OMB Contract Review

Contract Name	Resolution Approving an Amendment to the Downtown Master Plan for the City of Safety Harbor, Florida Pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969, Chapter 163, Part III, Florida Statutes; and Providing an Effective Date				
GRANICUS	19-1589A	**Contract #**	Resolution	**Date:**	09-18-2019

Mark all Applicable Boxes:

Type of Contract									
CIP		**Grant**		**Other**	**X**	**Revenue**		**Project**	

Contract information:

New Contract (Y/N)	N/A	**Original Contract Amount**	N/A
Fund(s)	0001	**Amount of Change**	N/A
Cost Center(s)	114300	**Contract Amount**	N/A
Program(s)	1103	**Amount Available**	$18.2M (Proposed)
Account(s)	5310001	**Included in Applicable Budget? (Y/N)**	N/A
Fiscal Year(s)	FY20 (Proposed)		

Description & Comments

(What is it, any issues found, is there a financial impact to current/next FY, does this contract vary from previous FY, etc.)

OMB reviewed the submitted amendments to the City of Safety Harbor Community Redevelopment Plan (Downtown Master Plan). These amendments changing the Future Land Use of Baranoff Oak "park"; the maximum height for building and structures in portions of the Community Town Center, Public, and Traditional Neighborhood Development-1 Character Districts; and updates to the redevelopment objectives and Pinellas County Tax Increment Tax Financing (TIF) Eligibility Table, were adopted by the City of Safety Harbor's Commission by resolution on July 15, 2019.

The Safety Harbor CRA is slated to sunset in 2022. In 2018 (FY19), the County has contributed 57.6% of the total contributions to the CRA fund. Between 2008 and 2018, the County has contributed 59.1% of the total contributions to the fund. Since the establishment of the CRA fund, the County has contributed $3.7M.

COMMENTS:

Questions

Do the updates to the redevelopment objects and the Pinellas County TIF eligibility policies impact/modify the Activities, Estimated Costs and TIF Contribution Sources shown in the "Project Capital Expenditures (2012-2022)" table on page 20 of the City of Safety Harbor Downtown Master Plan? Updates to the redevelopment objectives provide for the City and CRA (Agency) to carry out eligible projects suited to the demonstrated needs and current market environment.

Why at this time (less than 3 years before sunset), is there a need to update the County's policy section of the plan? City staff is including the CRA Eligibility Table, approved by the BCC in 2018, into the CRA Plan to demonstrate the CRA Plan's consistency with the County's guiding policy (Policy) for CRA expenditures.

Does the City plan to extend the CRA pass the current 30-year period? If so, reconsideration of the County's contribution percentage may be in order. City staff has not indicated that an extension of the CRA will be requested.

Documents

Staff Report:

- Recommended Action Section, last sentence states, "… attest the resolution and covenant." Is a covenant part of the package in Granicus? I have not been able to find a "covenant" in the attached documentation. I may have missed it. If not, please remove "and covenant." The word Covenant has been removed as requested.

- Summary Section, listing of amendments - Is the name of the park "Baranoff Oak Park" or is it "Baranoff Park"? The name is used interchangeably by the City of Safety Harbor. I have updated the staff to reflect both for clarity. Baranoff Park is the name used on the City of Safety Harbor's website. Please verify. Also, should "park" be capitalized in item 1)? The Word 'park' has been capitalized as requested.
- For better tracking of the listed amendments, I would renumber "3)" as "2)", and "5)" as "3)". Since the current #2 and #4 are just the titles of the Exhibits, and not additional amendments. The listed amendments in the staff report has been renumbered as requested.

Resolution:

- Section I – The exhibit of the Resolution is referenced as "Exhibit A" and is labeled "Exhibit A" in the pdf document. I think it is confusing when the Resolution's exhibit is "Exhibit A," and the first document of the exhibit is also labeled "Exhibit A" and then followed by documents Exhibit B and Exhibit C. In the MSword resolution document attached in Granicus, the exhibit of the Resolution is reference as "Exhibit A" but is labeled "Exhibit 1." If possible, an "Exhibit 1" reference in Section I and a labeled of "Exhibit 1" for the exhibit, is less confusing due to the content of the exhibit. This comment may be just confusing, too. The staff report and exhibit document set (item attachment 2) has already been updated to reflect Exhibit 1. I have requested David Sadowsky to update the Resolution's Exhibit page to be updated to reflect the same.

Analyst: Katherine Burbridge **Please See Comments Above:** ☒