



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Wendy Ellis, Chairman  
Andy Barber, Board Member  
Chris Cook, Board Member  
Marcus Herman, Board Member  
Tom Vani, Board Member

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Eddie Lebron, Vice Chairman  
Cindy Thurman, Board Member

**AGENCY STAFF**

Chuck Nelson, Executive Director  
Christine Schverak, Assistant County Attorney  
Cheryl Hurren, Interim Special Projects Coordinator

**GUESTS**

Liz Alward, Senior Legislative Aid, District 2 Commission Office  
Richard Webb, Beautification Committee  
Cindy Ciordia, Merritt Island Resident

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chairman Ellis called the workshop to order and completed a roll call of Board Members.

**PUBLIC COMMENT/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no public comments/announcements.

Chairman Ellis read the goals and actions from the April 17, 2017 Agency Board Meeting. The items listed were previously discussed at a meeting. She requested each Board Member comment for discussion or/or decisions. She noted that *“The goal of the Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program (Grant) is to improve the function and aesthetics of the Merritt Island Redevelopment Area (MIRA) by assisting commercial property owners in funding physical redevelopment and safety improvements to their existing properties. With the availability of matching funds through the Grant program, the improvements will have a positive visual impact on the community, reducing blight, and thereby increasing the economic benefits within the Redevelopment Area.”*

Chairman Ellis noted the following actions from April 17, 2017 Board Workshop for discussion at today’s CFIP workshop: *To draft language for grant program in conjunction with the Board motions and place on a future MIRA Board agenda for additional discussion and vetting of the following items:*

- a) Create a residential grant program specifically tailored for subdivision entrances for painting, landscaping and irrigation.
- b) Create or add to existing grant program irrigation and engineering services as eligible expenses.



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

- c) Create a program for disaster relief with signage being an eligible match for 6-12 months following the disaster.
- d) Allow an additional \$5,000 in bonus dollars for items previously on the ineligible list such as signage, lighting, and parking in a “bonus” matching grant, only after the initial \$15,000 matching Commercial Façade Grant has been completed.
- e) Place a MIRA façade grant sign on the property at the beginning of each Commercial Façade Grant project and ensure it remains throughout the project.

Chairman Ellis asked the Board Members to go around the table and discuss the following issues:

**I. Increasing the grant amount**

Director Nelson stated that increasing the grant amount is a Board decision. Board Member Vani commented he wants to keep the system processes simple. At the proper time, he wants to discuss irrigation as an eligible expense. Board Member Barber stated he would like to create a program for sub-division entrances. He doesn't believe the grant amount should be increased; he feels the MIRA Board should be good stewards of public money. Board Member Herman said MIRA needs to keep a positive visual impact, the visual part is important. He does not support increasing the grant amount. Board Member Vani stated that construction costs are more now than they were when the \$15,000 grant cap was implemented; he feels increasing the grant amount should be examined as costs are up, but not necessarily wages. Chairman Ellis said she agrees with Board Member Barber about being good stewards of the money, as MIRA always has been, however, she does not feel being a good steward is in opposition with increasing the grant amount. The Board discussed the following issues that had been previously raised:

- a) **Increase the grant amount for improvements with buildings that have more square footage.**

Director Nelson commented every building is going to be different and we should do continue with the current process. Board Members Barber, Herman, and Chairman Ellis agree that square footage should not be a consideration.

- b) **Implement a Rubric System, i.e., giving extra points, for redeveloping a vacant building.**

Director Nelson said he doesn't believe the Rubric System (point system) is necessary. He wants to keep it simple, although possibly extra consideration should be given for redeveloping an empty building. Board Member Herman and Chairman Ellis stated that they do not want to implement a rubric system.

- c) **Include professional engineering services as eligible expenses.**

Board Member Barber commented that if you include engineering and you don't increase the grant amount, it doesn't really benefit the applicant. He agrees with Director Nelson in that the process should be kept simple. Engineering & architecture should be eligible, but the \$15,000 grant cap should be retained. He does not want to start handing out \$20,000 grants. Board Member Herman does not want to include engineering as an eligible expense, commenting that if a big company is doing a big project, engineering could easily be \$10,000 alone. He believes small business owners know what they want to do and probably won't hire an engineer. It goes back to the history of the program in keeping it visual; if you can't see it, it's not eligible.



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

Chairman Ellis recommended that engineering could be part of a bonus category (e) and referred to the Marshall grant item for a roof. She knows that not everyone will tap into engineering services, but it could be an incentive to use an engineer and improve the appearance of facades. Inflation has incurred; she feels the amount of the grant could be improved and that MIRA still be a good steward of public money, as long as the oversight of the project remains. Director Nelson commented that architectural and engineering could possibly be included in a bonus category, which might take the appearance of the façade to the next level. Board Member Vani stated that he was involved in a Cocoa project without an engineer; had they used one, it would have been less trouble. He is 100% in favor of some sort of an ability to grant for professional services, possibly a bonus category that could be capped at a maximum of \$5,000.

Board Member Herman agreed with Board Member Barber; he feels that the grant program works and is not sure about an increase. He feels \$15,000 is a lot of money and that the Board does need to go any further. He does not believe an applicant would be discouraged by eliminating engineering from eligible reimbursement items. In regard to irrigation, is a requirement, however, MIRA is currently not paying for it as an eligible expense. The guidelines do not allow landscaping without irrigation. Board Member Herman stands firm on no increase in the grant amount. He feels a bonus category will be complicated and wants to keep it simple. He is OK with including engineering in the list of eligible expenses, but not in an “extra” category.

Board Member Vani commented that the main thing is that the MIRA Board still has control with a yea or a nay over how much grant money to award each applicant. He feels this money has come into Merritt Island and wants to see the money stay in Merritt Island, and that the more money that gets on the street, the higher the ROI. He feels the Board needs to consider a little more money, noting that \$15,000 is a lot, but a little higher amount may encourage someone and to have a professional involved, erring on the side of positive. He does not know how to propose it, possibly a category for professional services up to 50% with a cap of \$5,000. In other words, if the applicant spends \$5,000 on engineering and architectural services, they would be eligible for \$2,500 in matching grant funding. If they spent \$10,000 - \$30,000, they would only get the maximum match of \$5,000. He discussed raising the grant amount to \$17,500, noting that the Board does not need to go in \$5,000 increments. Everything's expensive, he wants to keep the money invested in Merritt Island businesses.

Chairman Ellis asked Board Member Vani if he wanted to see the \$5,000 in engineering/architectural services as a stand-alone category, or as part of the overall grant total. Board Member Vani replied that he sees it as a separate category. If he was coming in for a grant, he would apply for \$17,500. But if he used an engineer, he could get up to an additional \$5,000 for a total of \$22,500, noting again that the MIRA Board has the final say on approving each grant. Chairman Ellis reiterated Board Member Vani's position: an increase the grant amount to \$17,500; create an additional separate category for professional services up to \$5,000 which must be pre-approved, and the Board would approve a copy of the plans. Board Member Barber referred to the Marshall's drawing, stating it was probably just a CAD drawing. Board Member Barber asked if the Board really need to get into people's business; approving their plans and



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

their budget, stating that the Board should just make it an eligible expense instead of getting in the applicant's business and making judgement calls on their behalf. He noted that the Marshall's drawing was a \$250 drawing by a CAD operator.

Board Member Barber said no to a bonus category; yes, to engineering and architectural services as an eligible expense, and no to increasing the grant amount. Board Member Herman said he agreed with Board Member Barber and would like to make a compromise. He wants to include engineering in the list of eligible expenses; increase the grant amount to \$17,500 and not make it harder on anyone by keeping it simple. He wants to get rid of the bonus structure.

Chairman Ellis stated her concern is that someone could have a \$30,000 engineering plan and come in and never spend any of the grant money on improving their façade. Director Nelson stated that capping the A&E expense at \$2,500 is reasonable and that an architect that did the Marshall submittal. He does not believe A & E should be a disproportionate part of the grant, noting that \$2,500 would get the kind of drawing we saw in the Marshall submittal. Chairman Ellis noted that in a match situation, \$5,000 in A & E expense would get the applicant \$2,500 in a matching grant. Director Nelson appreciated Board member Herman's comments, stating that allowing an A & E line item would encourage better projects. Chairman Ellis asked Director Nelson if he thought increasing the amount to \$17,500 was reasonable. Director Nelson stated that it could be monitored and would be better than where we are now.

Board Member Vani also appreciated what Board Member Herman said, but noted that If MIRA was going to include professional architects and engineers, he would like to see the amount go to \$18,000, to put a little more in if we're going to include professional services. When Board Member Vani mentioned \$17,500 for the grant, it also included an additional \$5,000 match for professional services. He is open to keeping it simple and does not want to get into anyone's business. Chairman Ellis asked Board Member Vani if he could support \$18,000 as the total grant amount with a cap on professional fees of \$2,500 in matching funds and Board Member Vani replied yes. Board member Ellis added that she could support that as well. Board Member Barber stated that does not want to hold anyone's hand going through this process; he feels that going to \$17,500 won't be beneficial and does not see the advantage of going beyond \$15,000 in match. Board Member Herman stuck with his original proposal, stating that \$17,500 is enough for the matching grant, engineering should be eligible expense, and there should not be a bonus.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN TO RAISE THE COMMERCIAL FAÇADE GRANT AMOUNT FROM \$15,000 TO \$17,500, WITH \$2,500 OF THAT AMOUNT CAPPED AS BEING AN ELIGIBLE MATCH FOR ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL EXPENSES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BARBER AND PASSED 3 TO 1. BOARD MEMBER BARBER VOTED NO; BOARD MEMBERS HERMAN, VANI, AND CHAIRMAN ELLIS VOTED YES.**

Chairman Ellis asked the Board Members to go around the table and discuss their thoughts on the following:



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

**d) Review ineligible expenses that the Board may want eligible; i.e., lighting and parking lots as stand-alone-improvements.**

Board Member Herman stated possibly lighting and parking should be considered as not being stand alone. The reason these items are part of a more extensive project is because parking lots, signage requests could come in by themselves and receive the maximum grant amount without improving the façade, which is what the grant program is all about. That is why they're to be considered as "part of another project". He feels the verbiage needs to be improved so that the intent is still the same.

Chairman Ellis felt lighting should be eligible for any part of the grant as it was a safety issue. The CFIP line item has not been maxed out on the available grant program funding since she has been on the Board. She would like to see additional disbursement activity to benefit Merritt Island businesses who are willing to invest their own money. Board Member Vani stated lighting and parking should not be stand-alone improvements. Board Member Barber said lighting and parking should not be stand-alone projects. With no majority to make any changes, the Board moved ahead.

**e) Create a "bonus category" to facilitate additional improvements MIRA thinks are important to enhance blighted businesses, such as signage, lighting and parking lots.**

Board Members Herman and Barber said they would vote no on a bonus category. Board Members Vani and Ellis would vote yes. With no majority to make any changes, the Board moved ahead.

Charmin Ellis asked the Board to take action to adjourn the workshop until after the regularly scheduled meeting as there were audience members who had come to address the Board on agenda items from the regular meeting agenda. She suggested that after the regular meeting ended, the Board would reconvene the workshop.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER VANI TO TEMPORARILY ADJOURN THE WORKSHOP. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The workshop temporarily adjourned at 2:00 PM and reconvened at 2:50 PM.

Chairman Ellis noted that an item had been added to the Agenda: Discussion of the Park & Ride Lot Draft Ordinance; a memo dated January 31, 2018; and the recommendations made by the Planning and Development Department.

Director Nelson stated that in previous meetings MIRA has discussed the potential for seeing Park & Rides Lots for cruise parking, especially in this area of the county. Currently, the County doesn't have any specific way, except a requirement for "storage of parking", as a way to approve Park & Rides. Storage requirements do not negate the coming and going of cars on a daily basis, this is a different utilization. The County is making a revision to their latest ordinances to be able to create standards so they are compatible with neighborhoods; this draft ordinance is as a result of that. Director Nelson went through the provisions within the draft ordinance. The BoCC would be able to evaluate each Park and Ride application on an individual basis. Board Member Cook asked about the Board supporting the resolution and



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

ordinance. Director Nelson agreed to draft a letter of support for the Park & Ride Lot Draft Ordinance to the Planning and Development Department for the Chairman's signature.

**A MOTION BY BOARD MEMBER BARBER WAS MADE TO SUPPORT THE OVER-NIGHT PARKING ORDINANCE AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE BOCC. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY CHRIS COOK. THE MOTION WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Ellis asked the Board Members to go around the table and discuss the following:

**2. Signage**

**a) Improve existing signage as part of the grant façade program, particularly after hurricanes when more flexibility is needed.**

Director Nelson said the Board has discussed a program to deal with the damages resulting from hurricanes or other disasters, but because of the numerous variables (costs and insurance), he does not know how MIRA can get there. If nothing else, they could continue to use the Commercial Façade Grant Program for this purpose.

**b) A program for disaster relief extending 6-12 months after the incident.**

**c) Incentives for replacing non-conforming signs.**

Director Nelson continued that it was apparent to him that the Board has allowed signage as part of a larger project to receive some funding, however the Board has been inadvertently supporting non-conforming signs. Director Nelson suggested that the Board encourage and incentivize replacement of signage with conforming signs; the Board would need to deal with set-back issues (i.e. the bike shop). Board Member Cook said he doesn't want to add to the blight with signage; he asked to define "part of a larger project". Board Member Vani wants to keep it simple. He likes the disaster relief, but it is too complicated with insurance. He is not in favor of signage as a stand-alone improvement.

Board Member Barber doesn't like signage as a stand-alone project and feels it should be part of a larger project. He is not in favor for paying for signs from storm damage. He agrees with Director Nelson. In the future, the money for signage should go to conforming signs. Board Member Herman does not support items a and b. He did a survey of signs that were down; approximately 6 of the signs were corporate signs. He could agree to not paying for non-conforming signs. He feels item c is workable. Chairman Ellis said she likes the idea of some support for disaster relief, however, there does not seem to be Board support for that. She does like taking non-conforming signs and helping to make them conforming, but noted it was a large expenditure. She would like to see signage be eligible for 75% of the project instead of 50% of the project. Board Members Cook, Vani and Herman said they would support 50%. Board Member Barber said 49.9%.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN SIGNAGE CAN BE PART OF THE CFIP BUT NO GREATER THAN 50%, WITH THE REQUIREMENT THAT IT ADHERES TO THE CURRENT CODE. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER VANI.**

Director Nelson stated that the winding of S. Courtenay and 520 has created a circumstance where you can never be conforming; you can make it better than it is now, but never conforming as many parcels have lost their frontage. He noted that CRA's have the ability to create overlays - codes for the hardships created by different road projects. The Board



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

entered into a discussion regarding conforming and non-conforming. **Director Nelson requested time to evaluate the signage options and will come back to the Board with some recommendations.** He feels the Board cannot resolve this issue today.

**BOARD MEMBER HERMAN WITHDREW HIS MOTION AND BOARD MEMBER VANI WITHDREW HIS SECOND.**

**3. Landscaping/Irrigation**

**a) Include irrigation for landscaping located in front of the façade as an eligible expense:**

Board Member Herman will not support listing irrigation as eligible expense; it is already mandated and does not provide a visual impact. Board Member Barber said he didn't have as much of an objection to allowing irrigation as an eligible expense. Beautification Committee Member Webb and Board Member Cook agreed with Board Member Herman on irrigation. Board Member Vani said irrigation is a concern.

**b) Make periodic inspection of landscaping and require reimbursement to MIRA for failure to maintain.**

Board Member Herman said when we first started this program, a lien would be put on the property if for failure to maintain landscaping that was funded as part of the CFGP. No one applied for a grant because no one wanted a lien on their property. He questioned how MIRA could collect the reimbursement. Board Member Barber stated that there's no way to manage that type of requirement. Board Member Vani stated his concern is for the appearance of the landscaping/irrigation 6 months down the road. Board Member Cook does not support the concept.

**c) Tasking Beautification Committee members with tracking landscaping projects monthly for a predetermined period of time.**

Board Member Herman feels this concept has some validity. The Beautification Committee could go out and look, but he does not think any of this should be added to the grant process. Board Member Cook stated that whatever the Beautification Committee wants is fine with him. Chairman Ellis commented she would like to see landscaping qualify as a stand-alone project. In her opinion, there's anything more important than landscaping to make a project look better. Board Member Herman stated there isn't anyone who has ever come in for just landscaping that didn't receive a full grant. Chairman Ellis suggested that if that was the case, MIRA should not make it more complicated and take out the part of a bigger project wording to reflect what was actually occurring.

Board Member Herman stated that the grant program says irrigation is mandated. He would like to see some type of language that says if the applicant is required to maintain their landscaping, the Board has the opportunity to at least write a letter to say "you made the commitment to maintain your landscaping and you are not". It gives the Board the ability to check up on the re-plant or request a reimbursement. Director Nelson asked Attorney Schervak if there was a mechanism in place for that. Attorney Schervak replied that MIRA could always send them a letter, and that it didn't have to be in the agreement. She noted that the Board had the option of adding more language into the contract, but enforcing it was another matter. She would have to do more research on grant agreements, which are essentially contracts. Chairman Ellis said she's not



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

interested in utilizing an attorney for enforcement, but having it in the agreement gives the MIRA Board the ability to write a letter with some teeth. Board Member Vani asked could it be tied into code enforcement. Attorney Schervak stated she would need to do some research. She noted that the agreement already required a grantee to maintain the landscaping for 5 years; it would be simple to add additional wording to the agreement. Board Member Herman stated that adding additional wording is fine, but trying to enforce it is out of the question. He likes the positive - we expect you to maintain your landscaping - adding verbiage was fine, something like “you may be held responsible if the landscaping dies”.

Board Member Herman stated that as part of the “claw back” discussion, landscaping could be dovetailed onto the other monies. He does not think going to court is the answer; he likes the idea that Chairman Ellis mentioned Commissioner Fischer used - send out letters to the business owner. Director Nelson asked Beautification Committee member Richard Webb if he thought the Beautification Committee would mind sending out letters of encouragement, and if needed; assign sites to members to check on. Board Member Herman stated this is for future commercial façade grants; not retroactive. Beautification Committee Member Webb replied that he does not think Publix came to the Board for any money, but they’d be a case in point. Many Publix facilities have lush landscaping, the one in Merritt Island and ours is melting out and never grew. He does not know why.

Director Nelson letters could deal with two levels: 1) “if you got money from MIRA” and 2) “could you please”, or “we’ve noticed”. Chairman Ellis summarized by saying that she felt the Board wanted to make landscaping a stand-alone improvement and also wanted to interject additional language into the contract.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN TO REMOVE THE WORDING FROM THE ELIGIBLE LIST (IV.D) “IF IT IS EXTENSIVE IN SCOPE” AND ADD SIMILAR WORDING TO THE CFIP AGREEMENT UNDER WARRANTY OF GRANTEE “AND THE GRANTEE IS EXPECTED TO REPLACE ANY DEAD OR DETERIORATING LANDSCAPING COVERED BY THE GRANT PROJECT AGREEMENT”. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER VANI AND WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Director Nelson asked Board Member Herman if he knew what was covered under green infrastructure. Board Member Herman said he didn’t know what that was and had never seen that before. Chairman Ellis suggested the wording be removed.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN TO REMOVE THE WORDING FROM THE ELIGIBLE LIST (IV.D) “GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE”. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4. Americans with Disabilities**

**a) Allow ADA improvements as stand-alone projects.**

Board Member Vani stated that he thought ADA improvements should be stand-alone improvements. Director Nelson felt that one thing that improves the community is good access, noting that there are people who go around looking for the non-compliance in order to sue. He feels MIRA can’t go wrong by helping small business to come into





**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

compliance. Board Member Herman thinks it is reasonable to add ADA to the list of improvements, but not as stand-alone. Board Member Cook stated it was already in there under item “j”. Board Member Herman stated that what was already there for ADA was something that could be seen from the road; maybe the consideration should be for the back of the building as well. Director Nelson stated maybe it was similar to engineering - placing enough of a value on it enough that it would encourage business to become ADA compliant, such as a \$5,000 maximum as a stand-alone improvement. Board Member Herman summarized that someone could come to the Board with a regular project which includes the ADA improvements, or the ADA improvements could be stand-alone with a cap for that purpose. Board member Cook stated he would support it as a stand-alone as it is an access issue; a human rights issue; a community issue. He feels MIRA is going to complicate things if they start doing tiers and would like it to be keep simple.

Board Member Vani stated that he did one ADA project with a double switch back and it was expensive. He agrees with Board Member Cook. Board Member Herman wants to put a limit on it; he thinks allowing \$17,000 is too much. Chairman Ellis recapped by stating that Board Member Cook would like to see ADA being a stand-alone project period; Board Member Herman would like to see a cap; Board Member Vani stated he could go agree because he didn't think MIRA would see a \$17,000 application for ADA. Board Member Barber noted that MIRA is supposed to be doing safety improvements. He would go with a cap or stay with the language we have now. Chairman Ellis stated that she could support a cap of \$5,000. Board Member Cook would support \$10,000. Board Member Barber believes it is the property owner's responsibility, but could support a cap of \$2,500. Board Member Herman agrees with Board Member Barber, he thinks it is the business owner's responsibility; and would support a cap of \$5,000. Chairman Ellis entertained a motion.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER VANI TO REMOVE THE WORDING “AS PART OF MORE EXTENSIVE PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS” FROM PAGE 3, J, OF THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES; TO ADD THAT ADA EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS CAN BE UP TO 50% OF THE TOTAL PROJECT; TO CREATE J.1 TO STATE ADA EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS CAN BE STAND-ALONE UP TO A \$5,000 MATCH AS SEEN FROM THE ROAD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**5. Painting**

- a) Reconsider painting the front of a building, but not the sides or the back because they are not seen from the road.**

Board Members Cook, Vani, and Barber said they would not support that concept. Board Member Herman felt that MIRA has a couple of business owners that come every 5 years for painting and maybe some verbiage should be added to discourage that.

**6. Institute a Claw Back (reimbursement) for buildings sold**

- a) Require reimbursement to MIRA for buildings “flipped” within a specific time period.**

Board Members Cook, Vani, and Herman said they would not support that concept. Board Member Barber stated he would like to see the MIRA Attorney draw up language



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

that would be enforceable in court, then retracted his previous statement as he felt the purpose of MIRA is to enhance.

Director Nelson stated his concern was being accused of giving someone money and to an owner that turned around and flipped the property. Attorney Schervak interjected that MIRA could put wording in the agreement that the grantee is stating it is not their “intent” to sell the property within 6-12 months. Board Member Herman stated he did not know how the Board could ever chase that. Board Member Vani stated that MIRA has a grant program for property improvements and gets results for what it pays for. He does not think whether the property is sold or not is MIRA’s issue; the bottom line is that MIRA has an improved property in the district.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER BARBER TO ADD LANGUAGE TO THE AGREEMENT STATING THE GRANTEE’S CURRENT INTENT IS NOT TO SELL THE PROPERTY WITHIN A 12-MONTH PERIOD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER VANI. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**7. Roofing**

**a) Consider roofing upgrades as an eligible improvement.**

Board Member Ellis stated that currently the roofing is considered as part of a more extensive project. She would not have a problem removing “a more extensive project” if the owner was installing an upgraded roof. Board member Herman would vote no on that. He feels if the applicant goes to a metal or tile roof, that’s a choice they are making and they’re going to get 50% of the grant money paid by MIRA anyway. The Board discussed the roofing issues. Chairman Ellis discussed the Inmon roof grant that was passed at the December meeting, then noted that the December minutes were not in the book.

Director Nelson and Ms. Hurren left to get the December meeting minutes. The Agenda was verbally corrected to reflect approval of the December minutes as a line item.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER HERMAN TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 14, 2017 MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BARBER AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Board looked back at the Inmon grant in discussing the roof costs. **Attorney Schervak will qualify the wording “for more extensive project” and the formula for figuring the percentage of allowable match.** The Board agreed to leave roofs the way it currently was, and clarify the verbiage.

**8. Miscellaneous**

**a) Develop a proactive approach to contact owners of blighted properties.**

Chairman Ellis stated this was something MIRA should wait to do until it is fully staffed. Board Member Herman stated that maybe it is something the Beautification Committee can do.

**b) Develop a Façade Competition:**

Chairman Ellis recommended leaving this on the list for the new Director.



**MERRITT ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Commercial Façade Grant Workshop Meeting Minutes**  
**February 22, 2018 – 1:00 PM**

**c) Create a 100 percent residential grant program specifically tailored for subdivision entrances and walls for painting, landscaping and irrigation.**

Board member Barber stated that he really liked this idea, there is only about a half dozen walls that would qualify for a 100% grant. Board Member Cook supports the concept but asked about using money for residential tax dollars. **Attorney Schervak will research creating a 100 percent residential grant program specifically tailored for subdivision entrances and walls for painting, landscaping and irrigation and bring it back at the March meeting.**

**d) Set up criteria for MIRA Board Members to be allowed to apply for Commercial Façade Grants.**

Chairman Ellis believes MIRA Board Members should be eligible to apply for a CFIP grant 1 time during their 4-year term on the Board, using the same approved criteria. It would not apply to any property she owns but felt it was very unfair to Board Member Herman who it would have applied to. Board Member Cook feels it is reasonable, but noted that MIRA works in a very political atmosphere. Board member Vani doesn't feel members should be denied something that is available to the public. Board Member Barber stated he'd like to know what other Boards are doing. Board Member Herman believes at the time the policy was instituted it had to be done, but he believes it is unfair to this Board. **Attorney Schervak will provide a legal opinion on setting up criteria for MIRA Board Members to be allowed to apply for Commercial Façade Grants.** The Board continued to discuss the pros and cons of the restriction. Chairman Ellis asked the Attorney to bring this item be brought back at the March meeting.

**e) Create an improved checklist:**

Director Nelson said the checklist needs to be updated to include an aerial, etc. **Director Nelson and Ms. Hurren will update the CFIP checklist.** Chairman Ellis asked the checklist be brought back to the March meeting.

**f) Insure the Façade Program is user-friendly:**

Director Nelson said he flet this was a theme he had seen throughout the minutes. **Attorney Schervak will look at the entire CFIP Program and see if there is any streamlining that can be done.**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER VANI TO ADJOURN THE WORKSHOP AT 4:46 P.M. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER VANI AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**