

**DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
MINUTES**

September 27, 2011

There was a meeting of the Downtown Development Authority held Tuesday, September 27, 2011 at 8:00 a.m. in the Conference Room 149B at 301 South Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, Florida. The following people were present:

Board Members

Mr. Bob Abraham, Chair
Ms. Sheryl Cook
Mr. Joseph Hopkins
Ms. Stacey Lipton
Ms. Kelly White

Staff Members Present

Mr. Jason Jeffries, Project Manager
Mr. Bob Jagger, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Jeanne Tolley, Redevelopment Technician
Ms. Peggy Glatt, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Abraham called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Glatt called the roll and noted members present as stated above.

3. Approval of the Minutes of August 26, 2011

Ms. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes of August 26, 2011. Ms. White seconded the motion and it was unanimously (5-0).

4. Budget Update

Mr. Jeffries presented the budget update for the current year. He stated there would be a few additional expenses due to expenditures made out of the current fiscal year with invoices expected to be received after October 1st. He asked for approval of the following transfers: \$50 from office supplies to care and subsistence, \$2,500 from Downtown marketing to projects and \$5,500 from Downtown Marketing to Downtown events.

Ms. White asked why the Downtown Bar-B-Q was included and asked if it had been paid.

Mr. Jeffries stated expenses were paid for the BBQ and it should have been paid from the previous fiscal year, but when the request for payment came in, it came in late and therefore was paid in November so it came out of the current fiscal year.

Mr. Abraham stated the transfers would balance the budget.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes it would allow for payments to be made when invoices were received.

Board Action

Ms. Cook motioned to approve the budget transfers Ms. White seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

5. Funding Approval: Halifax Art Show

Mr. Jeffries stated the request was for \$10,750 to support the Halifax Art Show and would cover the Best of Show prize for \$5000 and permit fees. He explained that this had been the Board's commitment for the last couple of years. He stated that the DDA provided advertising through Bright House last year.

Mr. Abraham stated the request was a bit higher than last year.

Ms. Lipton asked how much the fees were last year.

Mr. Abraham stated that the Best of Show prize was \$4000 and event fees were \$4981.

Ms. Lipton stated there was concern the previous year from Beach Street restaurant owners about the number of food vendors brought in and where they were placed.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Al Smith would be responsible for food vendors for the next Art Show and he was not the previous year.

Mr. Al Smith stated that he had been responsible for the food for four years however he had not been the previous year. He stated at the next Art Show there would be a food court at Magnolia Avenue and Beach Street and there would be two food vendors in the north block in the Park.

Ms. Lipton stated that there were new restaurant operators on the street and suggested they be sent a letter to let them know about the event and to let them know what they would be allowed to do in front of their business.

Mr. Smith stated that he had been in contact with restaurant owners.

Ms. White asked why the DDA was being asked to contribute more than \$2,000 more for the upcoming event.

Mr. Abraham stated that the Best of Show prize had increased and the event fees could be higher.

Ms. Lipton stated that Cultural Services was raising their fees and she had paid higher fees for the French Market.

Mr. Jeffries stated that there were specific line items and some of the City fees that were set by City ordinance had been increased by \$50 or \$100 but the Police fees for the event had decreased. He stated he had been working with Cultural Services. He stated that the department that did the cleanup of the parks had projected the cost the previous year to be \$50 but there were overflowing trash cans and the cost was \$360.

Mr. Abraham asked about the increase in the cost of the Best in Show prize.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the DDA had been committed in the past to contribute \$5,000 but last year \$4,000 went to the Best in Show prize and \$1,000 was a donation to the Museum. At this year's show the Best in Show prize was between \$6,000 and \$7,000 so the DDA contribution of \$5,000 would all go to the winner.

Ms. Lipton stated that she had questioned the amount of the prize and was told that it attracts better artists and with the competition among all of the shows it was very important for the event.

Board Action

Mr. Hopkins made a motion to approve funding of \$10,750 for the contribution of \$5,000 to the Halifax Art Show for the Best of Show prize and \$5,750 for permitting costs. Ms. White seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

6. Funding Approval: Bright House Commercials

Mr. Jeffries stated that the request was the second part of the commitments to the Halifax Art Show which was to provide Downtown commercial to promote and advertise Downtown shopping and dining and promote the Art Show. He stated that the ads would run for at least two weeks in October and the first week in

November leading up to the art show and some of the ads would also mention the French Market.

Ms. Lipton asked if there would be any print ads for the event.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the DDA's commitment was for advertising through TV ads. He stated the Art Show had a marketing person working on other types of advertising.

Ms. Lipton stated that they would work with the Downtown on the gang page so they could get their advertising less expensive.

Mr. Jeffries stated that he would make them aware.

Board Action

Ms. Lipton made a motion to approve funding of \$3,100 for Bright House TV commercials. Ms. White seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

7. Funding Approval: French Market

Mr. Jeffries stated that the request for funds was for assistance to pay the permitting fees for the French Market of \$1,000.

Ms. Lipton stated she thought the request was for a higher amount than indicated by Mr. Jeffries.

Mr. Jeffries stated he only covered the permit fees because what was generally what was paid by the DDA.

Ms. Lipton stated that she had not had a chance to look at all of the expenses and did not know how much she had available for print ads. She stated that she had just given out 15,000 post cards but she would review the funds she had and may have to ask for additional money.

Ms. White asked if there was a financial layout for the French Market.

Mr. Jeffries stated that last year there was an extensive financial review and the revenue came from fees collected from the vendors.

Ms. Lipton agreed and stated all funds came from contracts with vendors.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the event revenues exceeded what was initially projected.

Ms. White asked where the revenues would be paid.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Ms. Lipton collected the checks then they were deposited. He stated that she worked through Cultural Services and they agreed to partnering with Ms. Lipton. He explained that nothing they pay exceeded what was collected in revenue from the French Market and there was a separate account to track revenues and expenses of the French Market.

Ms. Lipton stated that their fees had been the same amount for each event.

Mr. Jeffries stated that he could look at what were normal finances for the project then email the information to the Board rather than waiting for the next meeting.

Ms. Lipton stated she had not seen any background information on where the funds went or who they went to.

Mr. Abraham stated that Mr. Jeffries would look into that information.

Board Action

Ms. Cook made a motion to approve funding for the French Market in the amount of \$1000 with the stipulation that if additional funds were needed that that Ms. Lipton would come back for approval at the next meeting for up to an additional \$500. Ms. White seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

8. Independent Review of DBPA Grant Finances

Mr. Jeffries stated the report before the Board was a follow-up to the approved motion for an independent review of expenditures for the 2009/2010 expenses related to the DBPA grant. Mr. Dennis Raposa would present his findings, which was that \$5,379.62 of the expenses submitted by the DBPA were not eligible.

Mr. Dennis Raposa, partner with Raposa and Young, Port Orange, stated he was hired to do a procedures engagement which consisted of procedures and findings. The work he did was to define an agreed upon set of procedures with the DDA. Mr. Raposa stated that he then made requests of the DBPA and John Meyers and conducted phone interviews with Mr. Meyers and met with Ms. Weiss to clarify procedures and get documents requested in order to come up with a report. He stated that the summary of findings looked at specific costs. The AT&T phone bills had some long distance calls that were not allowed so \$25.53 had been deleted for those calls. He stated that News Journal ads were allowable however MyBliss ads were not specific to Downtown so they were not allowed and \$3,600 was paid for those. Restaurant/food charges were too specific to the grant so \$633.30 was not allowed. Postage charges were for mailing of the newsletter so none were in question. Office supplies had no traceable support to the purpose of the grant. He stated he also had observations that the grant had some problems and was not well written so it caused communication problems between the DDA

and DBPA. He stated that prior to the grant payments were being made each quarter with the DBPA submitting a reconciliation at the end of the quarter but at some point that changed and the DBPA was submitting receipts and being reimbursed. He stated that the grant had very limited room for overhead with specific costs for certain insurances but very little for office supplies. He explained that if office supplies were purchased it was difficult to tell if they were used only for grant purposes. He stated that the grant called for an audit to be done but Mr. Meyers supplied an agreed upon procedures report so the Board was not getting what they expected. He stated he had been asked to comment on internal controls of the DBPA and they were typical of other small agencies when it came to internal controls, which was informal. He stated that typically in a small organization the Executive Director was in charge of everything from check writing to data entry and Quick Books and the DBPA had a bookkeeper who was using Quick Books. He stated that monitoring and oversight of the grant was the main issue. For a small organization it would not be reasonable to require a financial statement audit because it would cost \$10,000 which would be 10% of the grant and not a good use of money. He stated that if the grant continued it might be good to use the City's audit staff to do periodic monitoring or require the grantee to open a separate bank account for grant funds with a board member as a signer.

Ms. Cook stated there were normally more checks and balances with more than one person able to check the invoice and sign off.

Mr. Raposa stated that the DBPA was a one person operation with the executive director responsible for everything which made it difficult. He stated to do a proper segregation of duties four people would be needed, one to have custody of the assets, someone to do record keeping, someone to sign checks and someone to reconcile the assets. With only one person the Board of Directors became involved in internal control duties.

Ms. White stated that two signatures were required to sign the DBPA checks, with one being a Board member.

Mr. Raposa stated that dual signatures were a control but he had never seen dual signatures be an effective control especially if you go to the bank and say there were supposed to be two signatures. The banks don't abide by that. He stated that he had seen fraud committed when there were two signatures and a Board member was the second signature so it was not the best fail safe.

Ms. Cook asked what would be a better way.

Mr. Raposa stated having four separate people worked better however, having two signatures was better than one. He stated it was not fair to the Board to put all the responsibility on the executive director.

Mr. Abraham stated that some points were valid but were moot because the grant agreement had been terminated. He stated that the Board would have to make a decision about the disallowed expenses being returned to the DDA.

Ms Cook asked Mr. Raposa if the paperwork had been given to him in an organized way.

Mr. Raposa stated yes, as it was presented to him. He stated that he did go through the records himself but made a request for specific items then the items were given to him.

Ms. Cindy Ritzi stated that Ms. Weiss had worked to provide information to Mr. Raposa. She stated that the bookkeeper did all the check writing and entered all the bills into the Quick Books program. She stated that they had a treasurer for at least three years who provided financial statements for monthly meetings. She stated that they had two check signers and Ms. Weiss was the third check signer but she was only allowed to sign a check if it was under \$500 so the signers were principally herself and Sans Lasseter. She stated that each time they were given a check to sign, the bill or invoice was attached so they were not blindly signing a check.

Ms. Naomi Weiss stated that along with the DBPA report they submitted a letter with responses to each item that had been signaled out as ineligible. She stated that the items that were signed out as disallowed were not allowed because of specific language in the grant agreement or a lack of specific connection between the exact charge and the grant agreement. She stated that the office supplies receipts did not specifically say what a packet of paper was used for so because she did not take the document to that level it was not traceable to the grant. She stated that the response to the phone bill was that they never had a log of long distance phone calls but looking at the phone bill she knew a number of the calls that were not related to the grant and those totaled \$25.23. She stated that she had used her personal cell phone for business since she began working for the DBPA and she did not get reimbursed for her cell phone. She stated that the previous executive director billed 100% of their phone to the DBPA and grant. She estimated that half of her \$135 cell phone bill was related to the DBPA and grant so she asked that be taken into consideration when reviewing the \$25 that was disallowed. She stated that the Bliss Magazine ad was not allowed because it was related to the Farmers' Market and when the ad was done she did not approach the Board with it as a separate project but it was similar to advertising for the Halifax Art Show or the French Market. She stated the DBPA used the Farmers' Market to promote people coming Downtown. She stated that even though it was not related to the grant agreement, as written, she asked that the Board approved it as a way to get people to the Downtown. The Farmers' Market was not a Main Street event it was an event that happened Downtown every week. She stated that the restaurant/food charges that were not allowed because there was nothing in the grant agreement that specified food/entertainment were allowable. She stated that

the meals were related to Main Street activities and she had receipts and a calendar showing meeting dates. She asked that the Board recognize those as Main Street program expenses and were allowable. The postage charges were done through a third party mailer and the charges were related administrative overhead so when they had expenses for postage it was for membership. Ms. Weiss acknowledged the expense was for administration and did not request payment be allowed. She stated that office supplies were not listed in the grant agreement as allowable expenses under administration. However, when the DDA approved the 2009/10 budget it specifically included office supplies. She stated that the DBPA was operating under the assumption that office supplies were allowed so she asked that it be an allowable administrative expense. She stated that marketing was not listed as an approved cost but she noted her documentation how the marketing supplies related to activities and related to the Promotions and Economic Restructuring committees. She stated they were very satisfied with the review and that issues were satisfied.

Ms. Lipton asked if, in regards to office supplies, there were agendas for the town hall meetings.

Ms. Weiss stated she had printed agendas for board meetings, executive committee meetings, and each of the three committee meetings which had been meeting at least twice a month and the town hall meetings. She stated that when she did merchant visits she gave them one page updates of what was happening in Downtown.

Ms. Lipton stated that she had issues with Bliss Magazine because she did not understand why they had an add with a huge watermelon but nothing about Downtown and she had questioned it when she originally saw it.

Ms. Weiss stated that they were no longer doing the Bliss ad because people did not think it was effective.

Ms. White asked for the legal name of the organization.

Ms. Weiss stated that the name was Downtown Business & Professional Association, Inc. and they had a fictitious name, Daytona Beach Partnership Association.

Ms. White asked if the contract was under the Daytona Beach Partnership.

Mr. Jagger stated that he was not the Board attorney when the grant was written so he was not sure.

Ms. Weiss stated she was not sure when the fictitious name was done but she thought it was in 2001 when they became a Main Street Association.

Ms. White stated that the largest expense in question was the MyBliss ad and marketing the Farmers' Market and the DDA had given a grant for a manager of the Market so the Board gave money to staff the Market so the DBPA did not have to use their money. She stated there should be a surplus of money and she wanted to know how those funds were being reinvested. She asked what the DBPA thought should happen to resolve the discrepancy.

Ms. Ritzi stated that they would agree to whatever the Board wanted to do. She stated that all of the funds they used had been used in the best interest of the Downtown.

Ms. Lipton stated that her objection was a picture of a giant watermelon that had nothing to do with Downtown and it was specifically created for the Farmers' Market.

Ms. White stated that it was very important for the Board to say how they were going to evaluate success. She asked if \$3,600 was approved and if it was not supposed to be used for the Farmers' Market advertising then what did the Board think it was going to be used for.

Ms. Weiss stated that it was under the general marketing category.

Mr. Jeffries stated that from a staff perspective it was a general promotion for Downtown shopping.

Mr. Abraham stated that the question was if the Board paid for something they should not have.

Ms. Lipton stated they compromise and pay half.

Citizen Comments

Ms. Judy Chiles, a resident, asked why there was no longer a grant.

Mr. Abraham stated that the DBPA had elected to terminate the grant agreement and the DDA accepted the termination.

Ms. Cook stated that in Mr. Raposa's report it stated no support was received and the DBPA did not contest and asked if that meant there were no receipts.

Mr. Raposa stated that if receipts were not received he would have put NONE.

Ms. Weiss stated that the items that said NONE and the comment was "this expense is disallowed" and the DBPA did not contest, those items were items that were never paid. She submitted a quarterly report then staff reviewed and marked

as disallowed so they were not paid for those items and the DBPA did not contest that decision.

Ms. Cook stated that they were asking for \$633.30 which was part of what was contested.

Ms. Weiss stated she only responded to items they were not paid and were not trying to get paid on.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Mr. Raposa's total amount was the amount being contested.

Mr. Raposa stated that the total in the report was all of the items the DDA requested be reviewed.

Mr. Abraham suggested the Board vote item by item whether or not to pay. The Board agreed to pay the phone bill \$25,53, office supplies \$772.65 and Marketing \$215.62.

Ms. Lipton questioned the MyBliss ad because it was for an entity that should have its own funding source and that was the Farmers' Market. She stated she wanted a decision to be made so they could move on.

Mr. Abraham stated that the Board was in agreement to pay the phone bill, office supplies and marketing but had a problem with MyBliss and Restaurant/Food Charges which totaled \$4,233.50. He asked what the Board wanted to do about MyBliss.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it was intended to go to the Farmers' Market which was not part of the Downtown but he did not know how they could separate the two. He stated that if they promoted the Farmers' Market they brought people Downtown whether it was directly or indirectly. He suggested they pay a percentage of the ad.

Mr. Abraham stated that new members were concerned because the ad did not mention Downtown.

Ms. Lipton stated it was a lot of money that was badly spent and she suggested they pay 50%.

It was the consensus of the Board to pay 50% of the MyBliss ad.

Mr. Abraham asked what the Board wanted to do with the Restaurant/Food Charges.

Ms. Lipton stated that she did not think the DDA should pay food cost for people to do work.

Ms. Weiss stated that she respected the Board's decision but Ms. Lipton's comment made it sound like the expenses were for Naomi's lunches and she had shown that they were payments for volunteer meetings and not Naomi's free lunch service.

Mr. Abraham stated that nobody thought that. In summary the consensus was to allow phone bills of \$25.53, office supplies of \$772.65, marketing supplies of \$215,63 and \$1,800 for half of the MyBliss ad.

Board Motion

Ms. Lipton made a motion to disallow expenses in the amount of \$2,813.81. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Jeffries stated that some items had already been disallowed so he would refigure the amount to be paid which would be approximately \$2,600.

Ms. Cook asked if Mr. Jeffries would have the amount for the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Jeffries stated that based on the motion he understood the direction the Board wanted to go in.

Board Action

The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

9. DOWNTOWN HOLIDAY PROMOTIONS

Ms. Kelly Koliopulos stated she and Debbie Brand, of Bullseye Marketing, wanted to promote the fourth quarter shopping for the Downtown as well as create something that could be carried out through the year with the theme "Buy Local, Think Downtown". She stated that they had done research and found that for every dollar spent locally 45 cents stayed in the market but if you spent a dollar at a chain only 15 cents stayed in the market. She stated they wanted to be sure that customers were constantly thinking about that and think about the merchants in the Downtown area. She stated that for the immediately future they were implementing a holiday discount card that would give card holders a 10% discount at any of the participating merchants. In addition everyone who had a card would be entered into a drawing to win a 5' stocking filled with gifts from participating merchants. She stated that involvement on the merchants side was that they would honor the 10% discount, which had a \$100 cap, and they would donate something with a \$50 value for the stocking. She stated there was also a

rack card that would be placed in the store of the participating merchants and once Bulleye got all of the cards back they would generate a master customer list for the merchants and DDA. She stated they would promote the cards by going to the Farmers' Market, French Market and Halifax Art Show and a newsletter would be going out to let people know what was going on. She stated they felt the best way to promote the card was through radio then downtown and shopping would be through TV. They were also creating a landing page for people who heard about the card on the radio so they could register online. Ms. Koliopulos stated that the cost for electronic media was \$3,000 for Brighthouse and \$4,240 for Black Crow and WORD. She stated they would produce 2000 rack cards and posters for merchant windows. She felt the TV ad needed to be upgraded to show customer interaction with vendors to show a happy environment to interact with. She stated they would purchase an email database with 27,000 names on it that could be used for one year and would be the property of the DDA. They had a good response from merchants and everyone she had talked to had signed up. She stated that a couple of merchants who did not want to participate in the discount said they would display the card and support the program.

Mr. Jagger stated that Mr. Hopkins would need to fill out the voting conflict form because of the advertising done through his radio station and he would need to abstain from voting.

Ms. White asked what the expectation to the Board was from Bullseye as far as reporting and documentation to be sure what was in the budget was delivered.

Mr. Abraham asked how they would measure success of the program.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that they would give the DDA the database of emails and they would have reports from the service they used for the email blasts. They would also have deliverables as far as how many reached the intended person and how many were opened. They would also have the number of people who completed the card with their name and address that would be part of the database. At the end of the program she would send a survey to the merchants to get feedback.

Ms. White stated that it was always good to get feedback.

Ms. Lipton stated that there was a burden on every business to give out the cards and she did not have time during the holidays to do that.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that there was no cost and merchants would not be selling the cards. She stated it would be up to the merchants if they wanted to display the cards and have people fill them out.

Ms. Lipton stated she already gave discounts and had reasonable prices so she could not afford to take 10% off so she was concerned the program would not work for everyone.

Ms. Brand stated that it was not up to the merchants to push the cards. That was just an option if they wanted to do it but they would need to be sure the information was filled out completely and retained then Bullseye would collect the cards. She stated they would be promoting the cards through the website and advertisements but they did not want it to be a burden for the merchants.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that some businesses were only one person and did not have time to do anything so they could feel like something was being done for them.

Mr. Jeffries stated that he had been talking to businesses and people had been positive about something being done to promote business.

Ms. Lipton stated that she did not know if the discount card was enough to get someone Downtown. She asked what would separate Downtown from other shopping areas.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that was why they were pushing the message to buy local.

Ms. Lipton stated that she wanted to make sure enough was being done to make a difference and she did not think it was.

Ms. Koliopulos stated it was a starting point and would showcase what was Downtown.

Ms. Cook stated that she did not give out her customer emails so she asked if Bullseye could give her the information in the email blasts so she could send them to her customers. At that point they could go to the landing page and sign up for the discount card.

Ms. Koliopulos stated yes she could give Ms. Cook the email blasts for her customers. She stated that they would spotlight 3 different businesses so emails Ms. Cook would send to her customers would be promoting someone else's business.

Ms. Brand stated that they could provide Ms. Cook with a template or she could give them her email list and they could add emails from the cards to her list.

Mr. Jeffries showed an example of a TV ad from Bullseye.

Mr. Abraham stated he was confused about the email database of 27,000 names for \$2,000 for one year and asked if they would have to pay \$2,000 again in one year.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that the industry worked with one year contracts.

Mr. Abraham asked if the DDA could build their own database or if they would be obligated to pay more than one year.

Ms. Koliopulos stated no, there was no obligation to continue. She stated they used one year because people's information changed and new people came to the area so the information would be outdated.

Mr. Abraham asked if after a year if they could still use the 27,000 email list.

Ms. Koliopulos stated technically no.

Mr. Jeffries stated that if Bullseye sent out a mass email and those people responded with the card then the DDA had captured the email.

Mr. Abraham stated that the concept was the DDA would have their own list and not have to pay \$2,000.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that Bullseye had bought an email list for another client and was able to use it for three years. She stated that the standard was one year but she could possibly renegotiate the time period, however, there would still be the possibility it would be outdated.

Mr. Abraham stated that at the previous Board meeting the Board approved a budget of \$15,000 but the total on the proposed budget from Bullseye was \$15,625.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that they were recommending that the TV commercial be reused to cut costs.

Ms. White asked if the Board would be given an update of the successes in January.

Ms. Koliopulos stated yes but prior to that she could draw up something that said what was expected of them with a timeline.

Mr. Jeffries stated that a contract had been submitted but it had not yet been reviewed by the Legal Department. He stated they would review the provision and make sure it included everything the Board had requested.

Ms. White asked if the Board would receive invoices.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the invoices would come to the Redevelopment Department. He explained that once the Board recommended approval of an expenditure they did not generally see individual payments.

Board Motion

Ms. White made a motion to approve Holiday Downtown Promotions. Ms. Cook seconded the motion.

Ms. Cook stated that even though the Board had approved the amount of the contract and they did not need to see individual invoices they would like to see a detailed expenditure report.

Ms. White stated that she wanted to be as clear as possible with what the Board wanted and she did not want to wait until January to find out the number of emails that were collected or how many ads were done.

Mr. Jeffries stated that he would report to the Board with a summary of expenses.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that she could write up something for the Board but she understood what was expected of her.

Mr. Jeffries stated that from that point forward he would have promotions as a monthly agenda item and update the Board.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that she might be able to get an article in the paper because of the Buy Local concept.

Ms. Cook asked if they would be on radio shows.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that they were on the AM stations and she was trying to be on the FM stations.

Ms. Lipton stated that there was a large percentage of the senior group that did not have computers so they would have to reach them in a different way.

Ms. Koliopulos stated that radio and TV would help with those people.

Board Action

The motion was approved unanimously (4-0) with Mr. Hopkins abstaining from the vote.

10. Termination of Grant Agreement with the DDA

Mr. Abraham stated that he and Mr. Jeffries had met with Cindy Ritzi and Sans Lasseter regarding the termination of the grant agreement.

Mr. Jeffries described issues of the term and direction the DBPA was going. He stated that there was money in the budget line for Main Street and the DBPA requesting keeping it so that as they formulated their progress they would come before the Board to request that funding. He stated that they discussed the audit and the final payment. They also discussed certain DDA property that the DDA may request the return of such as the website domain, email list and pictures.

Mr. Abraham stated that the DBPA was currently planning to continue maintaining the website and domain names but depending on what they decided to do they would revisit that issue. They did not make a final determination on the email list and pictures.

Mr. Jeffries stated there was a willingness to share the pictures but they felt the email lists were the property of the Partnership.

Ms. Weiss stated that people who received emails received them from the DBPA and they did not understand the relationship between the DDA and the DBPA.

Mr. Abraham stated that the DDA could not take ownership of the email list because those people had rights too.

Ms. Weiss stated that the website was hosted by the Chamber and they paid for the domain name. She stated that they would add links to whatever sites the DDA created.

Ms. Lipton stated that they could not have two Downtown pages because it would cause confusion.

Mr. Jeffries stated that they would be going through the transition and Bullseye was not doing anything about a website. He stated that would be discussed when they discussed the RFP.

Ms. Weiss stated that with termination of the grant agreement the DBPA site would probably become more of a member site and not general Downtown issues. The main thing she wanted to communicate was that they wanted to be cooperative.

Mr. Abraham stated that they would work it out and there was no reason why there could not be two web pages. He stated that whenever he visited a new place he looked at websites and there were usually more than one.

Ms. White asked if the website downtowndaytonabeach.com and daytonadowntown.com were both still up and running.

Ms. Weiss stated that they were paid for by the DBPA through the DDA grant agreement. She stated that the Daytona Downtown site was purchased by the Chamber and given to the DBPA.

11. Request for Proposals (RFP) to Manage Downtown & Marketing Promotions

Mr. Jeffries stated that the issuance of an RFP had been discussed at the previous meeting and the proposal was to issue an RFP for marketing of the Downtown. He stated that the components discussed were proposed duties or functions, submittal information, evaluation criteria and a proposed schedule. He stated that included in the Board packet was the actual technical document that would be mailed out to potential marketing firms or individuals that would do the marketing for Downtown. The information was basically the same as what was proposed at the previous meeting. He explained that after the DDA selected a firm based on qualifications they would negotiate a contract. He suggested that the marketing firm have seminars for merchants to suggest different ways to do marketing. He stated he had done a survey of merchants in the Downtown and there was a surprising number who did no marketing so it was important for whoever won the RFP to do marketing seminars with the merchants.

Mr. Abraham reviewed the RFP schedule dates and asked about review of the proposals.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the DDA could act as the selection committee and the process of the selection would be included in the RFP when it was sent out. He stated that he had worked with the Purchasing Agent and the RFP was ready to be sent out. He would be sending it to Bullseye, Mastando and Kelly Beasley and asked the Board to let him know of any other marketing firm names. The RFP would be issued September 29th and firms would have 4 weeks to submit then the Board would have a special meeting to review the submittals.

Mr. Hopkins stated that there was an evaluation criteria in the RFP with 6 different categories that were weighted so they could interview the top 3 ranked firms.

Mr. Jagger stated there would need to be a public meeting to delegate authority.

Mr. Hopkins asked if it was the Board's duty to evaluate or select the firm.

Mr. Jagger stated both. The Board would have a special meeting for the ranking then presentations would be made at a regular meeting then the final decision would be made.

Ms. Cook asked if the Board would see the proposals prior to the meeting.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes. Submittals would be opened in the Purchasing Department the day they were due then copies would be sent to the selection committee.

Ms. White asked if a budget would be included in the RFP.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes. The Board could have a proposal meeting where respondents come in prior to formally responding and could ask questions about the process. He stated that for the remainder of the year, up to June, 2012, there was \$38,500. In June they would begin planning for the following year and based on past years there should be approximately \$75,000. Mr. Jeffries suggested having the firm give a presentation about how they would leverage funds and work with the merchants.

Board Action

Ms. White made a motion to approve the Request for Proposals to Manage Downtown Marketing and Promotions. Ms. Lipton seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

12. Downtown Branding

Mr. Jeffries presented proposed logos the Board had previously asked Mike Mastando to make changes to.

Mr. Mastando stated that at the last meeting the Board indicated they wanted to use more historic colors and swap types of palm trees. He presented what the logo would look like on shopping bags, vertical banners, letterhead and advertisements.

Board Action

Mr. Hopkins made a motion to adopt logo #1 (revised orange and palm logo). Ms. Cook seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

13. Staff Update

Mr. Jeffries stated that the Redevelopment Board had reviewed a concept plan for the William Square at the southeast corner of Magnolia and Palmetto Avenues. He stated that the plan was originally a 7 story, 137 unit building and the new plan was 3 – 4 story townhomes with 15 units. He stated that the developer got a positive review and staff was dealing with the issue of access to some of the townhomes which fronted on future public parking lots. He stated the plan called for mixed use with the potential for retail on the first floor.

Mr. Abraham stated that the Board had expressed an interested in a denser project so there would be more people living Downtown but the developer was dealing with a downed economy.

Ms. Cook asked if the Brownsfield designation had been lifted.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the property would always have Brownsfield which opened the option of funding from State or Federal agencies but the environmental issues had been resolved.

Ms. Lipton stated that Biketoberfest would be occurring in October so she would like to have the sidewalks cleaned after the event before the French Market.

Mr. Jeffries stated that he would look into the possibility but the Redevelopment staff no longer dealt with pressure cleaning. He stated that there were more stringent environmental requirements so Public Works was handling the cleaning to be sure that the rules were being followed.

Ms. Lipton stated there were bad weeds outside the fence on the property at ISB and Beach Street, where the Plaza was being planned.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the City was leasing that property therefore maintenance was the City's responsibility so he would have it taken care of.

Ms. Lipton stated that there was a need for tasteful wooden signs at every corner in the Downtown to let people know that there were merchants on the side streets.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the parking signs were removed and the Traffic Management was going to install the standard parking signs.

Ms. Lipton stated she was talking about having signs for businesses on the side streets.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Traffic was going to go out with an RFP to complete the sign package so he would check on the status of the RFP. If there was long timeframe he would see what else could be done.

Ms. Lipton stated that interim signage was needed.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Redevelopment funding was very limited in the October 1st budget.

14. **Public Comments**

Mr. John Nicholson, 413 N. Grandview Avenue, stated that there were going to be seven different staffing groups doing work in the Downtown and the work needed to be coordinated. He stated that the Main Street CRA did not have anyone in that area.

Mr. Jeffries stated that there was one entity doing marketing and promoting and that was the DDA who contracted with Bullseye Marketing and the CRA took care of maintenance.

Ms. Weiss stated that a town hall meeting was recently held with 40 people in attendance for the breakfast meeting.

15. **Other Business**

There was no other business

16. **Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11.20 a.m.



Bob Abraham, Chairman



Jeanne Tolley, Board Secretary