CRA092616

NOTICE

There will be a Meeting of the CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) on Monday, September 26, 2016, at 6:30 p.m., at the Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

AGENDA

1. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

5. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

   a) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – June 27, 2016

6. **PUBLIC TO BE HEARD**

7. **RESOLUTION CRA 16-02, PUBLIC HEARING,** a Resolution of the City of Port St. Lucie Community Redevelopment Agency (The "Agency") relating to the Annual Budget, approving the Annual Budget of the Agency for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2016, and ending September 30, 2017; authorizing the expenditure of funds established by the budget; and providing an effective date.

8. **OTHER ISSUES BY BOARD MEMBERS**

9. **ADJOURN**

NOTICE: No stenographic record by a certified court reporter will be made of the foregoing meeting. Accordingly, any person who may seek to appeal any decisions involving the matters noticed herein will be responsible for making a verbatim record of the testimony and evidence of said meeting upon which any appeal is to be based.

NOTICE: Public and Press are invited to review all the backup for Meetings. Copies are available in the City Clerk's Office and the Communication Department on Thursday, Friday, and Monday before Meetings. On Meeting nights a copy of backup material is available in the Reception Area for public review. PLEASE LEAVE THE AGENDA BACKUP MATERIAL IN GOOD ORDER FOR OTHERS TO REVIEW.

NOTICE: Anyone wishing to speak during Public to be Heard is asked to fill out a yellow Participation Card and submit it to the City Clerk. Anyone wishing to speak on any Agenda Item is asked to fill out a green Participation Card and submit it to the City Clerk. Participation Cards are available on the lectern in the Council Chambers, at the Reception Desk in City Hall lobby, and in the City Clerk's office.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, persons needing special accommodation to participate in this proceeding should contact the City Clerk's Office at 772-871-5157.

AS A COURTESY TO THE PEOPLE RECORDING THE MEETING, PLEASE TURN ALL CELL PHONES TO SILENT.

CRA062716

CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 27, 2016

A Regular Meeting of THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) of the City of Port St. Lucie was called to order by Chairman Oravec on June 27, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present:
Chairman Gregory J. Oravec
Vice Chair Linda Bartz
Michelle Lee Berger
Ronald E. Bowen
Shannon M. Martin

Others Present:
Jeff Bremer, Executive Director
Kristina Ciuperger, Director, Communications
Sherman Conrad, Parks and Recreation Director
Richard Del Toro, Assistant Police Chief
John Finizio, Planner, Planning and Zoning
John Fumero, Interim City Attorney
Daniel Holbrook, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director
Bridget Kean, CRA Director
Edwin M. Fry, Jr., Finance Director/Treasurer
Jim MacMillan, Police Officer
Tom Mullin, Planning and Zoning Attorney
Karen A. Phillips, City Clerk
Jeannette C. Baeza, Deputy City Clerk

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Oravec led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Oravec asked, "Are there any additions or deletions to the Agenda?" There being none, Vice Chair Bartz **moved** to approve the Agenda. Ms. Martin **seconded** the

motion. There being no discussion, the City Clerk restated the motion as follows: for approval of the Agenda. The motion **passed unanimously** by roll call vote.

5. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

a) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 28, 2016

Ms. Berger **moved** to approve the Consent Agenda. Vice Chair Bartz **seconded** the motion. There being no discussion, the City Clerk restated the motion as follows: for approval of the Consent Agenda. The motion **passed unanimously** by roll call vote.

6. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD

FRED COOK stated, "Nice to see you all again. I don't see you very often, because I don't get a chance to come here like I should. This evening, I would like to discuss a situation that I think needs discussing. Hopefully, the red light won't turn on too fast, because I don't want to scramble on this, but I do want to be heard. I cannot hear as well as I should, because I did not wear any hearing aids. For the folks that are here, I am Fred Cook, a 30-year resident of Port St. Lucie. I want to talk about last week's news article. I personally feel that we should stop thinking we have to be a bedroom community, supplying other areas with a workforce to enhance their economy. We have to think positively, and try to enhance manufacturing, construction, and office complexes to keep the working forces here at home and boost our economy. We should defer from these outlandish subsidized assistance programs, as they are getting to be a little bit too much for the pocketbook. As an active member and chairman of various committees, including this CRA, I took part in discussions regarding the inland port, storage, and distribution center for merchandise coming through the enlarged Panama Canal and the Becker Road extension. I spent four years as Vice President and CEO of CE Enterprise, a registered corporation hoping to build a sports and entertainment center with an additional waterpark in the area we are speaking of tonight. Later on, you are going to hear from Wes McCurry, a longtime friend, regarding Southern Grove . . . ." Chair Oravec interjected, "Your time is up. Can you wrap it up?" Mr. Cook replied, "I was afraid of that. Please let me finish. He is also a business positive, and not a housing negative. Thank you. Are there any questions people want to throw at me in regards to why I'm here?" Chair Oravec replied, "I've got that part covered; I'll ask the Board in a second. Does the Board have any comments or questions?" There was no response.

7. P16-057 – AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE U.S. 1 CORRIDOR, PUBLIC HEARING – THIS IS A REQUEST TO AMEND THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE AREA DEFINED IN RESOLUTION 01-R27, AND COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE U.S. 1 CORRIDOR, TO INCLUDE A CHANGE IN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AREA, REVISED LEGAL DESCRIPTION, AND REVISED CRA MASTER PLAN TO ADD AN ADDITIONAL 47 ACRES OF LAND.

Chair Oravec opened the Public Hearing. The Community Redevelopment Agency Director stated, "Good evening, I have a presentation." (**Clerk's Note:** At this time, a PowerPoint presentation was shown.) The Community Redevelopment Agency Director said, "In this application, staff is proposing an amendment to the Community Redevelopment Plan to add additional acreage to the Redevelopment Plan, and the additional acreage is three parcels that add up to about 47 acres, which are contiguous to the existing CRA. This proposal will expand the CRA boundaries. It includes the 18.5 acres known as Grove Park, which is located at the intersection of Hilmoor Road and Lennard Road, as well as the Port St. Lucie Village Mobile Home Park, located on the east corner of Mariposa Avenue and US 1, and the Town Place property that is located at the northern boundary of the City of Port St. Lucie on US 1 at Savannah Club Road. These three properties were annexed into the City after the CRA was established on US 1, and the Resolution that created this was Resolution 01-27, so this would be an amendment to those boundary lines. Two of those properties, Grove Park and the Port St. Lucie Village Mobile Home Park, were included when the original CRA was established in 2001. They were included in the original study, and were identified for the conditions that created the CRA, as well as being included in the Redevelopment Plan, but since they were never actually part of Port St. Lucie or the municipal boundaries, they couldn't be included officially in the CRA or in the Tax Increment Refinancing District that was created. Town Place is situated between the northern municipal boundary line of the City and the CRA. When the CRA was first established, it was just to the north of the CRA boundary, so it wasn't included in the original study, but three years later, it was annexed into the City, so it is just sitting there outside of the CRA. The existing conditions in Town place plus its location make it suitable for inclusion in the CRA. Since these properties were already included in the original study area, the proposed changes to the Redevelopment Plan that are necessary are: to revise Figure 2-1, to update the CRA boundary map to include the additional areas; to revise the Master Plan to include Town Place, which is being shown as a Mixed Use Commercial area; and to amend the legal description to include these three properties."

The Community Redevelopment Agency Director said, "State statute outlines what you have to do to amend a Redevelopment Plan. It goes to the governing body, based on a recommendation from the CRA Board. To add additional acreage to a CRA, the agency has to show that the properties meet the conditions for blight in a CRA. A report called the Finding of Necessities Report for the CRA Expansion Area 2016 is included in your packet. It has been prepared, as well as the Resolution that goes with it, and if the CRA Board recommends the approval of this proposed modification to the Redevelopment Plan, the Finding of Necessities Report will be submitted to the City Council for review. The next step in that process is for the Modification to the Community Redevelopment Plan to go to City Council, along with an amendment to the Redevelopment Trust Fund. The purpose of all of this is to get the three properties into the CRA before they get developed, because there has been some movement to get Town Place developed, so I wanted to get it into the CRA. For planning consistency, staff does recommend that these properties be added to the CRA. I'm available to answer any questions."

Chair Oravec asked, "Are there any questions from the Board for staff?" There was no response. Chair Oravec asked, "Could you restate the purpose of this?" The Community Redevelopment Agency Director replied, "The purpose of this is that at least two of these properties were always in the CRA study area, and were always intended for inclusion in the CRA when the CRA was first established, but at that time, they were county enclaves, similar to Lentz Grove, which became East Lake Village. Once they were annexed into the City, the Redevelopment Plan was never modified through a formal process to add them to the CRA. Really, the reason for including Town Place is it's the only commercial property on US 1 that is not in the CRA, so for planning purposes, it makes more sense to get that in there as well."

There being no public comments, Chair Oravec closed the Public Hearing, and said, "Board, before we get into discussion, I just want to telegraph that during discussion, I am not supportive of several elements of this proposed Finding of Necessities, and I have some reservations about the stated purpose for this. The stated purpose should be eradication of some blight. I think we should have a discussion about the timing of including Grove Park, now that it is developed. Wouldn't it already go on the tax roll as a developed property? Have we talked to the county about this? Isn't the timing wrong for the northern portion? If it's called Town Center, isn't there a development proposal for that? Does that really meet the intent of redevelopment under Florida statutes? The one that I am willing to support is the trailer and RV park, as it seems natural, since it was part of the original Community Redevelopment planning process, and the Finding of Necessity. It just seems like we missed the window on Grove Park; it seems as if it's redeveloped. I think the same thing could be said about Town Center, and that was never envisioned to be part of the CRA, so I want you to know that before you kick off discussion, or a motion is made. I'll turn it over to the Board."

Ms. Berger asked, "Is there any thought on breaking up parts of this to approve for tonight, and possibly removing the portions you don't support for more information for the rest of the Board?" Chair Oravec replied, "I think because the Finding of Necessity is a significant process, and is part of a legal process that could be challenged as a whole, it is very important to come back. As you know, I've actually drafted a Finding of Necessity before that has withstood challenge as part of a bond validation proceeding, so this is where I do have some professional expertise. This is a big deal. I was out of town last week, and I was on the road for 18 hours yesterday, so I apologize. I forgot to say 'meeting' when I was calling the meeting to order. I don't know if there were one-on-ones that happened last week, but usually, this is a big deal, and there is discussion that happens going in, there is a comprehensive presentation provided into the public record, and a decision is made. I just think there is a deeper discussion to be had. I could just be the minority, and I'm okay with that, but I want to express my reservations and give everything I know about this District and the properties involved. I've been intimately involved with them for a long time. The one I'm prepared to support going forward, if it is presented, is the trailer park property." Ms. Berger said, "To your point, that is the piece of land that I remember always being a part of the discussions as well, from a history perspective. I'll wait and see what the rest of the Board thinks, too."

Ms. Martin said, "I don't mind having further discussion of it. I did not have a one-on-one, but I'd be happy to move it forward tonight and as it gets back to us at the next meeting, have more public discussion on it and get into the details of it if you'd like to have a more in-depth presentation." Chair Oravec asked, "Are there additional Board comments or a motion?"

Vice Chair Bartz stated, "I would **move** that we table this Item until further discussion and presentations are made." Ms. Martin **seconded** the motion. Chair Oravec asked, "Is there discussion of the motion?" Mr. Bowen replied, "Under discussion, we need more information. The Finding of Necessities Report and Resolution says that the City Council finds that a slum or blight exists within the CRA expansion area 2016. That is my District, and I do not consider that trailer park a slum or blight, so let's get that straightened out, and let's get a little more clarification before we start moving forward." Chair Oravec said, "Thank you, Board Member Bowen. I appreciate that comment being introduced to the record, because that is something that is brought up at almost every Finding Necessity hearing, and one of the things that is usually done is that the statutory definition of slum and/or blight is provided into the record, and then it is also introduced into the record in detail how the study areas fulfill those specific criteria, because there are statutory. . . . And you raised the issue that normally, when there is a room full of people, that same thing is going to be brought up every time. It's a very good point you raised. Going back into the technical weeds of it, even the Resolution on Page 3, Paragraph 2, 'Whereas the agency has considered the proposed plan amendment to the original Plan for the CRA expansion area 2016, and the local Planning Agency's comments, and has recommended to the City Council that the plan amendment be approved.' Has this been to the local Planning Agency yet?" The Community Redevelopment Agency Director replied, "It is scheduled for Planning and Zoning in July." Chair Oravec said, "I find the construction of that sentence problematic, because it says that the agency has considered the proposed plan amendment, and the local Planning Agency's comments." The Community Redevelopment Agency Director said, "I understand, and it definitely needs to be tabled. I'm sorry, I was under the impression that this was something just on the to-do list for the CRA, and we would bring it to you for a recommendation, and then do the explanations. If you approved it, we would go forward with discussion on the Finding of Necessity Report. I would be happy to table it and have one-on-one discussions."

Chair Oravec stated, "We have a motion and a second. Are there any additional discussions?" There being none, the City Clerk restated the motion as follows: to table Item 7 until further discussions take place, and a presentation is made. The motion **passed unanimously** by roll call vote."

8. RESOLUTION CRA 16-01, PUBLIC HEARING - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING RESOLUTION NO. CRA 03-04 ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 17, 2004, WHICH RESOLUTION NO. CRA 03-04 AUTHORIZED, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE ISSUANCE FROM TIME TO TIME OF REDEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND REVENUE BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED

$46,000,000 IN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY REDEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2016, THE PROCEEDS OF WHICH WILL BE USED TO REFUND ALL OR A PORTION OF THE AGENCY'S OUTSTANDING REDEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2004 AND REDEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2006 (CITY CENTER PROJECT), IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE DEBT SERVICE SAVINGS FOR THE AGENCY; MAKING CERTAIN COVENANTS AND AGREEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUANCE OF SUCH BONDS; AUTHORIZING A NEGOTIATED SALE OF SAID BONDS; DELEGATING CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR THE AUTHORIZATION, EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF A BOND PURCHASE CONTRACT WITH RESPECT THERETO AND THE APPROVAL OF THE TERMS AND DETAILS OF SUCH BONDS; APPOINTING THE PAYING AGENT AND REGISTRAR FOR SAID BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE DISTRIBUTION OF A PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT AND THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT WITH RESPECT THERETO; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF AN ESCROW DEPOSIT AGREEMENT AND THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ESCROW AGENT THERETO; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF A CONTINUING DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT; DELEGATING CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR WITH RESPECT TO DEBT SERVICE RESERVE AND MUNICIPAL BOND INSURANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE BONDS; MAKING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO RESOLUTION NO. CRA 03-04; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The City Clerk read Resolution CRA 16-01 aloud by title only. Mayor Oravec opened the Public Hearing. The Finance Director stated, "I wanted to summarize some of what we are trying to accomplish with this issue. As stated in the Resolution, we will be refunding all of the 2004 and 2006 CRA bonds. The 2004 bond issue was used to pay for road improvements and stormwater improvements, as well as water and wastewater lines along Lennard Road, and in the general CRA area. The 2006 bonds were used to pay for improvements in the City Center area. There were road improvements that were made contiguous to that, as well as construction of the Civic Center in the Civic Plaza, and the parking garage. These bonds are payable from the Tax Increment Revenues that are generated within the CRA. Since those Tax Increment Revenues have been insufficient to pay for the bonds for the 2004 and 2006 principal and interest on the bonds, the City has also appropriated other non-ad valorem revenues to make those payments. The refund in bonds will result in a debt service savings of approximately 10.9% of the refunded bonds, and a net present value of approximately $4.7 million, which is well in excess of the City's debt policy requirements of 5% savings, and a net present value savings of $400,000. I'd like to point out that with these bonds, there will be no change in the maturity; these bonds will mature in 2026. I'd also like to state that they will be backed by the City's Covenant to Budget and Appropriate, which is the same policy that is in place with the existing bonds."

The Finance Director continued, "A bit of good news I'd like to pass along is that Standard and Poor's has issued a rating of A+ on these bonds, which I regard as being

a great rating. Additionally, Standard and Poor's has verified their AA- rating on the City's general obligation bond. I just got this report, and it is hot off the press, so I wanted to provide a copy." (**Clerk's Note:** At this time, the Finance Director handed a copy of the Standard and Poor's report to each person on the dais.) The Finance Director stated, "At this point, staff recommends approval of Resolution CRA 16-01, authorizing the issuance of the 2016 CRA refunding bonds."

Chair Oravec asked, "Are there any questions for the Finance Director?" There was no response. Mayor Oravec said, "I have a question. When I look at the staff memo and I add the outstanding balances of each fund, I get about $43.825 million, and the proposed bond issue is for up to $46 million. Where is the $2.2 million going?" The Finance Director replied, "That contingency could be for if there are any additional costs involved, but the probability is that the bond issue will be less than the combined bonds that we're issuing, so it is really a not to exceed amount, but dependent on the rates and where the market is going, and based upon the last couple of days, I am fairly confident that the face amount that will be issued will be significantly less than the total amount." Chair Oravec said, "That will be a good thing, because even though there might be total payment savings due to the interest, it is disconcerting to potentially see the balance go up. It feels like it is counterintuitive, and working against ourselves. With future refundings, could you provide me with the list of fees that the financial advisor and the bond team make on each issue, or would make under the proposal?" The Finance Director responded in the affirmative.

Chair Oravec asked, "Are there other questions for the Finance Director?" Ms. Berger replied, "I don't have questions, just a quick comment. I'm happy to see not only the ratings themselves, but the word 'stable' through the columns, so thank you very much for that information." Chair Oravec asked, "Does any member of the public wish to speak on this Item?" There being no response, Chair Oravec closed the Public Hearing. Mr. Bowen **moved** to approve Resolution CRA 16-01. Ms. Martin **seconded** the motion. The City Clerk restated the motion as follows: for approval of CRA Resolution 16-01. The motion **passed unanimously** by roll call vote.

9. BILLBOARD RECONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY, THE CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, AND OUTFRONT MEDIA LLC

(**Clerk's Note:** At this time, a PowerPoint presentation was shown.) The Community Redevelopment Agency Director stated, "This Item is a proposal from Outfront Media concerning the billboard at 10602 US Highway 1, at the southeast corner of the intersection of US 1 and Port St. Lucie Boulevard. The billboard is located on property that is under the jurisdiction of St. Lucie County, and it is contiguous to the CRA. When the CRA was established in 2001, the City, the Agency, and St. Lucie County entered into an interlocal agreement that required the county to provide the CRA and the City with copies of development applications for properties on the unincorporated areas of US 1 on US 1, Mariposa Avenue, and Lennard Road that are adjacent to the CRA. The City and the CRA would review these applications for consistency with the CRA Master

Plan, the City's Land Development Regulations and the Design Standards. Even though this agreement expired in 2001, as a courtesy, St. Lucie County has continued to supply the Agency with development proposals for unincorporated properties in that area, and the Agency has provided review and comment. In 2015, Agency staff received a copy of a county application for a Variance to the county's height limitations for billboard signage for the billboard sign that is located at 10602 S. Federal Highway. The approximate height of the sign is 48 feet. It was erected prior to the county's requirement that billboard signs be a maximum of 35 in height. Outfront Media would like to replace the existing sign with a variable message sign at the intersection of US 1 and Port St. Lucie Boulevard, and they would like for it to be 45 feet. This is a picture of the billboard I am talking about; it is at the bagel shop at US 1 and Port St. Lucie Boulevard. Under the county code, billboards are permitted on US 1, and the variable message boards, or the LED signs, are permitted by right, but the maximum height, as I said, it 35 feet, and this request will exceed that by ten feet. Agency staff did review the proposed application for consistency with the adopted Community Redevelopment Plan, the City's Land Development Regulations, and Design Standards, noting that the City's regulations prohibit billboard signs on US 1, as well as only allowing the variable message signs under certain circumstances, such as a Master Sign Program. Staff provided the county with written notification of its objection to the Variance request on June 3, 2015. Outfront Media has approached the City with a desire to enter into an agreement to resolve the Agency's existing, and the City's potential objections to the Variance request. In exchange to withdraw the objection, Outfront Media agrees to make the replacement billboard sign available at no cost to the City or Agency for public service information, as set forth in the agreement. Variances are heard under St. Lucie County Section 10-1 of the county code, and they are reviewed by the St. Lucie County Board of Adjustment. If this Variance is denied by St. Lucie County, Outfront Media does have the right to erect a 35-foot tall variable message board sign at that location as a matter of right. The attorney for the sign company, Bill McCormick is here to provide a short presentation." Chair Oravec asked, "Are there any questions for the Community Redevelopment Agency Director before we invite the representatives of Outfront Media?" There was no response.

Lee Dobbins stated, "I represent Charlie Grunbaum, who owns the shopping center on that corner through his entity, Equity Investment Corporation. With me today is Bill McCormick of Outfront Media, as well as Chris Ashely, of Outfront Media. I'd like to disclose for the record that we've met with a number of you individually ahead of the meeting, and we are here to answer any questions you have. Mr. McCormick is going to give a short presentation." Bill McCormick stated, "For the record, I am Bill McCormick on behalf of Outfront Media. Chris Ashley is with me, and he is a real estate manager with Outfront Media. Staff did a very good job explaining the background of it, and I will fill in a few holes, or go into a little bit more depth. We've met with all of you, or mostly all of you, and have gone through this. Essentially, we have a billboard here that has been in place for about 25 years. The billboard is non-conforming in several different ways: setback, wind load, engineering, height, and a couple of other things. We put in an application with the county to replace the structure with a new structure, which eliminates essentially every non-conformity, with the exception of height. It would be

rebuilt as an LED, which we have not only a matter or right under the county code, but we have an approved permit for it. I think we are just updating our contract information and the permit will be ready to be picked up. The purpose of the height variance with the county is that the onsite signage, if the sign were to be 35 feet, would interfere with the display on the board. I hear a lot of talk about visual clutter and all that kind of stuff, and I think a lot of times, visual clutter is used as a term to generally define signage. I think, particularly in this instance, the variance we're requesting is to essentially keep it above the other onsite signage, and there is also a mast arm for the traffic lights, which goes across and in front of it. I think a 35-foot LED sign with the onsite signage and the mast arm would create visual clutter, and more of an unsightly situation. I think by going to 45 feet, we keep separation between the different signage, and it makes for a more aesthetically pleasing appearance for both directions on US 1 and Port St. Lucie Boulevard. To fill in exactly what Outfront Media is offering to the CRA, the City, and its residents, if the county approves the height variance, the City will be getting usage of the board for any Amber alerts. Any time an Amber alert is issued in the area, it would immediately go up on the LED sign. If there are any police emergencies, such as hostage situations, an active shooter, or fugitives in the area, it would go up on there. Emergency weather events, such as emergency information for storms and hurricanes would go up on the sign. Four times per year, we give the CRA and/or the City the opportunity to advertise at no cost for a period of 30 days for City-sponsored events. We give priority to your local business to not only purchase time on the board, but there is a reduced rate as well. Remember, these digital boards have maybe eight different messages. Any time there is an unsold flip, Outfront will put on a stock message encouraging people to shop local, or advertise some sort of event for the CRA or the City, all at no cost to the City. Just to clear up one last thing, we spoke to many of you. I understand that Chair Oravec has his own feeling about billboards, which certainly, everyone is entitled to, and I know you oppose it. I don't say this to be smug or confrontational, quite the opposite, but I want to make sure everyone understands that we have a permit for a 35-foot LED board, and we will build a 35-foot LED board. We see this agreement between Outfront Media, and the CRA and the City as an opportunity to create a situation where the City, the CRA, and its residents can get some sort of benefit out of it, and Outfront Media can be a good corporate citizen, and hopefully build some sort of partnership with the City and the CRA going forward, to make this board available and not only benefit the property owner and the billboard company, but also the residents and members of your CRA. We believe that's what this agreement does; it's what we were trying to do and accomplish with working with your staff. That is our proposal, and I certainly can answer any questions."

Ms. Berger **moved** to approve Item 9. Ms. Martin **seconded** the motion. Chair Oravec stated, "Under discussion, I won't be supporting this Item. One of several reasons I broke early from the U.S. Conference of Mayors and drove 18-plus hours to be with you is to ask and express my thoughts on the type of community we're going to be. We have a Community Redevelopment Plan, which identifies this as a major intersection. We have renderings of what that's supposed to look like, and we have policies about how we feel about billboards. I'm hoping that at some point, we are going to be the type of community that finds a way to live up to those pretty pictures and promises, rather than

taking little carrots that are dangled in front of us. Rather than take this deal, I don't know why we're not trying to work with the county within the confines of billboard law to have this removed ultimately. That should be the end game, not a variance to increase how high it is, and how it impacts the skyline and the aesthetics of Port St. Lucie. We should be working long-term to get rid of it from one of our most prominent intersections. Even after the construction of Crosstown, this will continue to be one of our most heavily-traveled intersections, and to have that be the reality and have it continue to be the reality doesn't seem to be congruent or compatible with the vision this Council . . . . Of course, we're in a different capacity as CRA Board Members, but this doesn't seem to be consistent with the vision that is set forth by the Strategic Plan. We are very excited about Neighborhood Planning and decorative street signs, and we do a great job of landscaping roads and adding all kinds of flourishes. It doesn't seem that allowing billboards at our most prominent intersection to be higher than they would otherwise be allowed in consistent with that. I am disappointed to hear a quick first and second, and I will be voting against this."

Mr. Bowen said, "I appreciate your comments. First of all, the Variance is only ten feet. I am six feet tall, so it is four feet taller than me. I would remind the Board that we already have LED lights on US 1, one by the hospital, and at our own City Center, which has LED lights, or a 'billboard' on US 1. I did have one-on-one meetings with Outfront Media. If it is 35 feet, you cannot see the sign while sitting in traffic, so it is really not effective. To take the billboard of an attorney, which looks okay, and replace it with something modern that is LED and shows emergency and Amber alerts, which benefit the City, I am in favor of the motion."

Ms. Martin said, "I agree with that point. The bottom line is that this is on county property, is already permitted by right, and a billboard will go up, regardless of whether we say so or not. Instead of working to abolish something, I prefer to look at it positively, and say that we are getting a benefit. I agree with the fact that LED are what's happening now. All over the City, many of the gas stations are converting over to LED instead of the regular signage. If there is an opportunity that staff took to create a win-win out of this, which I thank them for doing and getting the City a benefit out of it, this is a good outcome, and that is why I'm supporting it."

Vice Mayor Bartz said, "I met with the applicants as well, and I can tell you that my first blush reaction was absolutely not, until I went back into history and remembered that with a brand new bank on that corner, we used that billboard very successfully prior to the mast arms being there, and prior to it being blocked. I appreciate your comments, but the fact of the matter is that they are going up. I certainly don't want them just anywhere, but I do happen to believe that this is a good location, and it's already there, so it may as well be visible and done well, and have the City be able to advertise. For me, more so than the City events, although they are important, are the things like Amber alerts, Police emergencies, hurricane notifications, and things like that, things we all think may not happen. We all want to not have it happen, but we've all faced that reality and know that it very well could, and in a busy area like that, it is important to be able to reach the people. I will be supporting this as well."

Mayor Oravec said, "In response to some of the comments that were made, I would just say that I am not opposed to LED as a technology, I am opposed to billboards. While I respect the . . . . Could everyone just check their cellphones and make sure they're in the off or silent position? While I certainly respect the will of the Board, I am impressed by communities that come together to get rid of visual blight and billboards, and they find a way to make it happen over time. This is a county enclave that is completely surrounded by the City of Port St. Lucie, and is one of our most important intersections. Just looking at it as being a county parcel, and us not being able to do anything because of that, I resist that in the same way that I resist the idea that . . . . We have to do something about schools. It doesn't matter that it is an independently-elected School District, it impacts our residents. The way this looks impacts our residents, and it being a county enclave, we should work with the county. We are 60% of St. Lucie County, we should find a way to get it done and live up to our Vision, but I respect the will of the Board."

Ms. Berger stated, "I didn't get a chance to make comments. For disclosure purposes, I know the applicant had mentioned that they met with people on the Board but I did not meet with the applicant, and did not do so on purpose, because I had a chance to meet with staff on this issue. I want to take the opportunity to thank staff for your collaborative efforts with the county. I know this issue had a chance to come before us earlier, and knowing that this was not, at first blush, something that the Council would typically be happy to approve, our staff did go back and work with the county on items in an effort to make it more compliant. I wanted to thank you for creating that compliance we are constantly looking for."

There being no further discussion, the City Clerk restated the motion as follows: for approval of Item 9. The motion **passed** by roll call vote, with Vice Chair Bartz, Ms. Berger, Ms. Martin, and Mr. Bowen voting in favor, and Chairman Oravec voting against.

10. SOUTHERN GROVE CRA UPDATE

The Community Redevelopment Agency Director said, "Wes McCurry and Jim Anderson are here from the Tradition Land Company to give an update on development in the Southern Grove CRA." Chair Oravec said, "As they come up, we have a packed house for the upcoming 7:00 p.m. City Council meeting. We have a cell tower on the Agenda, and it looks like a lot of you are here for that. I am going to ask, once again, that you please check your phones to make sure they are in the off or silent position. When the phones go off, you can't hear the audio, and it disrupts the meeting. Please place your phone in the off or silent position." Ms. Berger said, "How about the irony, though? A majority of the people who are here, are here to talk about the cell tower issue, which I'm guessing they're against, yet the cell phones keep going off. I think it is quite the irony." Chair Oravec said, "Evidently, there must be adequate coverage at the moment."

Wes McCurry stated, "As the Community Redevelopment Agency Director mentioned, I am Wes McCurry with Fishkind and Associates, and with me is Jim Anderson, also of Fishkind and Associates, representing Tradition Land Company, which is the majority property owner within the Southern Grove CRA. I believe it's been a little more than three years since Southern Grove was added to the CRA, and made the tools available to address some of the economic challenges that are associated with this property and increase its competitiveness in the market. Today, luckily, we can say that those efforts are starting to pay off. We are seeing an improving housing market, an improving office market, and are beginning to see some increased development activity, which we will go over with you tonight." (**Clerk's Note:** At this time, a PowerPoint presentation was shown.)

Mr. McCurry continued, "The Southern Grove CRA is roughly 3,600 acres to proof for more than 7,300 residential units, and more than 12 million square-feet of non-residential uses at buildout. There are three areas we are going to focus on tonight, which are the commercial development activity occurring in the vicinity of Village Point and the Tradition Center for Innovation, as well as some new residential activity occurring to the south, within the middle of the property, and our efforts at marketing the Tradition Commerce Park, which is the core of the property along I-95, which we commonly refer to as the 'jobs corridor.' This slide represents the overall development activity to date and some of the projects that are currently under construction. To date, I believe the existing projects represent about $17 million in taxable value, and there are several more projects that are under construction, or are proposed for construction in the near future, which will add to that tax base. These 12 projects are currently under construction, or are in the permitting phase. The projects represent over 500,000 square-feet of new construction, with an estimated taxable value of approximately $50 million. Most of the retail projects are going to be slated for completion in early 2017, with the office and hospital projects being completed in late 2017 to early 2018. To support the development of these projects, the developer and the CDD have undertaken approximately $6 million of infrastructure improvements, which also serve to support an additional 150 acres of developable area. This area includes the balance of the Village Point area, which is on the left of the screen, as well as the northern end of the Tradition Commerce Park, which is the area around Number 12, Kaiser University. You're probably familiar with most of these projects, so I am not going to go into detail, but I'd be happy to answer any questions, if you have questions on any of them individually."

Mr. McCurry said, "On the residential front, we have two of the top five national builders currently under contract to bring the first rooftops into Southern Grove. The number one project is approximately 163 acres, planned for a 500-unit multi-generational community. Applications for this project should be submitted in the next few weeks, and development of the first phase of this community is expected to begin in the second quarter of 2017. The second project is a Del Webb community, probably the most recognizable brand of active adult communities in the nation, and a subsidiary of Polte's Home Group. This project has already submitted plans to the City, and is planning a 426-acre community for 1,300 active adult units. Development of the first phase will

include extension of East-West Number 3, and it expected to begin in early 2017. Next, we will discuss Tradition Park, which is the jobs corridor we commonly refer to. It is probably one of the best positioned properties along the east coast for creating a regional employment center. We've recently hired, or contracted, with two of the top brokerage houses in the nation to offer this property for sale and bring it to the market, and those brokerage houses are CBRE, and Cushman and Wakefield. We wanted to take advantage of the opportunities that this property offers to capitalize on South Florida's growing population and the growing consumer economy, as well as the lack of larger, affordable site in the counties to the south, for industrial, commercial, and manufacturing-type development. CBRE and Cushman and Wakefield are helping us position this property, and have brought it to market. We have had several inquiries regarding this property, but we've also identified a number of challenges, and hopefully some opportunities as well. The consistent challenge we're hearing from the market as it relates to this 900 acres and the interest we've garnered from the offering is that the carrying costs associated with the SAD are burdensome to carry the property for an extended period of time, while we wait for an industrial manufacturing market to mature and be viable on this site. In the meantime, what we are hearing from interested parties is that they would like to see more ability to do some residential within this area, to allow for some projects early on in the process, to lay off some of the capital investment and lay off some of the SAD assessment, and recoup some money early on, and allow for a long-term hold on some of the balance so that the non-residential market can materialize. Some opportunities we see in helping to deal with that are two Items on your Regular City Council Meeting Agenda. One is the refinancing of the Southern Grove SAD, which will help to significantly lower the annual carrying costs on the SAD and hopefully make the property more marketable. We're also looking at revising the Capital Improvement Program via the CDD, to lower the assessment that is implemented through the CDD as well. Lastly, as far as flexibility for residential, we are looking at potentially coming in with some Master Plan revisions in the near future, which will change a portion of that 900-acre property from being an employment center designation to a mixed use designation, and the importance of that is that the mixed use designation still allows for all the same non-residential uses, but introduces the ability to do more residential within the property. You can still do all the industrial, manufacturing, office, and retail, but it also adds the residential component as well to give that flexibility that the market is seeking. We'll likely submit some applications on this in the coming weeks as well. That wraps up what I have for you tonight, but I'm happy to answer any questions you may have regarding what we've got going on."

Chair Oravec remarked, "Thank you, Mr. McCurry. Are there any questions for Mr. McCurry?" There was no response. Chair Oravec asked, "Is there any discussion on this Item?" There was no response. Chair Oravec said, "I'll be looking forward to the policy discussion on land use, whether it happens as a Board or a City Council. There were a lot of discussions that went on with the Council at the time over the job corridor, and what the purpose of those huge annexations were. You could make the argument, if we brought some former employees and Councilmembers up here, that the only reason the southwest annexation came was to support the jobs corridor. If we would then see the jobs corridor go from a jobs corridor to more housing, an interesting policy

question that I would look to this Council to address is: how big do you have to be to be a properly sized bedroom community? At the time, if we were 100 square-miles, and were 100,000 quarter-acre lots, did we need to add all those square-miles west of I-95 all the way out to Rangeline Road to include more houses? Will that ever pay for itself? I think there is a big policy discussion to have there, so it'll be interesting to have that. Ms. Berger was here."

Ms. Berger said, "I wasn't here for that vote; that was before me. I think it is interesting. I think that the terms 'flexibility that the market is seeking' is an interesting term. Up until the time we're getting ready to vote, I've been very supportive about the idea of refinancing the Southern Grove SAD to lower the carrying costs, and to make this more marketable to the overall market that is out there, whether it be residential, or the commercial piece. Now, I am kind of feeling like I must've missed along the way the piece about transferring some of the zoning to residential. Somehow, I missed that, so I'm wondering if this is part of a leverage conversation. I know there is nothing to be voted on right now in this particular issue, but that is definitely a concern. I am just wondering, is this something you see as a mandate, or a necessity in order to move this project forward, transitioning some of this back to residential, or is this a conversation you're having with us as a 'if this, then that?' I know you watch the Council meetings and Workshops, and if you watched the previous Workshop, you saw a majority of the Council saying they're supportive to the idea of assisting with creating some better options for your SAD, so that we can market that altogether as a better option. I don't know that you need to come up and start talking about changing things to residential when the tone of the Council has been, 'No, we need the jobs corridor.' That's kind of what I'm balancing with."

Mr. McCurry said, "What I would say is that it's something we're considering. We have not submitted any applications to this date. What we're looking at . . . . And again, it is all in reaction to what we're hearing from the market to allow for some flexibility to do some residential. The jobs corridor is about 900 acres. The northern 486 acres or so is already zoned for PUD, and already zoned for the employment center use. We wouldn't be looking at making any changes to that. The southern piece, which is a little bit smaller, is where we think it might make sense to allow for some increased residential capacity in that area. The mixed use designation still allows for all of the other designations, such as industrial, commercial, and office. It is kind of a transitionary zone from the retail designations at the Becker interchange, so that is what we see as potentially allowing for some additional residential in that area as a transition up into the more intensive employment corridor could make some sense, and could help better market the property. Like I said, it is something we're considering, and we haven't submitted any applications to date."

Ms. Berger said, "I just want to make sure we're hearing each other correctly. I understand and you know I understand, what it is about the transition piece, and I also understand that to the west, we have additional properties that are already residential, and have been approved here and at the state level. I know we don't do DRI's anymore, but from a DRI standpoint, that was something we anticipated being a focus for the job

category. We'll have a conversation afterwards, I guess, but I want to make sure I'm not hearing that if we don't move forward with this SAD adjustment, then we're going to change it to residential." Mr. McCurry replied, "All I can say right now is that it's something we're considering. We haven't submitted any applications on it. If we were to move forward with an application on it, the residential you would see within a mixed use category within that area is a transition zone, and would likely be higher density, like apartments and condos, as opposed to the single-family that you're going to see to the west. Again, it is just something we're considering for flexibility and reaction to the market."

Mr. Oravec said, "To your comment about residential to the west, that has already decreased in intensity. They have divested themselves, and I think we even have another Item on tonight's City Council Agenda where they are taking out commercial, because it is in Southern Grove already. Those were supposed to have neighborhood, retail, and office uses that all kind of fit with some of the ULI planning principles, etc., and that is already coming out to be pure residential, because you have the commercial in Southern Grove, but now, we have this positioning of, 'Well maybe we're going to take some of the jobs corridor out of Southern Grove and make it residential.' That's why I say it is an interesting policy debate for another day." Ms. Berger said, "I think that we're going to be asked to leave some skin in the game, but when we're talking about both help, assistance with an SAD and changing to more residential, I think that is a lot of skin to leave in the game." Chair Oravec said, "Agreed. It is problematic for me. I was a staffer at the time, and we had Vice Mayor or Councilman Kelly at the time. I remember Ken Pruitt coming and presenting to the Council about the Southwest Annexation Area, so you just have a number of interesting angles to that. I get excited about the hospital growth, I like that Kaiser is developing over there, and I'm happy to see the service retail, but the service retail comes from what's already there and what is planned. That is not exciting from an Economic Development standpoint. Mr. McCurry, I know you get this. You are a long time planner, and you know your stuff. That is going to come. It is not value added. To me, it is not as impressive, not as desirable, or not as compatible with the original vision as what's happening across the street."

Ms. Martin said, "I would look forward to that policy conversation if and when things come before us in the future, but I also want to make a point in saying that things evolve over time. I'm not saying that I'm pro-more residential, because we certainly have enough of it, but we have to remember that the market evolves over time, things evolve over time, and the market is going to dictate what occurs, to a certain extent. We have to be open and willing to listen to all that, and research and analyze it, and not focus on what we did 10 and 15 years ago, because we all know from experience that what has been planned and what was done 10 and 15 years ago doesn't necessarily work for today. I would just say that going into these policy discussions, which I think are very important, especially based on our Strategic Plan, our Visions, and what we have already decided . . . . We need to also be willing to evolve and grow, and see what is presented to us at that time." Chair Oravec asked, "Is there any additional discussion?" There was no response.

11. DETERMINATION OF EXCUSED ABSENCES

A) BOARD MEMBER BERGER – COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA), MARCH 28, 2016.

Vice Chair Bartz **moved** to approve Item 11 a). Mr. Bowen **seconded** the motion. The City Clerk restated the motion as follows: for approval of Item 11 a). The motion **passed unanimously** by roll call vote.

12. OTHER ISSUES BY BOARD MEMBERS

There was nothing heard under this Item.

13. ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

_____
Karen A. Phillips, City Clerk

_____
Jeannette C. Baeza, Deputy City Clerk

CITY OF PORT ST LUCIE

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEMORANDUM

Agenda Item #: 7
Meeting Date: 9/26/16

TO: Community Redevelopment Agency Board

THRU: Patricia Roebling, Executive Director

THRU: Daniel Holbrook, Assistant City Manager – Community Development Director

FROM: Bridget Kean- CRA Director BK

Agenda Item: CRA Resolution: 16-02 Fiscal Year 2016-17 CRA Budget

Submittal Date: 9/21/2016

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK: Goals 2020, Goal 1 Financially Sound City.

BACKGROUND: A Community Redevelopment Agency is a dependent special district and must comply with Chapter 189, Florida Statutes. Chapter 189, Florida Statutes, requires the governing body of each special district to adopt a budget by resolution each fiscal year. The proposed budget of a dependent special district must be contained within the general budget of the local governing authority to which it is dependent and be clearly stated as the budget of the dependent district. In addition, the total amount available from taxation and other sources, including balances brought forward from prior fiscal years, must equal the total of appropriations for expenditures and reserves. In accordance with these requirements, the Community Redevelopment Agency (the "Agency") has worked with the Office of Management and Budget to prepare the Agency's annual budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17. The proposed budget is being presented to the Community Redevelopment Agency Board for review and approval. The proposed budget is contained in the City's Annual Budget as Fund Number 175 for the Eastern CRA and Fund Number 178 for the Southern Grove CRA District.

ANALYSIS: The proposed budget for the Eastern CRA is $4,452,727 and is sufficient to cover $124,995 in personal services, $375,960 in operating expenses (including SAD payments), and $3,896,753 in debt service. The proposed budget for the Southern Grove CRA is $53,900.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement between the City, CRA, and Southern Grove Community Development District No. 1, the City is required to transfer 95 percent of any tax increment revenue collected with respect to Southern Grove property to the Southern Grove CDD No. 1 to help cover the special assessment payments on qualified properties.

The budget figures are based on estimates and are subject to change depending on final millage rates of the City and County.

LEGAL INFORMATION: Reviewed by Counsel for the CRA and approved as to form.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve CRA Resolution 16-02 to adopt the CRA budget.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: N/A

PRESENTATION INFORMATION: N/A

REQUESTED MEETING DATE: 9/26/2016

LOCATION OF PROJECT: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution and Exhibits "A" and "B", pages 146 and 147 of proposed City of Port St. Lucie FY 2016-17 Budget.

*All the attached items have been sent to the City Clerk. Any items not provided in the City Council packets are available upon request from the City Clerk.

RESOLUTION CRA 16-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (THE "AGENCY") RELATING TO THE ANNUAL BUDGET, APPROVING THE ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE AGENCY FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 2016 AND ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017; AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Port St. Lucie City Council created a Community Redevelopment Agency pursuant to Chapter 163, Part III, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the governing body of the Agency is required to adopt a budget by resolution each fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the total amount available from taxation and other sources, including balances brought forward from prior fiscal years, must equal the total of appropriations for expenditures and reserves; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director of the Agency has caused to be prepared a budget for the Agency for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2016 and ending September 30, 2017 under Community Redevelopment Trust Fund No. 175 and Southern Grove Community Redevelopment Trust Fund No. 178 as contained within the annual budget for the City of Port St. Lucie for Fiscal Year 2016-17, attached as Exhibits "A" and "B".

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The foregoing whereas clauses and recitations are hereby ratified and confirmed as being true, and the same are hereby made a part of this Resolution.

RESOLUTION CRA 16-02

Section 2. The Annual Budget of the Community Redevelopment Agency for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2016 and ending September 30, 2017, attached as Exhibits "A" and "B", is hereby approved and adopted.

Section 3. Funding appropriated in the budget may be expended in accordance with the provisions of the budget, the Community Redevelopment Plan, and as authorized by law. Expenditures of additional revenues received by the Community Redevelopment Agency during the fiscal year shall be deemed to be appropriated, subject to the approval of the Community Redevelopment Agency.

Section 4 This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the City of Port St. Lucie Community Redevelopment Agency this 26th day of September, 2016.

CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

BY: _____
Gregory J. Oravec, Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Karen A. Phillips, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____
O. Reginald Osenton, Counsel

Exhibit "A"

CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
PROPOSED BUDGET - CRA FUND #175
FY 2016-17

	AUDITED 2013-14 **********	AUDITED 2014-15 **********	ESTIMATED 2015-16 **********	PROPOSED 2016-17 **********	PROJECTED 2017-18 **********	PROJECTED 2018-19 **********	PROJECTED 2019-20 **********
REVENUES & SOURCES:							
Contribution of Ad Valorem Taxes - County GF	$330,453	$478,375	$586,672	$661,180	$720,686	$729,334	$738,086
Contribution of Ad Valorem Taxes - County Fine & Forf.	448,946	414,214	464,798	523,827	570,972	622,359	678,372
Required TIF Property Tax Pmt from City General Fund	399,346	446,941	524,988	797,874	853,725	930,560	1,014,311
Required TIF Property Tax Pmt from City Road Operating Fund	41,380	46,312	51,933	57,154	60,011	63,012	66,162
Required TIF Property Tax Pmt from City Road CIP Fund	63,889	71,510	0	0	0	0	0
Interfund Transfer from Fund #375	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interfund Transfer from Fund #377	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interfund Transfer from Fund #605	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Sale of Civic Center and Village Square - City General Fund	0	0	200,000	483,403	1,083,350	1,257,850	1,457,150
Sale of Civic Center and Village Square - City Parks MSTU Fund	2,711,570	3,300,000	3,000,000	1,800,000	1,600,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Interest Inc. & Other	22,876	20,301	26,500	22,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Budgeted Cash Carryforward	0	0	125,011	107,289	28,015	167,171	623,679
TOTAL	4,018,459	4,777,667	4,979,902	4,452,727	4,941,759	5,495,286	6,302,760
EXPENDITURES:							
Personal Services	11,735	136,484	142,000	124,995	129,995	136,494	143,319
Operating Expenses / SAD Pmts	292,674	347,675	300,000	375,960	379,720	394,908	411,100
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0
Debt Service (City Center & CRA Expansion)	4,325,663	4,333,725	4,430,100	3,896,753	4,238,350	4,313,150	4,580,750
Interfund Transfer to the Medical Fund #605	0	0	513	0	0	0	0
Administrative Charge	0	0	0	26,004	26,524	27,054	27,595
Contingency	0	0	0	28,015	167,171	623,679	1,139,996
TOTAL	4,630,072	4,817,884	4,872,613	4,452,726	4,941,759	5,495,286	6,302,760
SURPLUS <DEFICIT>	($611,612)	($40,216)	$107,289	$0	($0)	$0	($0)

Exhibit "B"

CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
PROPOSED BUDGET - SOUTHERN GROVE CRA FUND #178
FY 2016-17

	AUDITED 2013-14 **********	AUDITED 2014-15 **********	ESTIMATED 2015-16 **********	PROPOSED 2016-17 **********	PROJECTED 2017-18 **********	PROJECTED 2018-19 **********	PROJECTED 2019-20 **********
REVENUES & SOURCES:							
Contribution of Ad Valorem Taxes - County GF	$102	$0	$5,478	$5,889	$6,331	$6,806	$7,316
Interfund Transfer of Property Tax from City General Fund	81	0	5,478	$44,091	47,398	50,952	54,774
Interfund Transfer of Property Tax from City Road Op. Fund	8	0	0	3,158	0	0	0
Interfund Transfer of Property Tax from City Road CIP Fund	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interest/Cash	0	2	4	4	0		
Budgeted Cash Carryforward	0	0	207	758	6,420	9,106	11,994
TOTAL	205	2	11,167	53,900	60,148	66,864	74,084
EXPENDITURES:							
Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payment to Southern Grove CDD (95% of revenue collected)	0	0	10,409	47,481	51,042	54,870	58,986
Contingency	0	0	0	6,420	9,106	11,994	15,098
TOTAL	0	0	10,409	53,900	60,148	66,864	74,084
SURPLUS <DEFICIT>	$205	$2	$759	$0	$0	$0	$0