

be a discrepancy as to how the copies had been distributed to the Board, and what ordinance had been handed out.

New Board Member Update

Susan Batchelder advised that Avery Dial was a new member to the Community Services Advisory Board.

Avery Dial stated that this was his first endeavor in serving on a Board for the City. He added that he had been involved in student government in college and law school. He stated that he was an attorney and lived in Fort Lauderdale.

Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Update

Susan Batchelder stated that Mr. Battle has a great vision for the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Al Battle, Director Northwest CRA, stated that he was new to the area and was from Jacksonville. He stated that tonight he wanted to provide the Board with a general overview in regard to where the monies had been spent during the past year. He added that he had been in "the saddle" since February, 2005, and was still attempting to familiarize himself with all the information.

Mr. Battle further stated that the Northwest CRA boundaries were bounded on the north by Sunrise Boulevard, the west by 22nd and 24th Avenues, the south by Broward Boulevard, and on the east by Andrews Avenue and Federal Highway. He stated that the CRA consisted of about 1400 acres. He stated that when the CRA was formed in 1995, the vision was to create an opportunity to promote redevelopment in the north and west downtown portions of the City of Fort Lauderdale. He stated that in 2000, the CRA Advisory Board, with the direction of the CRA Board, prepared a Strategic Finance Plan in which they identified four critical areas for emphasis for redevelopment opportunities. He stated the areas identified were Flagler Village, Dorsey Riverbend, Sweeting Estates (as an area and as a project), and Sistrunk Boulevard (also as an area and as a project). To date there has been significant progress in some of those areas.

Mr. Battle continued stating that the old CRA Strategic Plan was a 5-year schedule of how the CRA would spend their dollars on an annual basis. In the equation, there would be some instances where they would be requesting assistance from the Community Development Division to spend money primarily in the areas of housing and incentive programs to help rejuvenate the area. He stated that as of Fiscal Year 2004/2005, there were three areas in which community development dollars were utilized in the CRA area. The first of those areas was along Sistrunk Boulevard where land had been purchased on behalf of the City using a variety of funding sources. Today, in most cases, they had disposed of those properties and utilized the community development regulations regarding such disposal, such as job requirements or some type of low to moderate income housing requirement. Those opportunities had been met. He stated that there were some additional opportunities upcoming, and RFPs had been put out soliciting development proposals. The developers had been notified that the parcels of land that were to be disposed of and had been acquired with community development dollars would have the same requirements. They would have to either create jobs or provide some type of low to moderate income housing opportunities for individuals. He added that they were optimistic that they would receive some very interesting proposals.

Mr. Battle further stated that another area where they had used community development dollars in the past was the Dorsey Riverbend in-fill project, where they had primarily used CRA and City

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 3

funds to acquire a collection of lots to create an urban subdivision. He stated that they had the Community Development Division help to provide fee waiver assistance, down payment assistance for the home program, and also assistance to potential buyers who met the income requirements. He stated that to date such dollars had not been used because the homes were not yet completed, but they expected that by the first quarter of 2006 they would ask for some of the funds to be drawn upon. He explained that they believed 5-10 of the lots would have buyers who would need financial assistance. He stated they did not require that a certain number of units be set-aside for such buyers, but they had been informed by the developers that they had interest from buyers in both price ranges.

Mr. Battle stated that another area where community development dollars were utilized was the Sweeting Estates project. In the past, such dollars were set aside for infrastructure. In looking at the Strategic Plan, about \$2 Million had been spent on infrastructure, including trees, landscaping and new roadways. He stated that 12-13 new homes had been built in the area, and another 11 would come on line with the development of the old retirement home site. He stated that such homes should be ready for occupancy by the latter part of 2006.

Mr. Battle continued stating that the last area using such monies was the Flagler Heights area. He explained that this area took off on its own with little assistance from the City. He advised that no community development block grant dollars had been used in that area primarily because the projects did not meet the objectives of the programs.

Mr. Battle further stated that in looking at 2005/2006 and 2006/2007, the CRA would be looking at Phase II opportunities, including the completion of the jobs in the four areas mentioned. He stated that Sistrunk Boulevard would be the greatest opportunity, and they had not yet decided how the street would be redeveloped. He explained they were attempting to identify the location of their next opportunities. He stated that the areas would need strategic visioning, planning and financial direction, which would be from the CRA or other partners, or even through the development block grant funds and other funds not yet identified.

Mr. Battle stated that the area was very condensed and easy to understand.

Mr. Goetz asked what percentage of the properties they were going to sell to developers would be designated for affordable housing. Mr. Battle stated that they did not specifically ask for a certain percentage. He continued stating that if a proposal was responded to, they had to meet the rules and regulations of the community development dollars that had been spent to purchase the properties. If they did an affordable project for sale or rent, they would have to meet the 51% or the 100% objectives.

Mr. Goetz asked about the properties that such criteria was not applicable to. Mr. Battle stated that would be a policy decision of the CRA Board. He stated that the discussion so far had centered around a 15% minimum threshold for any project coming on line. He added that the parcels he was referring to were small, and they may have only about 10-20 units at a time.

Sanford Rosenthal asked about the time frames involved in the phases. Mr. Battle stated that he imagined there would be 3-4 phases. He explained the CRA's life cycle was a 30-year life cycle established in 1995. He remarked that there was about 20 years left for the CRA to be an agency to utilize tax increment financing. He felt within the next 20 years a significant dent could be made in the northwest CRA.

Robert Smith stated that unfortunately due to increases in construction costs about half of those houses that were designated to be low to moderate income had upgraded to middle housing. He asked how they would be able to stop the "creep."

Mr. Battle stated that one of the most recent projects scheduled at the site of the old retirement home had their prices for construction escalate, and the City increased the threshold of what was to be considered an affordable housing unit. He stated the developer stated they would keep 3 of the 11 units affordable which would be make them no more than \$218,000. He further stated that was more than the 15% discussed by the City Commission as a minimum threshold. He felt moving forward there would be significant concern as to how they could keep the prices within the character of the neighborhood. He stated there had to be a collective vision of where they wanted to go. He stated they have not yet decided on their total vision for the area. Therefore, they would probably be at odds with the developers for a while as to what could be built at the sites, and yet have the developers make their profits. He stated they needed to be sensitive to prices, but at the same time a vision was needed so developers could be informed of what the City wanted.

Marie Conroy asked what criteria was being used to select the developers responding to the RFPs. She asked how they choose the developers who were sent the RFPs.

Mr. Battle stated it was a public process and they did not attempt to limit the opportunities for individuals. He stated they took a specific step to reach out to those who had done such projects. He explained it would be a process to evaluate the project that would provide the best opportunity for success in northwest Fort Lauderdale. He stated they have not done a lot so far to be "picky." He stated it would be policy driven and people would have to get involved. He hoped the right choices would be made.

Mr. Goetz asked if there were any figures available regarding the average incomes of the individuals who had purchased affordable housing units. Mr. Battle stated that none had been purchased so far, and such information would not be known until the first home closed. He further stated that in Dorsey Riverbend the units were not 100% complete. He stated that a model row project had been constructed, and therefore, the models had only been built.

Mr. Rosenthal asked if there had been any discussion regarding the deferment of loans for individuals who could not afford the increase in prices, and could pay the money at the back end.

Mr. Battle stated that the City increased the cap from \$25,000 to \$50,000. He stated that there had been some steps to increase the amount of subsidy from the buyer side. He stated that he was not sure if such increase had been enough. He further stated the units in Flagler Village appeared to not have gone beyond \$300,000. He explained that the prices in those areas were 20% - 30% higher than the units in the northwest portion of the City.

Chair Jennie Brooks stated that some of the vacant lots on Sistrunk Boulevard did not have a sign on them, and she asked if they were privately owned. Mr. Battle stated they probably were privately owned because anything purchased by the CRA had a sign placed on it so conversations could take place with developers and individuals to purchase the lots. He added that the price of doing business has increased and does so daily. It was a challenge. He stated that there were constant conversations as to how lots could be acquired. He felt that when the road issue was resolved, there would be more support for buying the lots.

Chair Jennie Brooks asked if individuals owned some of the lots would monies be available through the CRA to assist them in their redevelopment. Mr. Battle replied that they would be happy to work with anyone interested.

Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity Application Review

Susan Batchelder stated that the Assistant City Attorney would provide an overview on the certificates of public convenience and necessity.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that copies of the ordinance had been distributed to the Board, and she wanted to review it with them. She stated that staff had received four applications for such certificates for non-taxicab vehicles for hire, which included sightseeing vans, airport limos, and vehicles that someone else drove that was not a taxicab. She further stated that one application had also been received for a pedicab, which was not included in the ordinance, but at the direction of the City Commission this Board was to consider the pedicab application in the same manner.

The Assistant City Attorney stated it was her understanding that of the four applications received, one requested a continuance until a later date.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that the ordinance was Section 27-192, and the first Section B included the items 1 through 11, which the applicant was required to provide to staff with their application. She stated that Section C was how the application comes to the Community Services Board. She explained that staff reviewed the applications, set them for hearing before this Board. She stated that notices were sent to the applicants advising them of the hearing date. Then, this Board "shall review each application by considering the date of the application, the violation history of the applicant, the testimony provided by the applicant, and the comments from members of the public."

The Assistant City Attorney suggested that the Board review each application and ask any questions of staff and the applicant, and at the conclusion of each application, a Board Member should then make a motion recommending approval of the application. She stated the motion should be made in the positive. She stated that the sum of all recommendations would be provided to the City Commission for their final decision, which would take place within 45 days of tonight's date.

Marie Conroy asked what was the relevance of the date of the application. The Assistant City Attorney stated that it was just included to show it was a current application. She explained that if someone had previously been refused, the application was held by staff and the applicant would not have to reapply, and then in six months the application could be reviewed again. By supplying the date, the Board would see whether this was a new application or one that had previously been denied. She stated that such information could add to the discussion as to why it had previously been denied, and if defects were remedied the application was being resubmitted. She explained that last October or November the ordinance in its present form had been adopted by the City Commission, and the applications had been held and recently reviewed by staff. She advised that these applications were being reviewed for the first time.

Robert Smith asked if they were not in a "grandfathering-in" period at this time, and therefore, all proper applications had to be considered. The Assistant City Attorney explained that no grandfathering was to take place. She stated that discussion was held in the fall regarding that issue. She stated that this ordinance had no limits for non-taxicab vehicles for hire and no grandfathering provisions. She stated that staff researched how other counties handled this matter, and the conclusion reached by the City Commission was that there was no need for grandfathering or a limit because it would be too hard to regulate.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 6

Valerie Bohlander, Director Building Department, stated that there were five applications before this Board this evening. She stated that Tri-County had requested a continuance until next month.

Ms. Bohlander stated that two of the applicants were present tonight, and she suggested that those two applications be dealt with at this time. One applicant was KSG Transportation represented by Mr. Graves, and HGM Transport represented by Mr. Manning. She advised that staff and the applicants were available for any questions the Board might have at this time.

Chair Jennie Brooks asked if anyone wanted to make a presentation at this time. She stated that everyone was welcome to come forward and that they should state the name of their business.

Harris Manning stated that he was the President of HGM Transport and Services, Inc.

Robert Pascal stated that he believed Mr. Manning had been before this Board previously and a conditional approval had been granted to him regarding his application.

Mr. Manning stated that they have been in business for about 3 years, and their objective was to provide service to the public while being ambassadors of the state, county and city. He stated they wanted to provide the kind of service that would make people come and visit the City. He advised their business had grown over the 3 years, and he had not received any complaints from his customers. He stated they wanted to get more individuals involved and train them in the business. He asked for his application to be considered by this Board.

John Hurley asked about the conditional approval that had been granted to Mr. Manning. Mr. Pascal stated that it was granted about 6-7 months ago. Mr. Hurley asked why the application had not received full approval. Mr. Hurley stated that there had been a problem with the hearing being noticed and put on the Board's agenda. Mr. Hurley stated that if a conditional approval had been granted, and if the company had met all the requirements, then summarily the application should be handled. Mr. Pascal stated that the hearing had to be placed on the agenda properly. Mr. Hurley suggested that a vote be taken regarding the application.

Motion made by John Hurley and seconded by Robert Pascal to recommend to the City Commission approval of the application submitted by HGM Transport and Services, Inc. for a CPCN certificate. Board unanimously approved.

Kenneth Graves, KSG Transportation, Inc, stated that he had been in the limousine business for about 6 years, but this would be a new business. He stated that in the past he had operated as Ray's Limousine Service and Associated Limousine Service. He stated that he enjoyed this type of work, and had resided in Broward County for over 40 years. He stated that he wanted his own business now and would start out small with only one luxury sedan, and hopefully later one he would purchase a luxury limousine. He explained that he would be targeting corporations that would be coming for conventions, and hosting companies and doing farm work from other limousine companies. He advised that he would advertise on the Internet and in the Yellow Pages so as to build his business. He stated that he had transported in the past some big name performers and some of the Dolphin Players. He stated that he had a storage place for the vehicles about two blocks from his house. He stated that he had a competitive rate sheet for the Board's review. He stated there was now an issue regarding the rising fuel costs, and he had recently read that some companies were now tacking on a 5% surcharge due to such increases. He stated that he might impose such a surcharge.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 7

Mr. Kimmey asked if Mr. Graves had a DUI in the past. Mr. Graves explained that about 8 years ago unfortunately he had been in a bad state of mind due to deaths in the family and did have a DUI. He also stated that Mr. Graves did not have any available records for certified financial statements.

Susan Ciccone, Corporate Secretary for KSG Transportation, Inc., stated they had a CPA who took care of their accounting records. She advised they had been incorporated since 2002. She stated it was a small company and records could be provided to the Board.

Mr. Kimmey stated that the Board had to abide by how the ordinance was written and there was a list of items that had to be provided, including certified financial statements. No such information had been included with their application. In addition, no profit or loss statements had been included or an accurate certified accounting of records for the previous year. He stated, therefore, the application was incomplete.

Ms. Ciccone stated that in 2003 when they had originally applied, they had been told that such information did not have to accompany the application since it was a new business, and at that time such records were not available. She stated that when they applied now, they reiterated their previous application. She stated that she had inquired if other information was needed, and she had been informed that nothing else need be submitted.

Alfred Imgrund asked if the applications were not to have been reviewed by staff to make sure that they were in compliance with the ordinance.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that this applicant provided a letter dated August 1, 2005 which stated: "To Whom It May Concern: Please be advised that KSG Transportation, Inc. is a new business that has not conducted any business transactions in the City of Fort Lauderdale since its time of incorporation in 2002." She stated that she did not know if they had conducted business elsewhere in the State of Florida. She agreed that a certified financial statement was required. She advised that the company informed them they did not have one. Therefore, they could not be made to produce something which they did not have available. She stated this application was being brought forward so questions could be asked of the applicant.

Mr. Imgrund stated that the assumption was that the individuals coming before this Board had been reviewed by staff and had met all necessary requirements of the ordinance. He stated further that it was clear this applicant had not met all the necessary requirements.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that she agreed, but this was a case where this corporation was brand new and had not conducted any business in the City. Therefore, financial records were not available.

Mr. Imgrund remarked that the company had been incorporated in 2002. He asked if the company had done any business in the City since its incorporation.

Mr. Graves explained that the company had not been active as a corporation. He explained further that he had been working under other companies. He added that he did not have an office or vehicles. He stated that he was incorporated under that name.

Chair Jennie Brooks asked if when working under other companies did he use his own name. Mr. Graves stated that he received his paychecks under KSG Transportation. Chair Jennie Brooks further stated that there should then be a financial trail as to what he had earned over the years. She believed that once a company was incorporated, they had to file a financial yearly statement. Mr. Graves replied that he had to file his taxes. He stated that he had tax

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 8

records and could provide those. Chair Jennie Brooks explained that his financial statement would show his income and losses.

Avery Dial asked at the time when he submitted his application to the City had he been receiving income under the name of KSG Transportation and conducting business. Mr. Graves explained that he had not been conducting business on his own. Mr. Dial clarified that at the time of the submission of his application, all documents had been properly filed because there had been no financial activity to document. Mr. Graves confirmed.

John Hurley asked if his company was an S Corp or a C Corp. Mr. Graves stated that it was an S Corp. Mr. Hurley asked if the other companies that were paying him did so by checks to KSG or to himself. Mr. Graves replied the checks were made to KSG. Mr. Hurley stated that was then income to KSG. Mr. Graves confirmed, but he reiterated that he had not been conducting business and was working for another company. Mr. Hurley clarified that KSG was a subcontractor of another company and getting paid in that manner. He further stated that Mr. Graves was conducting business. Mr. Graves stated that the company was not operating under its own wheels. Mr. Hurley asked how KSG would conduct business if it was not already doing so. Mr. Graves stated that he would have his own permits, vehicles, and office. Mr. Hurley stated that if he was being paid as a corporation, which was doing subcontracting work, then, in his opinion, he felt that Mr. Graves was conducting business. He stated further that he did not think he would get hung up on the application regarding that issue.

Mr. Hurley stated that in regard to Mr. Graves' driving record; he asked if his license had been suspended due to not satisfying a judgment as a result of a motor vehicle accident in 1992. He explained that he had been a State Prosecutor and that meant someone had a judgment against Mr. Graves as the result of a motor vehicle accident, and he asked how that occurred. Mr. Graves stated that he thought it was a suspension judgment because it had to do with the DUI he had been accused of, but not convicted. Mr. Hurley clarified that Mr. Graves had been arrested for two DUIs. Mr. Graves confirmed he had been arrested for DUIs, but not convicted. He further stated that the case had been dismissed. Mr. Hurley stated that Mr. Graves had been convicted of one DUI. Mr. Graves confirmed. Mr. Hurley stated that the first DUI had a financial judgment against him due to it being a motor vehicle accident. Mr. Graves stated that it was a motor vehicle accident, but he did not recall any financial judgment against him. Mr. Hurley advised Mr. Graves to check his record with the State. Mr. Graves stated that he would address that issue because it was inaccurate. Mr. Hurley further stated that it appeared the matter had been resolved and paid. Mr. Graves stated he did not have a perfect record, but he had improved, as he got older.

Robert Smith stated that he preferred to look at a person's current record, and Mr. Graves had a clean record for the last 3 years. Mr. Graves stated that all his jobs had been driving jobs.

Marie Conroy stated that when she began her business, she had been required to have a financial statement, which included information such as costs for an office and equipment, which in Mr. Graves' case would also include vehicles. She felt it was still required. Mr. Graves asked if he had to supply a business plan. Ms. Conroy explained that the financial statement was part of a business plan. She stated that he did not own any vehicles at this time. Mr. Graves confirmed, and stated that he would supply such information once he owned vehicles, but he had been told not to purchase them

because he could not obtain permits until he received an occupational license. He stated this was his first step. He stated that he would not proceed without this Board's approval.

Ms. Conroy stated the Board had the rates and fares, and to have the figures balance out, costs of the vehicles needed to be shown. She stated that such information would be necessary to move the application forward in the proper manner.

Motion made by Robert Smith and seconded by Robert Pascal to continue this matter for 30 days so a financial statement could be provided to the Board.

Mr. Goetz asked which offenses involved cars for hire that Mr. Graves had been driving. Mr. Graves stated that one offense involved driving a bus late at night. He explained he was going over a bridge late at night and the bus was over the weight requirement, which he was unaware of. He stated that the other offense involved rolling through a STOP sign in Victoria Park.

Mr. Goetz asked if any of the violations were to be reported on the application filed by Mr. Graves. The Assistant City Attorney explained that Section 10 required a comprehensive listing of any violations or complaints made against the applicant regarding a vehicle for hire incidents that occurred in the State of Florida. Mr. Goetz stated that Mr. Graves had commented that he did not have any prior violations on the application. The Assistant City Attorney stated that she had not read the actual application. Mr. Goetz proceeded to read from the application as follows: "I do not have any violations or complaints that meet the requirements of Section 192-B.10." Mr. Graves stated that he had not been charged. He stated that a violation, in his opinion, would be what he had been convicted or charged of. He reiterated that he did not have any convictions under his vehicles for hire. Mr. Goetz stated that it did not state anything about convictions and only asked about violations or complaints. He asked if such violations were available to staff at the time the applications were submitted. The Assistant City Attorney stated that she believed staff asked about the violations today or Friday, and that they had not accompanied the application. She added that it was not the applicant's fault because it had been a staff oversight. She clarified that the applicant had checked the box on the application, which stated: "I do not have any violations or complaints that meet the requirements of Section 27-192-B.10 to report." She added that he had submitted his driving record evidently pursuant to staff's request.

Mr. Goetz asked further if such violations should have been reported under that Section. The Assistant City Attorney stated that she had not seen the violations, and therefore, could not answer the question. Mr. Goetz stated that the violations involved cars for hire. The Assistant City Attorney stated that the ordinance required a comprehensive listing of any violations or complaints made against the applicant regarding vehicles for hire. She stated that the word violations would come under the "common" understanding of the word violation meaning that a law was violated. She explained a complaint would be a complaint made against the business. Mr. Goetz stated that the applicant advised that he had two prior violations relative to cars for hire in the State of Florida. Mr. Graves confirmed he had two violations, but no convictions.

Chair Jennie Brooks asked Mr. Graves if he had pled no contest or not guilty to the violations. Mr. Graves stated that his attorney had handled the matters.

Mr. Hurley stated that a withheld adjudication be it a traffic ticket or a criminal violation meant that the Court was not convicting the individual, but punishment could be given. He further explained that if a person had been adjudicated, it meant they had been convicted. He stated they were getting into legal semantics in this case. He continued stating that the application asked for the applicant to list violations or complaints, and the applicant felt that since he had received a withheld adjudication, he did not believe it was a violation of the law. Mr. Graves stated that he had not received that portion of the application.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 10

Mr. Goetz stated that the application had been signed by Mr. Graves. Chair Jennie Brooks stated that an "X" had been placed in that box. Mr. Goetz suggested that staff review the matter further.

Mr. Hurley asked if Court costs or a fine had been paid in regard to the violations. Mr. Graves stated that he paid some attorney fees, but he did not recall whether he had to go to driving school or pay any Court fees. He imagined he must have had to do one or the other. Mr. Hurley clarified that Mr. Graves' position was that he went to Court, a lawyer had been hired, adjudication was withheld, Court costs were paid or a driving school attended, and when that was all said and done, Mr. Graves did not consider that a violation in regard to the application. Mr. Graves stated that he did not consider it a conviction. Mr. Hurley agreed it was not a conviction in the strict sense of the word. He stated that the application did not ask for an individual to list convictions.

Mr. Dial asked if it could be said that the applicant had amended the application when the information had been turned in earlier today.

The Assistant City Attorney explained that the applicant had provided his driving license record at staff's request. The application had been submitted earlier and today staff contacted the applicants requesting driving records.

Mr. Hurley stated that would mitigate his prior criticisms. Mr. Graves stated that by no means was he trying to evade anything.

Mr. Imgrund asked if the motion could be voted on or moved off the table. He stated that if the motion passed, then the applicant would return after 30 days, and all information could be supplied. Personally, he felt the application had been handled poorly by staff. He stated that, in his opinion, the applicant had been forthright, and he did not think he attempted to hide any information. He stated that he was attempting to put his best foot forward. He stated that he did some have doubts, but he was not against anyone attempting to start their own business even if they did not have a penny in their pocket.

Mr. Graves stated that when he first applied in 2003, he supposed the occupational license portion was in some turmoil. He stated that many issues had not been answered or clarified. Then, the application procedure appeared to change hands, and it all became unclear. He explained that for several years he had attempted to obtain an occupational license. He stated when the application had been changed, he reapplied. He explained that he would provide whatever was necessary to the Board so he could be granted the license.

Mr. Hurley suggested that the applicant return before the Board after 30 days with financial information. He stated that sometimes Boards could be bureaucratic. He stated that he would support this application unless something happened drastically to change his mind in the next 30 days.

Ms. Conroy suggested that staff provide whatever documents Mr. Graves would need to complete his application. Mr. Graves clarified that the Board was requesting a financial statement, along with projected costs for his business.

Sanford Rosenthal stated that in his mind when the application listed violations or complaints, he thought they would be referring to outstanding ones. He stated that if something in the past had been taken care of, but yet counted against the applicant, he felt that would be "double jeopardy." He felt they should move on if there were no outstanding violations or complaints.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 11

He agreed that the applicant could return before the Board in 30 days with his financial information.

Mr. Graves stated that he was not withholding any information. He stated that within a month, he had been in a hurry to get to the Airport and the speed limit was reduced from one end of I-595 to the other, he had pulled over by a State Trooper and had received a ticket for 72 miles per hour. He stated that he was not sure what speed he had been going. He stated that violation was outstanding.

Chair Jennie Brooks thanked Mr. Graves for the information and his honesty. She stated that a vote needed to be taken regarding the motion for having Mr. Graves return next month with the necessary documentation being required.

The Board unanimously approved.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that there were two other applications, but the applicants were not present. Therefore, it was up to the Board to decide how to handle those matters. She stated they could be continued to next month or the Board could review them without the applicants being present.

Mr. Imgrund asked if the applicants had notified staff that they could not be present this evening. The Assistant City Attorney stated that the applicants had been sent certified mail regarding tonight's meeting.

Motion made by John Hurley to have the two applications struck from the docket this evening.

Ms. Batchelder advised that Mr. Leon had been present earlier in the evening, but had to leave due to an emergency, but he had requested that the Board consider his application in his absence.

Chair Jennie Brooks asked if any of the Board Members had any questions that needed to be answered by the applicant. It was stated by various Board Members that they would prefer to have the applicant present when considering their applications.

Motion made by Alfred Imgrund and seconded by John Hurley that the two applications be continued to the Board's next meeting and that staff notify the individuals of such meeting. Board unanimously approved.

Susan Batchelder stated that regarding Tri-County, the Board needed to vote on the matter. She stated that a letter had been distributed regarding why they could not be present.

Mr. Pascal stated that conditional approval had been granted to Tri-County previously. Chair Jennie Brooks added that they also needed to be present regarding their application.

Motion made by John Hurley and seconded by Robert Pascal to have Tri-County listed on the Board's next month's agenda. Board unanimously approved.

Mr. Rosenthal asked if there was a rule or law regarding an individual having an outstanding violation, and could that person still be qualified to receive a license for hire.

Mr. Hurley stated they could be qualified as long as they had not been found guilty.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

PAGE 12

Mr. Goetz stated that it was his understanding that fares were set by the County or the City. He asked if a gratuity was fixed at 20% should that not be included as the rate for the service. It was stated that did not apply to limousines.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that it was her understanding that the ordinance stated that the CPCN set the rates. She advised that she would look into this matter further, and would advise the Board at their next meeting.

Other Business

Susan Batchelder advised that Chair Jennie Brooks reached her term limit, and therefore, tonight would be her last meeting. She stated that the City was grateful for her service and excellent stewardship of this Board for the last few meetings.

Chair Jennie Brooks stated that it had been a pleasure serving on this Board.

Motion made by John Hurley and seconded by Avery Dial to adjourn the meeting.

There being no other business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Margaret A. Muhl (D'Alessio)
Recording Secretary