



**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
FINAL OFFICIAL MINUTES
Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment
Agency (CRA)**

South Dade Government Center
Room 203
10710 S.W. 211 Street
Miami, Florida

January 28, 2008
As Advertised

Harvey Ruvin, Clerk
Board of County Commissioners

Kay Madry Sullivan, Director
Clerk of the Board Division

Jill Thornton, Commission Reporter
(305) 375-2505



**CLERK'S SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES
NARANJA LAKES
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA)
JANUARY 28, 2008**

The Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Board met in the South Dade Government Center, Room 203, 10710 S.W. 211 Street, Miami, Florida, at 6:00 p.m., January 28, 2008; there being present upon roll call: Mr. Rene Infante, Mr. Moe Hakssa, Mr. Stuart Archer and Mr. Kenneth Forbes; (Mr. Parsuram Ramkissoon and Ms. Marlene Volkert were late); (Chairperson Nina Betancourt and Mr. Danny Lipe were absent); Assistant County Attorney Mandana Dashtaki; Mr. Mike Iturrey, CRA Coordinator; Mr. Jason Rodriguez, CRA Analyst, Office of Strategic Business Management; and Deputy Clerk Jill Thornton.

I. Meeting Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Forbes called the CRA Board meeting to order at 6:08 p.m., and noted as a quorum was not present, the Board would consider informational items first.

There being no objection, the following agenda items were considered out of order.

IV. Open Forum for Public Comments

Mr. Forbes opened the floor for public input and the following person(s) appeared:

Mr. Phillip Murray, 13248 SW 256th Terrace, appeared before the CRA and referred to a newspaper article stating a number of Miami-Dade Housing Agency (MDHA) representatives had been transferred under the supervision of the State Department - Housing Urban Development (HUD). He asked whether the CRA planned to follow-up with the status of those promises made by MDHA representatives last year, in response to concerns expressed by the residents of the Villages of Naranja.

Mr. Leonard (Len) Anthony, 14020 Naranja Lakes Boulevard, appeared before the CRA and noted he had expressed concern at several CRA meetings regarding the lack of street lighting in the Naranja Lakes area, and was aware of two responsible entities, FPL and the Department of Public Works, but nothing seemed to transpire. Mr. Anthony stated he felt this was unfair to the residents living in the area that pay the Street Lighting tax. Mr. Anthony also expressed concern that the following terms in the NLCRA Redevelopment Plan had not been honored: 1) annual public workshops and status reports to be provided to the public on the CRA District's programs/projects; 2) workshops to be conducted for receiving input and discussion from property owners, citizens and interested parties on strategies/issues relating to local redevelopment activities; 3) Australian Pines damaged by Hurricane Andrew along Naranja Lakes Boulevard to be removed; and 4) a community facility, available to all existing communities within the NLCRA District, to be provided at the intersection of SW 145th Avenue and Naranja Lakes Boulevard.

Mr. Anthony referred to one of tonight's agenda items entitled "Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Community Urban Center (CUC) District," and expressed concern that the Planning Department's public hearing notice for this CUC did not include Naranja Lakes as part of the official name. He noted he was not opposed to the deduction of the Charrette since the CUC District was needed; but excluding Naranja Lakes from the official name was a major concern since the Leisure City CUC District included a huge portion of the Naranja Lakes jurisdiction, and he felt that Naranja Lakes should have been included.

Mr. Archer noted the CRA reached out to the community by advertising and conducting an open house and workshops to provide opportunities for public input. He further noted the CRA also was involved in the design and development of the County's Park, Library and other facilities near SW 280th street. Regarding the official name of the CUC District, Mr. Archer said he felt the content of the Charrette was more important than the name.

Mr. Anthony stated he felt that open houses were not structured to receive constructive input or reflect what was generally expressed at public workshops, which were more community oriented; nor were they advertised as well.

Mr. Hakssa commented that in addition to the open house, the CRA advertised and conducted four workshops at the Naranja Community Center, in which a very small portion of the community responded.

Mr. Infante noted the CRA should continue its efforts to reach out to the residents by conducting more workshops.

Mr. Forbes questioned why the Zoning public hearing notices for the Leisure City CUC District excluded Naranja Lakes from the official name. He noted he recalled the Charrette was called the Leisure City Charrette when it was established, but later discussed adding Naranja Lakes. In addition, he noted he recalled Mr. Albert Gonzalez, a former County Planner, had come before this CRA to state that Naranja Lakes should be included in the name, which the CRA supported. He stated he felt Naranja Lakes should be included and advised he would ensure that future zoning notices for this CUC District would include Naranja Lakes in the official name. Mr. Forbes also noted the CRA would take under advisement the remaining concerns expressed by Mr. Anthony and Mr. Murray.

There being no other persons wishing to speak, the open forum was closed.

Upon arrival of a quorum, the CRA proceeded to consider the balance of tonight's agenda.

II. Approval of the Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Archer that the November 26, 2007 NLCRA Meeting minutes be approved as presented. This motion was seconded by Mr. Infante, and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Forbes requested tonight's agenda be amended to include a presentation by Mr. Gerald Valent under New Business as Item VII f.

It was moved by Mr. Archer that tonight's agenda be approved as amended to include a presentation by Mr. Gerald Valent under New Business, as requested by Mr. Forbes. This motion was seconded by Mr. Infante, and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

V. Old Business

Community Policing

Sergeant Ozzie Hernandez, Miami Dade Police Department, Cutler Ridge District, provided an overview of the monthly community policing report entitled "Naranja Lakes CRA Initiative Monthly Progress Report," dated January 22, 2008. He advised that over 200 arrests were made by his department in the CRA District last year, and that all officers were required to submit a Cost Recovery Form with every arrest for the purpose of collecting restitution from a convicted defendant for the cost of the arrest. He noted the Recovery Costs collected for arrests made within the CRA District were previously allocated to the MDPD Cutler Ridge District; however, he was working with the MDPD's legal department, the CRA's Legal Counsel and County staff to have some of those costs allocated to the CRA.

Mr. Iturrey noted staff would explore the possibility that the restitution amounts from last year's arrests could be quantified and recovered as well.

Sergeant Hernandez noted the Recovery Form included a section for listing the arresting officer that would be modified to list the CRA District as well. He advised that he had begun tracking all arrests made within the CRA District.

Mr. Archer expressed concern with the street lighting condition on SW 144th Avenue and asked Sergeant Hernandez to explore and determine what types of assistance the MDPD could provide to resolve this issue.

Sergeant Hernandez noted MDPD had the ability to address broken lighting on poles that already exist; however, the Public Works Department (PWD) would have to address the installation of additional street lights. He pointed out that the PWD staff made a presentation at a previous CRA meeting, and agreed to identify SW 144th Avenue as a public road entitled to street lighting.

Heritage Report

Mr. Iturrey advised that Mr. Patrick Brown, Miami-Dade Housing Agency (MDHA), was now under the supervision of the HUD Administration, and had not provided this month's status report on the Heritage Village Project. Mr. Iturrey noted he would continue his attempt to obtain the report and would provide a copy to CRA members once he received it.

Mr. Archer noted this project had been ongoing for some time and several units remained vacant that could be utilized by people in the community. He stated he felt County staff needed to take action to get this project completed.

Mr. Infante suggested the new Oversight Administrator for HUD be invited to attend a CRA meeting to discuss and work with the CRA on the Heritage Village issues. He noted HUD's Administration had the same responsibility as the MDHA concerning this project.

Mr. Forbes referred to a newspaper article stating that MDHA administrators were removed from the Department. He stressed the fact that HUD had taken over MDHA and that the CRA no longer had a contact person. Mr. Forbes noted he felt some action should be taken by the CRA concerning this project since the CRA was responsible for providing the community with answers. He also expressed concern that MDHA representatives who previously came before this CRA, made promises they knew they could not keep.

Mr. Archer noted MDHA Administrators were still being paid while the Heritage Village Units remained vacant and people remained homeless. He stressed that something was seriously wrong with this program.

Update on General Old Business

Current re-zoning applications in CRA

Mr. Iturrey noted the most current re-zoning application submitted for property within the CRA District was a Director's application by Miami-Dade County for the Leisure City Community Urban Center (CUC) District. He noted this application was related to tonight's agenda item entitled "Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette" under New Business, which would be addressed by the Department of Planning and Zoning staff later in tonight's meeting.

Mandarin Lakes

Mr. Forbes noted staff forwarded each CRA member, an e-mail from DR Horton, Inc regarding the Mandarin Lakes Sales and Closings Report. He asked if any representatives from DR Horton Inc, were present to provide further information.

Mr. Karl Albertson, Land Acquisitions Manager, D.R. Horton, Inc., appeared before the CRA and noted the total sales and total closings had increased by nine (9) over the past two months.

Mr. Archer questioned why the fence around the property adjacent to the Mandarin Lakes Development had been removed, where much dumping was occurring there again.

Mr. Albertson noted DR Horton Inc, did not own that property, but had an option agreement with the property owner to rent the fence, and the fence was removed to reduce expenses.

In response to Mr. Infante's question regarding the name of the party whom DR Horton negotiated with to rent the fence, Mr. Albertson noted the name of the property owner was Capital West (CW).

Mr. Archer noted for the record, that the subject property was located between SW 280th Street and 272nd Street, from SW 145th Avenue east to the Canal.

Mr. Iturrey noted staff would need to contact Team Metro regarding dumping in this area.

Responding to Mr. Hakssa's inquiry concerning the cost to rent the fence, Mr. Albertson stated he believed the cost was between \$600 and \$900 per month.

Upon conclusion of discussion, Mr. Forbes asked the CRA Board to reconsider the order of the agenda and move up the presentation by Gerald Valent to follow the Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette, Agenda Item VII a.

Mr. Iturrey clarified the presentation by Gerald Valent would follow Agenda Item VII a. and be identified as Item VII a.(1) as opposed to Item VII f, noted during the approval of the agenda.

VII. New Business

a. Leisure City / Naranja Lakes Charrette and Community Urban Center District

Mr. Thomas Spehar, Community Planning Acting Chief, Department of Planning and Zoning (DP&Z), introduced Mr. Gianni Lodi as project manager of the Leisure City Charrette, established in 2004.

Mr. Gianni Lodi, Community Planning Principal Planner, DP&Z, provided CRA members with two handouts entitled "Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette Area Plan Report Executive Summary" and "Director's Application for Zoning Public Hearing." He explained that when the Leisure City Charrette held a design workshop in October 2004, the Charrette's name was extended to include Naranja Lakes, which remained the Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette today. Mr. Lodi noted the County Commission received the Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette report in July 2006 and directed County staff to implement the recommendations, which prompted DP&Z's Land Use Planning Staff to initiate creation of the ordinance.

Mr. Lodi noted in November 2007, the County Commission adopted the ordinance establishing the Leisure City Community Urban Center (CUC) District, which was how this district was known in the Comprehensive Planning process. He noted the areas encompassed by the Charrette remain the same as the areas listed in the report received by the County Commission in 2006. Mr. Lodi explained the steps in the process were first to process the application, then conduct the public hearing before the Developmental Impact Committee (DIC), and finally, to hold the Zoning Hearing for re-zoning of the Leisure City CUC District, which should be held sometime in late March or early April of 2008.

Mr. Lodi noted the new Leisure City CUC District would implement most of the Charrette's recommendations and would be a transit-oriented development district that bordered on the transit corridor and corresponded with the NLCRA Redevelopment Plan. He noted this CUC District involved high density development, and staff used the Charrette's input to streamline and direct development according to the community's requests. Mr. Lodi noted an application for changes to the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) was not necessary since high density was already approved for this area. He noted staff looked forward to working with the community in the hearing processes, and would be available to answer any questions or concerns regarding the new zoning CUC district.

Mr. Forbes stated he participated in the Leisure City, Naranja Lakes, and the Princeton Charrettes, and was aware of the process. He noted the purpose of the Charrette master plan was to involve the community's input and vision for future development of these areas, and the citizens believed their input was valid. He said that clearly the original name of the Charrette was Leisure City, but a large portion of that area encompassed Naranja Lakes, and those citizens' who participated in the Charrette came before the CRA to request the CRA's support to include Naranja Lakes in the CUC District name, and the CRA supported that request. Mr. Forbes stated he felt it was wrong not to include Naranja Lakes in the official title of the CUC District.

Mr. Lodi explained that the County Commission established the CUC District as the Leisure City Urban Center District (LCUCD) to avoid confusion with the existing Naranja Community Urban Center District (NCUCD), but this would not preclude Naranja Lakes from engaging in the LCUCD. He noted staff would pursue legal advice as to whether the CUC District's title could be amended to include Naranja Lakes.

Mr. Forbes emphasized that the community's desired was to include Naranja Lakes and staff should have informed the community of the confusion between the two CUC District names.

In response to Mr. Infante's question regarding a bump up in density score to 90, Mr. Lodi affirmed the density score was 90 for this CUC District area, as opposed to 60 in Princeton and that without the CUC District, the CDMP allowed a bump up in density for businesses and offices. Mr. Lodi noted this process began in 1999; however, the County Commission adopted a new CDMP in 2006 that established maximum density. He noted the new ordinance bumped the density up to 125 for the Model City Charrette, and that it was possible a future request could be made for additional density to the Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette area.

Mr. Infante commended the DP&Z Planning staff for all their efforts in the Charrette areas.

In response to a question by Mr. Hedge, DR Horton Representative, as to whether the LCUCD was an overlay or a replacement of the existing zoning, Mr. Lodi noted the CUC District was not an overlay, but once the re-zoning resolution was adopted by the Board, it would completely replace the existing zoning. He further noted the reason why the process was so difficult and time-consuming was that each parcel needed to be updated individually.

Following Mr. Infante's comments that he thought the Princeton and Naranja Lakes zonings were to be overlays, Mr. Lodi explained the County Commission decided against overlays but approved a CUC District, and staff grandfathered in all of the existing structures and uses.

In response to Mr. Hakssa's question regarding whether Business land uses were separated from Residential land uses, Mr. Lodi referred to an attachment in the Zoning Ordinance establishing the LCUCD that contained a Land Use Plan indicating the allowed land uses, and indicated that the mixed-use corridor allowed for all types of mixes.

a. (1) Presentation by Mr. Gerald Ballard

Mr. Gerald Valent appeared before the CRA and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to make this presentation. He noted when he came before the CRA approximately four years ago, he presented a project approved for affordable rental housing; but since then, the market changed and they decided to go forward with market rate housing. He advised that an approved site plan to build approximately 470 townhomes was presented before Community Council #15, but could not be sustained by the current economy. Mr. Valent noted he found that a majority of people in need of housing were of the essential workforce community (teachers, police officers); and that his office proposed to sell approximately 50 townhomes to the essential workforce community. He noted they applied for funding from the State's new Community Workforce Housing Innovation Pilot (CWHIP) program, which utilizes funds from programs operated by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation; and would allow them to market for-sale properties to essential workforce by granting a \$100,000 subsidy to anyone under the 140% medium income. Mr. Valent explained that in order to receive approval for the CWHIP subsidy, they needed community support and partnerships. He requested the CRA sign the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to be presented to the State that would endorse \$5 million to come into this community. Mr. Valent apologized for not presenting this request sooner but explained that he had been out on sick leave. He noted that signing the MOU would not affect the CRA's bonding capability and emphasized the need to have the MOU signed quickly.

Ms. Volkert questioned the total number of homes they planned to build over the initial 50 homes.

Mr. Valent noted a site plan was approved for the construction of 470 Homes, but he wanted to only build 50 homes given the current status of the housing market, and then build the balance as rental homes as initially planned to provide for mixed uses.

In response to Ms. Volkert' inquiry regarding the total acreage, Mr. Valent noted approximately 36 acres would be dedicated to develop this project using the subsidy, with housing prices ranging from \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Infante expressed concern that the Housing Bill required the applicant to enter into a public/private partnership, and asked Mr. Valent whether he was asking the CRA to become a partner. He also expressed concern with the impact of this project on the high-density zoning approved for the Leisure City/Naranja Lakes Charrette area. Mr. Infante stated he could not support this request if the law was clear in requiring a partnership.

In response to Mr. Zelkowitz' inquiry why the CRA was being presented with this request on the eve of the application deadline, Mr. Valent noted he was out on sick leave and could not say why this was not addressed earlier. He assured this would not impact the CRA's liability.

Mr. Zelkowitz stated he was aware of the CWHIP funding, and that he could not advise the CRA of the implications of creating a public/private partnership based on the document that Mr. Valent was asking the CRA to sign without knowing the nature or requirements of the public/private partnership.

Following Mr. Valent's explanation of the funding point system and the CRA's participation, Mr. Zelkowitz stated he would like to review this document first for any legal ramifications before advising the CRA on this matter. He noted however, that nothing prohibited the CRA from passing a motion to support the project, without having to sign the document.

Mr. Valent requested the CRA's permission to allow him to consult with his office and come back at the end of tonight's agenda to provide the CRA and Legal Counsel with additional information.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Valent reappeared and noted that after consulting with his office, they proposed to strike out any paragraphs referencing the Housing Bill and public/private partnerships, and to use the MOU as an attached exhibit to the application, which would only show that the CRA endorsed it. He noted the State would either discount it or require a public/partnership be initiated, for which he would come back before the CRA to get approval.

Mr. Zelkowitz noted he reviewed the changes as drafted, which appeared not to obligate the CRA in a public/private partnership, but he preferred to review this application, along with the State Statute for any hidden implications.

Both Mr. Infante and Mr. Archer expressed concern with signing this document, and suggested that Mr. Zelkowitz draft a letter of support.

Following discussion regarding the proposed MOU and changes, Mr. Zelkowitz advised that he had not reviewed the MOU, only the site plan presented tonight, and that he did not think it would be appropriate for the CRA members to sign the MOU. He noted, however, the CRA could pass a motion directing him to draft a letter of support for this project, which could be faxed immediately to the CRA Chairperson or Secretary for signature, and then forwarded to Mr. Valent.

Following further discussion, it was moved by Mr. Archer that Mr. Zelkowitz, Legal Counsel for the CRA, draft a letter of support on behalf of the CRA supporting the project as presented tonight (01/28). This motion was seconded by Mr. Ramkissoon.

In response to Ms. Volkert's inquiry whether the County's Planning and Zoning Department had approved the site plan, Mr. Valent noted the site plan was approved, and that they would go forward with this application, but the support of the CRA would help in obtaining the funds.

Following Ms. Volkert suggestion that the foregoing motion be amended to allow legal counsel to review the State Statute and add any appropriate clauses, Mr. Archer stated he would accept that amendment.

Mr. Ramkissoon noted his support of the proposed project and asked for clarification regarding the motion on the floor.

Mr. Iturrey clarified the intent was to make the MOU an exhibit of the application; and advised that he did not know what that would imply.

Mr. Forbes pointed out that pursuant to the interlocal agreement, the CRA could not obligate the County in anyway. He requested the advice of Assistant County Attorney Mandana Dashtaki as to whether the CRA's action regarding the MOU would obligate the County in anyway.

Assistant County Attorney Mandana Dashtaki advised that she had not seen this MOU prior to tonight, and did not have an opportunity to review it; and that she could not advise the CRA of any implications in the MOU that might bind the County or the CRA without first reviewing the application and the State Statute.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Board proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion and upon being put to a vote, the motion failed by a vote of 5-1. (Mr. Ramkissoon voted in support).

It was moved by Mr. Forbes that tonight's meeting be extended to complete the balance of the agenda. This motion was seconded by Ms. Volkert and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

b. Update on BCC approved CRA FY 07-08 Budget

Mr. Iturrey advised that the County Commission approved the CRA's proposed FY2007-08 Budget with no questions asked.

Responding to Ms. Volkert's inquiry regarding future bonding, Mr. Iturrey noted language was included in the proposed Budget, and staff informed the County Commissioners that the CRA would need to draw down on the Sunshine State Loan during this fiscal year.

c. Executive Director - Discussion

Mr. Infante noted now that the proposed budget was approved with funds to support the hiring of an Executive Director, he requested CRA members to support advertising this position.

Mr. Iturrey recommended the CRA work with its Legal Counsel and County staff in drafting a Request for Quotation (RFQ).

It was moved by Mr. Infante that the former Executive Director Subcommittee, which consisted of Mr. Stuart Archer, Ms. Nina Betancourt and himself, be re-established to work with the

CRA's Legal Counsel and County staff to draft an RFQ for an Executive Director. This motion was seconded by Mr. Archer for discussion.

Mr. Archer stated he believed the appropriate title for this position should be Executive Consultant rather than Executive Director.

Mr. Iturrey suggested the Subcommittee work with Legal Counsel and County staff to draft the job details first before coming up with an appropriate title.

Hearing no further comments or questions, the CRA proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion, and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

Following comments by Mr. Forbes and Mr. Infante regarding a timeframe for this meeting, it was moved by Mr. Forbes that this Subcommittee meet with Legal Counsel and County staff within seven to ten days from today.

Mr. Archer asked that the motion be amended to appoint one CRA member as an alternate member to the Subcommittee in the event one member was not unavailable.

Mr. Infante nominated Mr. Hakssa.

There being no objection, the CRA proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion as amended to appoint Mr. Hakssa as an alternate member to the Subcommittee in the event one member was unavailable and that the Subcommittee meets with Legal Counsel and County Staff within seven to ten days from today. Upon being put to a vote, this motion passed unanimously by those members present.

d. Villages of Naranja - Discussion

Mr. Iturrey advised that staff contacted Mr. Brian Myers of Richman Asset Management Inc, the new contact person who replaced Mr. Andrew Clauser, GP LLC, in the Tax Credit program. He noted Mr. Myers provided a report via e-mail addressing the current status of the Villages of Naranja issues, which was included in tonight's agenda package.

In response to Mr. Archer's inquiry regarding who were the responsible parties for oversight and legal action concerning the contract between the Richman Asset Management and Miami-Dade County, Assistant County Attorney Mandana noted she had not reviewed that contract, but would review it once she obtained a copy.

Mr. Iturrey explained that the funding structure for the State's Tax Credit Program was handled by Richman Asset Management Company and the County's Office of Community Economic Development (OCED) program. He noted a copy of the complaints and photos of the conditions of the Villages of Naranja had been forwarded to OCED's Director, Mr. Jose Cintron. Mr. Iturrey also noted that Richman Asset Management Company recognized this was a challenging project; however, Mr. Meyers indicated that after inspecting the site, he did not find the

conditions to be as stated in the complaints. He noted it seemed that Mr. Meyers was taking responsibility for the ongoing problems.

Mr. Infante noted that though Richman Asset Management Company had advanced more than \$1 million to improve this property, but they had not seen the results.

Mr. Archer noted the Fire Department and Team Metro needed to inspect this facility for safety code violations; that the CRA and Miami-Dade County had a responsibility to ensure action was taken to improve the unsafe conditions the residents were living in, and to ensure these units were brought to Code.

Mr. Forbes noted that Greater Miami Neighborhood filed for Bankruptcy under Chapter 11, and in anticipation of that bankruptcy, transferred all of their asset interests to two groups. He asked whether those assets transferred included the properties of the Villages of Naranja.

Mr. Iturrey stated he understood that Richman Asset Management Company had taken over the management of the tax credits program and someone else was managing the Villages of Naranja properties.

Mr. Forbes noted he visited the Villages of Naranja and found the conditions of these units to be deplorable; and that the County should not allow people to live in these conditions.

Following comments by Mr. Iturrey that the CRA could direct staff to draft a letter to the County Manager on the CRA's behalf expressing their concerns regarding the conditions of the Villages of Naranja; it was moved by Mr. Forbes that a workshop be scheduled on February 11, 2008 at the Naranja Neighborhood Community Center for the CRA and Legal Counsel to review the interlocal agreement and bylaws, and to see how public health issues at the Villages of Naranja could be addressed quickly. This motion was seconded by Mr. Archer, and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

Following further discussion, it was moved by Mr. Archer that staff proceeds with drafting a letter to the County Manager on behalf of the CRA, listing all CRA member's concerns for safety, health and maintenance issues at the Villages of Naranja. This motion was seconded by Mr. Infante, and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

e. Reduction of Letter of Credit and Letter Agreement Discussion

Mr. Iturrey provided a status report on the request by Naranja Lakes Construction, LLC (NLC) to reduce the Letters of Credit. He noted the CRA's Legal Counsel, Mr. Zelkowitz met with County staff and NLC Representatives to resolve all major issues concerning the Letter of Credit and negotiated a reduction, which was drafted and now in the process of being reviewed by the County Manager's Office for approval. He noted this request was handled in the same manner and format as the previous performance bond issue, and would be delivered to Mr. DeGuardiola for his signature before NLC proceeds with the remaining construction work.

Mr. Iturrey advised that the urgency to seek additional funding from the State Sunshine Loan had subsided somewhat since the projection for Cash Flows to cease in April 2008 would be delayed by three months. He noted, however, that staff was clear in its presentation of the CRA's proposed FY 2007-08 Budget to the BCC that the CRA would be seeking additional funding.

f. Non-Agenda

Mr. Ramkissoon, as business owner of House of Pancakes in the NLCRA district, appeared before the CRA to request the CRA's support for his business. He referenced a newspaper article regarding TIF monies to be used to aid and attract small businesses to the CRA areas, and to improve street lighting and landscaping. He noted several small businesses within the NLCRA District had gone out of business, and he was facing a similar situation, and may be out of business within 60 days if he could not provide payment for a business improvement loan. He requested any assistance that the CRA could provide would help keep him in business.

Ms. Volkert referred to past CRA meetings where discussion was held regarding establishing a Small Business Grants program and Mr. Ramkissoon had always spoke in support of the business community. She noted the key word in those discussions was "soon" and nothing had moved forward on this issue, yet businesses were failing.

Mr. Infante noted the current economy was not conducive to small businesses. He noted he had pushed for the CRA to establish a Small Business Grants program and hire an Executive Director to administer these programs. He stated he had hoped that staff would have developed the competitive application process, but this process needed to be transparent and Mr. Ramkissoon's business was one of many troubled businesses within the CRA District.

Mr. Ramkissoon noted he also pushed for this program long before he became a victim.

Mr. Archer noted he was aware of the County Commission's Mom and Pop Small Business Grant program and other funds provided by OCED that might assist. He also noted the CRA was presented with a budget for County staff to administer the CRA's Small Business Grants Program that was absorbent.

Mr. Iturrey clarified that when staff developed the Grants program, staff intended to minimize the number of applications in order to allow for a larger grant amount and less contracts to be managed. He concurred that the number of hours and cost for staff to administer these grants would be expensive.

Mr. Forbes emphasized that the CRA rejected staff's presentation of the Grants programs. He noted, however, that since the CRA was charged with assisting those areas considered to be slum and blight, it did not necessarily need to be conventional, but rather innovative.

Mr. Infante noted the primary reason for him pushing for the CRA to hire an Executive Director was due to the high cost of County staff administering the Small Business Grant program. He pointed out that the CRA voted to have CRA members meet within 7 to 10 days to discuss the advertisement of the RFQ for an Executive Director. Mr. Infante noted he could not support Mr.

Ramkissoon's request at this time because the CRA represents public monies and needed to be transparent.

Mr. Iturrey reminded CRA members that prior to him working with the CRA, the CRA received a \$75,000 allocation from Office of Community Economic Development (OCED) for small programs and staff approached OCED for guidelines to develop a Small Business Grants program, which was discussed.

Mr. Archer asked if the CRA could piggyback on the Commissioner's Mom and Pop Small Business Grant program.

Mr. Iturrey asked for clarification regarding this program or whether Mr. Archer was referring to the Commissioner's Discretionary Funds. He advised that staff had the ability to develop a similar program.

Following discussion among CRA members regarding the OCED guidelines, Mr. Zelkowitz advised that he would provide CRA members with the guidelines used by other CRAs for Commercial Beautification Grants programs. He noted these grants were administered through a simple agreement with property owners to ensure payment, and had been successfully administered by other CRAs.

Following Mr. Forbes comments that some businesses do not own the property in which their businesses reside; Mr. Zelkowitz advised that this program also addressed lessees, and included the property owner as part of the agreement.

Mr. Forbes asked that Mr. Zelkowitz forward those guidelines to all CRA members.

VII. Next Meeting Dates:

a. February 25, 2008 Regular Board Meeting

Mr. Forbes announced the next NLCRA Regular Board meeting would be held on February 25, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Board, the Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Kenneth Forbes, Acting Chairperson
Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency