

**Redevelopment Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, June 7, 2016  
Greenville, North Carolina**

**Present:**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angela Marshall | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tracie Gardner    | <input type="checkbox"/> Sharif Hatoum |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeremy King     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patricia Dunn     |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Siguaw                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Patterson |  |

**Absent:**

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Angela Marshall        | <input type="checkbox"/> Tracie Gardner    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharif Hatoum |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jeremy King            | <input type="checkbox"/> Patricia Dunn     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Siguaw | <input type="checkbox"/> Richard Patterson |   |

**Staff:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Merrill Flood              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Casey Verburg |
| <input type="checkbox"/> McClean Godley (City Council Liaison) | <input type="checkbox"/> Christian Lockamy        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roger Johnson              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Betty Moseley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Wisemiller             | <input type="checkbox"/>                          |
- 

**I. Welcome**

**II. Roll Call**

**III. Approval of Minutes – March 1, 2016**

Motion was made by Ms. Dunn and seconded by Ms. Marshall to approve the meeting minutes from March 1, 2016 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**IV. Consideration of Revision to Small Business Plan Competition Grant Guidelines**

Ms. Verburg stated that during the last meeting with the Small Business Plan Competition committee, two of the members suggested revising the guidelines to include leases. The revision would require applicants to include a copy of the lease or similar document that indicates intent when submitting for grant. The reason is because only two applicants in each designation are selected per round. The designations are Center City and West Greenville. Lease payment arrangement improves financial projections and cash flow analysis.

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Commission decide tonight whether to revise the Guidelines, so that staff can keep future applicants fully abreast of program requirements.

Mr. King asked if there have been issues prior.

Ms. Verburg replied that there has been an increase in interest in the program. Many of the applicant in the last round had no locations. They were immediately disqualified because only two applicants per designation can be awarded. Currently they do submit a lease before receiving a benefit.

Ms. Marshall asked if the applicants from the last two rounds were existing businesses or new ones. If they are existing, then there is a good likelihood that they do have leases.

Ms. Verburg replied most were existing businesses. There were a couple that were new that either had a location in mind or had conditions involved.

Mr. King stated that part of the purpose of the small business plan is to have businesses expand or relocate to the designated areas or to open a business in the area. However, on the scoring sheet, the business that either is currently located in the area or has a lease in the area will score higher than the one willing to locate in the area provided they receive the grant. According to the revision request, if the applicant has a letter of intent that includes the terms and rent, then they will not be required to have a fully executed lease.

Ms. Verburg replied correct. Additionally, the letter of intent must include the applicants' responsibilities.

Ms. Marshall asked if the letter of intent would state all of those things.

Ms. Verburg replied that the letter of intent must state same information for all applicants.

Mr. King stated that typically under a lease the tenant must be responsible for repairs, insurance, and other costs. There is not a shortage of leasable space in the West Greenville or Center City areas.

Ms. Verburg stated that the problems are not in the price but finding a building that meets their needs.

Ms. Dunn stated that having an understanding of the lease is basic good business. Most people will not commit to a lease if they do not understand what they are getting in to. We are awarding public money to people and we need to know as much as we can. If we award the money and they fail because they did not understand the lease, then that is not a win for anybody. It is only reasonable that they understand the terms and conditions, and if they don't, should we really be awarding them money.

Ms. Marshall stated that if she was starting a business she would find out how much it will cost her. She doesn't want to see the Small Business Plan Committee policing leases. There are lawyers and small business associations to assist with these questions. There should be a letter of intent to note which area they plan to go into.

Ms. Dunn stated to award money there must be some indication that they will be successful.

Ms. Verburg stated that if they are an existing business then they will submit prior tax forms for the business. If they are new, then they will submit personal tax records. Once they have been selected, they must submit a signed lease before getting any money. They also have to have a credit check done prior to the award.

Ms. Marshall stated that they also submit a five year plan /projection with their application. There is enough information submitted that you can find out if they have enough business sense to do what is submitted. You get to question everything they submit.

Mr. King stated that it was okay to request a signed lease before getting any money. However, for the application at minimum, a letter of intent; maximum a signed lease. We don't want something binding prior to the award.

Ms. Verburg stated that the concerns was location and the ability to pay the lease.

Ms. Dunn asked what the down side was to knowing this information.

Ms. Verburg replied that it may push people out further from applying immediately or at a specific time.

Mr. King asked if any of the successful applicants that went out of business attributed it to a bad lease.

Ms. Verburg replied that she was not aware of that happening.

Ms. Dunn asked what prompted staff to put this item on the agenda.

Ms. Verburg replied that the next round is July 1<sup>st</sup>. A Small Business Plan committee member made a request to make this a requirement.

Ms. Marshall asked if the requirement is approved, will the change be made in time for the July competition.

Ms. Verburg replied that the change would not be effective until August since City Council does not meet in July. The commission has the right to table this item until the next RDC meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Ms. Marshall to table consideration of revision to Small Business Plan Competition Grant guidelines until next Redevelopment Commission meeting. In favor of the motion was Mr. King, Ms. Marshall, Ms. Gardner, and Ms. Dunn. Opposed was Mr. Patterson.

## **V. Update of Merchants Parking Lot Design Study**

Mr. Wisemiller stated that at the last RDC meeting, members approved \$12,500 for a parking lot design study. The lot is located off of Washington Street, behind the theatre. The purpose for doing the lot improvements is to:

- Accommodate the Uptown Theatre's operational functions (tour buses, trucks)
- Upgrade the sanitation/utility infrastructure
- Increase efficiency of parking
- Make the lot more attractive, while supporting and complementing the adjacent business uses
- Build on existing improvements to Merchant's Alley

An outline for the project includes completing a parking lot study and conceptual redesign of the lot. Execute a contract with East Group for \$13,000, and then hold stakeholder meetings and seek input from business owners. Based on the study recommendations, staff might come back to RDC to request additional Center City Bond funds for final design and construction of the lot improvements

Mr. King asked what pot of money will be used to pay for the study.

Mr. Flood replied that the Brownfields grant is covering the theatre remediation which freed up RDC bond funds to cover other improvements.

## **VI. Update on Uptown Theatre Remediation and Building Stabilization Project**

Mr. Wisemiller stated that the remediation is going at a good pace. The goal of the remediation and stabilization is to remediate asbestos, lead-based paint surfaces, biological contamination, and removal of impacted materials, remove chimney, fly loft, utility building, and install a new roof. The project budget is \$290,000; \$125,000 is Brownfields sub-grant, \$165,000 is Center City Bond funds.

In February the Public Works Department selected IMEC Group, LLC as the low bidder (\$168,200) after completing all necessary reviews. The remediation work began in April. Interior environmental remediation is about two-thirds completed. Demolition is about half completed. There is a change order for ceiling removal.

Mr. King asked if there was a fund breakdown yet.

Mr. Wisemiller replied not yet.

## **VII. Update on the Imperial Site Brownfields Cleanup Project**

Mr. Wisemiller delineated the location and gave a project background. In April 17, 2008 the Imperial Site plant was gutted by fire. After the fire, there were several code violations and public safety concerns; however the former owner claimed financial hardship and could not correct the issues. On November 5, 2012, City Council approved for the Redevelopment Commission to purchase and remediate the property for one dollar. An additional \$1,033,000 payment would be due the owner after cleanup. An EPA brownfields grant was received in the amount of \$400,000. There was an additional match of \$80,000. Since that time, RDC has been facilitating the redevelopment of this property.

Cleanup Grant Timeline:

- 2013-2016: accepted cleanup grant, pre-cleanup planning, State of NC brownfields agreement
- 03/2016: Cardno selected HEPACO for on-site cleanup work (4 bids total)
- 07/2016: Cleanup work to begin, removing fuel tanks
- 12/2016: Estimated closeout
- 03/2017: \$1,033,000 payment due

The Imperial site has been a focal point of recent and ongoing redevelopment and economic development plans and initiatives:

- Strategic property acquisitions
- Dickinson Avenue corridor
- Parking for Sidewalk Development
- Virtual Building
- DFI/Mixed-use development

The Imperial site is about 6.82 acres. There have been additional parcels purchased bringing the total to 9.14 acres.

The Dickinson Avenue Market and Planning Study in 2014 noted some road realignment to accommodate GTAC. The study also recommended promoting makers spaces in this area.

Part of the site will be used for sidewalk development and permanent parking.

Ms. Dunn asked what SDG stood for.

Mr. Wisemiller replied sidewalk development.

Ms. Dunn asked why it had the word “students” attached to it.

Mr. Wisemiller replied because it will be mixed use for students and market rate. This is trying to break it down. The market rates will have on-site parking but the students will probably use the sidewalk parking.

Mr. Flood stated that about 70 spaces will be on site. However, that will not be enough to accommodate all the bedrooms. The remainder of the parking is within 300 feet.

Ms. Dunn asked if requirements still state that dormitories don’t have same parking requirements as other apartment complexes.

Mr. Flood replied yes, dormitories require .7 instead of .5.

Ms. Dunn stated that every student comes with a car. The parking in the downtown area needs to be addressed.

Mr. Flood stated that in the future the Board of Adjustment may consider additional standards regarding dormitory parking. For now, .7 will be the standard applied to these projects.

Mr. King stated that the theory is less people want to drive.

Ms. Dunn stated that they may not want to drive, but they will have a car for getting to some places. They will not walk to Raleigh or to the beach.

Mr. King stated that many students opt for sharing or using public transportation. Many start college young and don’t have a driver’s license.

Ms. Dunn stated that Sheppard Memorial Library and Jarvis Memorial Methodist Church complain about people parking in their lots.

Ms. Marshall stated that in her experience, the students are leaving their cars at home because the ECU buses are taking them wherever they want to go.

Mr. Flood indicated that the size of the parcel has the shape for a parking deck. Based on City Council approval this will allow a balance of parking spaces.

Ms. Dunn asked if NC DOT was finished with the pipeline work on Dickinson Avenue.

Mr. Flood replied that it was still ongoing.

Ms. Dunn asked if NCDOT planned to repair and repave Dickinson Avenue.

Mr. Flood replied that they do have it on their improvement list. They plan to resurface from Reid Street to Memorial Drive in 2018 or 2019, after the Tenth Street Connector project is complete.

Mr. King asked if commitments had been made to parking and sidewalk development.

Mr. Flood replied yes, an agreement has been signed.

Mr. King stated that the Redevelopment Commission currently owns the Imperial Site, for a dollar, but the site could go back to owner if he is not paid \$1,033,000. The City can either pay or allow it to go back. The RDC acquired it for Brownfields purposes. Based on the locations of the other properties owned by the RDC in that area, we will still have a voice in the development.

Ms. Dunn asked if the City Council recommend using fund balance to buy this site.

Mr. Flood replied that it was suggested. The work still needs to be finalized.

Mr. King asked if we have a recent appraisal. If so, what is the value since all of the improvements in 2012?

Mr. Flood replied that staff will have to get an updated appraisal prior to any developments. Once the cleanup is complete EPA will need to certify it.

## **VIII. Update on Uptown Alley Improvements**

Mr. Wisemiller gave the progress report for Hodges Alley. Public Works has noted that the drainage issues for this alley are rather complicated. Solutions for implementing this design concept have not been presented yet. As previously stated, Hodges Alley will not be open for vehicles. The plan is to install the archway, cleanup and level the alley while making it more attractive.

Mr. King asked if any of the drainage issues had anything to do with the Town Creek Culvert.

Mr. Wisemiller replied not that he was aware of; he suspected that the issue was more due to topography and the way the alley was designed.

**IX. Public Comment Period**

No comments were received.

**X. Report from Secretary**

**a. Monthly Financial Report**

Mr. Wisemiller gave the monthly financial report.

**XI. Comments from Commission Members**

No comments were received.

**XII. Adjournment**

Motion was made by Ms. Dunn and seconded by Mr. King to adjourn the RDC at 6:35 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

Thomas G. Wisemiller,  
The Economic Development Project Coordinator  
City of Greenville Community Development Department