Redevelopment Commission Meeting Minutes Tuesday, November 1 2016 Greenville, North Carolina

 Present: ✓ Angela Marshall ✓ Jeremy King ✓ Judy Siguaw 	 □ Tracie Gardne ✓ Patricia Dunn □ Richard Patte 	l	Sharif Hatoum
Absent: Angela Marshall Jeremy King Judy Siguaw	 Tracie Gardne Patricia Dunn Richard Patte 	-	□ Sharif Hatoum
 Staff: ✓ Merrill Flood □ McClean Godley (City Council □ Roger Johnson ✓ Tom Wisemiller 	Liaison)	 Christian Loc Betty Moseley David Holec Ben Griffith 	•

I. Welcome

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2016

Motion was made by Ms. Marshall and seconded by Ms. Siguaw to approve the meeting minutes from October 4, 2016 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. Request from CommunitySmith, LLC to Extend the Closing Date on the Uptown Theatre Property Transaction

Mr. Wisemiller presented a request from CommunitySmith, LLC to extend the closing date on the Uptown Theatre property transaction. Originally, the closing was to be 60 days from the approval of the sale. CommunitySmith, LLC has made significant progress, but must complete a few additional steps that were attached to the property. They need to complete exempt recombination process for the small parcel at the rear of the property and remove title exceptions. Extending the closing to December 31, 2016 will allow sufficient time to complete these steps and likely ensure no additional extensions are necessary.

Mr. King stated that the small parcel, approximately 20 feet wide, needed to be surveyed and recombined to the larger parcel. This is a legitimate request.

Mr. Holec stated that the contract does provide extension upon mutual agreement by both parties.

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Commission approve the request from CommunitySmith, LLC to extend the closing date on the Uptown Theatre property transaction to December 31, 2016.

Motion was made by Ms. Siguaw and seconded by Ms. Marshall to approve the request from CommunitySmith, LLC to extend the closing date on the Uptown Theatre property transaction to December 31, 2016. Motion carried unanimously.

V. Discussion of the Small Business Plan Competition Winter of 2016 Grant Cycle

Mr. Wisemiller stated that after the July cycle for the Small Business Plan Competition, there was \$10,000 remaining in the budget for this program for fiscal year 2016-17. Grant awards have typically been \$15,000. \$40,000 has already been budgeted to this program for fiscal year 2017-18 for the next two SBPC grant cycles. The RDC SBPC committee recommends rolling over the current \$10,000 in funds, so that \$50,000 will be available for the next two grant cycles. If the RDC rolls over the current \$10,000 in funds, the program could fund three \$15,000 awards during fiscal year 2017-18.

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Commission rollover the remaining \$10,000 in fiscal year 2016-17 funding to the Small Business Plan Competition funds for fiscal year 2017-18, as per the recommendation of the Small Business Plan Competition Committee.

Mr. King stated that originally the RDC used bond funds to support the Small Business Plan. Once the bond funds ran out the program has been supplemented by City Council on a year-to-year basis. This program has been very successful. Applicants can be awarded \$15,000 for meeting basic requirement and possibly up to \$30,000 for capital requirements.

Motion was made by Mr. Hatoum and seconded by Ms. Siguaw to rollover the remaining \$10,000 in fiscal year 2016-17 funding to the Small Business Plan Competition funds for fiscal year 2017-18, as per the recommendation of the Small Business Plan Competition Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. Discussion of the GO Science Lease Committee

Mr. Wisemiller stated that at the October 4th, 2016 RDC meeting, the board voted to form a committee to discuss the conditions of a new lease agreement with GO Science. The committee is to consist of two board members from RDC and two board members

from GO Science. The next steps are to select the two RDC committee members and schedule the first meeting with GO Science representatives.

Mr. King stated that the lease committee will have the authority to negotiate any parameters for the lease. The lease will still need to be approved by the board.

Ms. Dunn stated that the last thing the board wanted was to see an organization fail. The board should be willing to make the accommodations necessary to ensure they succeed. At the last meeting, they were able to show a list of the things they had done and a list of the people serviced. The recommendations made last time was to help them be successful.

Mr. King stated that in his opinion, GO Science has already failed. He will keep an open mind and will consider any recommendation made by the lease committee. As far as the lease goes, the committee should put forth parameters that they are looking for in a lease.

Mr. Wisemiller stated that at the last RDC meeting, there was discussion regarding setting forth measurable parameters.

Mr. King stated that the lease committee should negotiate the lease with two of their representatives. They need to be able to agree to common grounds which should include the parameters the committee feels necessary. There should be some performance requirements. Examples include: 1. Hire someone who has a science background, preferably someone with a science education background. 2. Be in compliance with all wage and hour act rules and all legislation. You should be able to provide a certified opinion letter from an attorney stating that your wage practices are in compliance with the law. 3. Provide RDC with audited financial statements from an independent auditor.

Ms. Marshall asked Mr. King if he would consider getting with the lease committee, since he has experience with lease agreements and can articulate the expectations, beforehand to list the expectations.

Mr. King replied that he would suggest a one week window to meet with the committee to suggest expectations for the lease.

Ms. Dunn stated that since the committee is comprised of volunteers, then the schedule should accommodate their time. If the parameters are going to be determined by Mr. King, then there is no need for two other volunteers to sit down with GO Science just to have a conversation about the agreement.

Ms. Marshall stated that she saw this as a negotiation, not just a conversation. At the conclusion of the meeting, she expects there to be a clear path regarding the expectations for the GO Science lease.

Ms. Siguaw stated that she felt RDC was trying to manage GO Science and that it was not appropriate. We should either say yes you are doing what we want and move forward

or no to the lease, but to say what we want in regards to their management or who is hired is over-stepping the boundary.

Mr. King stated that it was the job of the landlord to decide if they were qualified tenants. It is our job as landlord to decide if they can meet the requirements of the lease.

Ms. Dunn stated that according to the minutes from the last meeting, a motion was made stating, "that a subcommittee be formed consisting of two board members from the Redevelopment Commission and two board members from the GO Science Board to discuss the conditions of a new lease agreement." She suggested that RDC proceed with implementing that motion.

Ms. Marshall stated that once the lease committee is formed, then all of the other concerns will be addressed. The committee will discuss the terms of the lease. They will not tell them how to run their business. We can put certain parameters and performance guidance as terms of the lease. During the meeting when this motion was made, GO Science was present and did not disapprove of the motion.

Mr. Holec stated that it was a common provision for a lease to state that the tenant will comply with all Federal, State and Local laws.

Mr. King asked if it was also a provision to require a nonprofit to submit audits once a year.

Mr. Holec replied yes, that is a provision allowed.

Mr. King asked if it would be a reasonable provision, or a clause, to require the business to be open for a certain number of hours.

Mr. Holec replied yes.

Mr. King asked if it would be a reasonable provision in the lease to require them to be able to meet their financial requirements for expanding.

Mr. Holec replied yes that can be included.

Mr. Flood stated that the board could either inform the committee of their concerns tonight, or the committee could meet with GO Science and bring the results back for discussion and/or approval.

Motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Ms. Marshall to appoint Ms. Angela Marshall and Mr. Sharif Hatoum to the Lease Subcommittee to negotiate the lease and report back to the board. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Marshall requested that the other board members send their concerns to her and Mr. Hatoum via email.

VII. Public Comment Period

No comments were received.

VIII. Report from Secretary

a. Monthly Financial Report

Mr. Flood gave the monthly financial report.

IX. Comments from Commission Members

No comments were received.

X. Adjournment

Motion was made by Ms. Dunn and seconded by Ms. Marshall to adjourn the Redevelopment meeting at 6:38 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

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