy master plan and not continue with partnership with the County on their plan. Seconded by Member Elias. Motion carries with a vote of 4-1 with Member Dowdell as a nay.

Manager Davis asked for clarification as to which plan the board is referring too, as there are a couple of options in the master plan. One is a parking structure, one is parking with a welcome center and the third had live to work units. Do you want me come back and have meetings on those three or do guys want to determine where to go next? Direction is still needed.

Member Gay – I just want to be certain that we budgeted no dollars for this project.

Chair McMillan – Not specifically for this project but we do have \$350K set aside for downtown catalyst projects.

Member Gay – Ok but no funds have been earmarked for that project. That discussion should be held first, whether we are earmarking dollars for that. I would like to see this contamination cleared before we move forward with that discussion.

Member Sapp – I believe that's why we didn't earmark any money because it's still contaminated and we hadn't gotten those reports in yet. I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Member Dowdell – Clarification, we did not set aside \$350K just for that area but as downtown catalysts projects.

Member Elias asked the board to consider what will we do if the property is not cleaned up? It was noted by the Chair that the State is obligated to complete the cleanup.

Manager Updates

Subdivision signage – This item was mentioned during the last meeting and as requested the manager provided a list of those names. The board will need to review the list and let the manager know what names you would like to have signs for.

CRA copier replacement – Provided two quotes to replace the current copier that is past its last leg. Motion by Member Gay to upgrade CRA copier. Seconded by Member Sapp. Motion carries with a vote of 5-0.

CRA Attorney Updates

None

Board Member Comments

Dowdell – None

Gay –None

Elias – None

Sapp – None

Chair McMillon – None

Adjournment–Motion by Member Sapp to adjourn, seconded by Member Dowdell, motion carries 5-0. Meeting adjourned 5:58pm.