

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE**  
**BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID)**  
**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD (BRAB)**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 2008 – 2:00 P.M.**

<b>BID COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE</b>	
		<b>6/07 – 5/08</b>	<b>PRESENT ABSENT</b>
Amaury Piedra, Chair	P	9	2
Carlos Molinet, Vice Chair	A	1	1
Ina Lee	P	11	0
Michael Hatzfield	A	7	4
Andreas Ioannou	A	6	5
Ramola Motwani	P	9	2
Gabriel Rodriguez	P	8	3
Joseph Geluso	P	8	3

<b>BRAB MEMBERS</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE</b>	
		<b>2/08 – 1/09</b>	<b>PRESENT ABSENT</b>
Ina Lee, Chair	P	4	0
Shirley Smith	P	4	0
Miranda Lopez	P	4	0
Carlos Molinet	A	2	2
Judy Scher	P	2	3
Amaury Piedra	P	3	0
Aiton Yaari	A	3	1
Ramola Motwani (arrived 3:16)	P	4	0
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	3	0
Melissa Milroy	P	1	0

**Staff**

Jeff Modarelli, Economic Development Director  
Donald Morris, Beach CRA Director  
Earl Prizlee, Engineering Design Manager, CRA  
Karen Reese, Economic Development Representative  
Eric Silva, Planning and Zoning  
Hilda Testa, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chairs Piedra and Lee called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and roll was called. BRAB Chair Lee introduced new BRAB member Melissa Milroy and affirmed that a BRAB quorum was present. BID Chair Piedra noted that Ms. Linda Geyer is no longer a BID Committee member.

**II. Approval of Minutes May 19, 2008**

BRAB Chair Lee requested a motion to approve the May 19, 2008 BRAB meeting minutes. **Motion** made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Piedra, to approve these minutes. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

BID Chair Piedra requested a motion to approve the May 19, 2008 BID meeting minutes. **Motion** made by BRAB Chair Lee, seconded by Mr. Geluso, to approve these minutes. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**III. Master Plan Presentation/Discussion**

BRAB Chair Lee welcomed members of both Boards to the joint meeting. Mr. Silva of Planning and Zoning stated that the third public meeting regarding the Master Plan was scheduled later that evening, at 6:30 to review additional zoning recommendations. One more public meeting is set for September 2008 to discuss any remaining zoning issues and review a draft of the final plan. BRAB Chair Lee requested that the last meeting be scheduled, if possible, to coincide again with that month's BRAB meeting, or let the BRAB know if they should change their schedule accordingly.

Ted Schirmacher of Sasaki Associates said the previous presentation of the Master Plan had established a number of public improvements to be introduced to the beach. This presentation, he said, focuses predominantly on the zoning implications for various districts, and will also cover a market analysis summary and an overview of the conceptual framework for public improvements.

Mr. Schirmacher said Sasaki had met over the last year with stakeholder groups that identified numerous urban design principles, including:

- Create identity of the Central Beach as a gathering place
- Promote a “mix of uses for a mix of users”
- Create public spaces friendly to children and families

- Plan for a variety of uses, including special events and performances
- Enhance connectivity to create a more continuous Central Beach experience
- Create sidewalk areas with cafes, restaurants, and shops
- Establish a “wayfinder” system throughout the Central Beach area to facilitate ease of movement

Regarding the Central Beach zoning, Mr. Schirmacher said, Sasaki wanted to address this issue in two parts: overall framework and individual districts. Part of the zoning established in the 1990s was the identification of “people streets,” which set up East/West corridors coming back from the beach into various neighborhoods. A consideration to be addressed by the Master Plan, he said, is to add North/South corridors – Almond Street, Birch Road, and Breakers Avenue, for example – and provide “street enhancements” to encourage use.

Part of the code regarding street treatments, he said, discusses a need for these people streets to accommodate pedestrian traffic and serve as major vehicular entryways to the Central Beach. The Master Plan’s recommendations note that development has occurred on the people streets, but requirements should be strengthened to encourage more pedestrian activity and attempt to get people “more actively involved” on these streets, with a goal of increased use on 50% of the frontage.

Mr. Schirmacher also stated street level guidelines should be modified from the current requirement of at least 50% “transparent features” such as windows and doors. Unfortunately, he said, this requirement includes parking structures as transparent features. This does not fit the original intent of the regulation, which was to create more “active” street frontages. He suggested the requirement be expanded to include people streets and activate areas of significant public improvements, such as Las Olas Gateway Plaza, which will be covered later in this presentation.

Another recommendation is to create incentives for street level uses on people streets to promote activity along the facades of these streets and therefore increase activity throughout the Central Beach area. Finally, Mr. Schirmacher said, they hope to reinforce and unify the architectural character of the beach area. He said Fort Lauderdale has its own “South Florida Modern” look, as cities like Miami and Palm Beach have their own distinctive and unified character.

One major Central Beach issue is parking, and Sasaki compared Fort Lauderdale's parking requirements for different uses such as residential, commercial, and restaurant regulations with the respective requirements in similar cities. They concluded the parking requirements are on a "suburban scale," which means the requirement of 2.2 spaces per dwelling unit presents an economic burden for development. This means a potential excess of parking is being created under the current code. Lodging requirements in Fort Lauderdale and similar beach communities specify one parking space per hotel room, while the Institute of Transportation Engineering (ITE) requires less than one space.

A major difficulty of this nature occurs with retail and restaurant parking space assignments in the beach area. Retail requirements for the City are for one parking space per 250 square feet, and restaurant space is assigned according to whether or not the business occupies more or less than 4000 square feet. Space assignments are, again, calculated differently in similar communities such as Hollywood or Miami Beach: in more urban areas, Mr. Schirmacher said, these assignments are "more appropriate" to the density of the neighborhoods. He said the recommendation is to consider a reduction of required spaces or examine a new methodology for calculating the number of spaces needed. This will bring retail and restaurant parking more in line with current industry standards. In terms of "mixed use," which describes many developments on Central Beach, Sasaki feels the City should adopt a "shared parking" policy to relieve the burden the current code places on businesses.

Both these considerations, Mr. Schirmacher said – parking as well as changes in "people streets" – apply to the Central Beach RAC overall. Sasaki also looked at the Central Beach zoning codes in terms of individual districts, and studied the relative densities. They noted there is no non-tourist retail in most of these districts, and felt that the addition of local retail would add a welcome diversity to the area. They also felt it would support the resort and hotel trade as well.

The South Beach Marina and Hotel Area (SBMHA), specifically, was also examined. Mr. Schirmacher noted that this location promotes high-quality destination resort uses focused around the Marina and the Swimming Hall of Fame; to promote additional development, however, Sasaki's recommendation was to enhance the public amenities in this area, and maintain and encourage the public's access to the Intracoastal Waterway. They also suggested enhancing visual connectivity from the Central Beach area to the Intracoastal Waterway.

PRD (Planned Resort Development) was a major focus of their studies, Mr. Schirmacher said. Redevelopment of the area has been a success in terms of higher quality and a mixed use of public and private properties. He said they

hoped to add incentives to stimulate development. To further the goals of the PRD, he said Almond Street should be classified as a people street, with an active street level connecting to the Las Olas Gateway Plaza; as with the SBMHA, public amenities should be enhanced and access to the Intracoastal Waterway should be encouraged; and pedestrian and visual connectivity should be increased.

The A1A beachfront area has seen the most recent redevelopment, Mr. Schirmacher noted, and has a similar focus as the SBMHA: to be a high-quality destination and resort area reflecting the character of the beach. Recommendations for this area are to create a more pedestrian-friendly atmosphere; require new development along key public open spaces, such as the Las Olas Gateway; and eliminate the existing design compatibility scheme and establish new design guidelines.

The North Beach Residential Area is advised to classify Birch Street as a people street; require building design street edges to preserve the character and nature of the area; require active building faces for new construction; establish incentives to preserve and reuse existing structures; and allow uses that “activate” people streets, such as neighborhood-supported retail or restaurants.

One strategy for these improvements, Mr. Schirmacher said, was to adjust the NBRA’s zoning to create incentives for incoming businesses. He pointed out that surface parking “fragments” the area, while buildings on the street with their parking located behind them makes for a more active street front. He also stated that height restrictions could be adjusted to allow for higher street levels (up to six stories) on some people streets. The NBRA abuts the ABA on a number of walks, including Birch Road and Breakers Avenue; the density of the ABA allows for higher street levels, so some continuity would exist if the height restrictions are amended.

The Intracoastal Overlook Area, Mr. Schirmacher said, should maintain visual corridors to the waterway, which would mean revisiting the requirements of building length along that area. He also said restaurants with outdoor dining should be encouraged to locate in this scenic development.

The Sunrise Lane Area, he said, is advised to encourage revitalization (including reuse and redevelopment of existing structures) to create a more pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use beach village. This would require allowing a variety of new commercial uses in addition to current tourist uses; Sasaki felt that adopting a revision to these uses would provide a better mix. He also said they should reevaluate the parking requirements, also in encouragement of a mixed-use

community. Finally, they should endorse and support the streetscape initiative currently underway in this area.

A market analysis summary followed, including identification of uses of the various Central Beach areas; creating a market-supportable development program and investigating potential locations for retail and restaurants.

ERA, he said, looked at speculative offices, floor-sale housing, rental housing, lodging for hotels and resort hotels, and restaurants and retail with an eye toward their five- and ten-year market potential. He concluded this is a relatively modest market, particularly considering the ten-year demand, for housing and offices; the majority of the demand in this area is for upscale business-class hotels and resorts, and for restaurants and retail primarily driven by hotels, not residents.

Where Sasaki saw the most potential demand occurring, he said, was Bahia Mar, which is adding a number of rooms. He felt this was the core of the Central Beach area. He also believed there was restaurant and retail potential along Breakers Avenue, and mentioned again the need for some retail to extend back into the NBRA.

Mr. Schirmacher opened the floor to questions before the presentation moved on to zoning and marketing improvements.

Ms. Scher expressed concern that the contemporary-style motels in the Birch Road area would now attempt to emulate the high-rise hotels like the ones on A1A. She said residents of that area wanted to maintain its neighborhood-friendly character. Mr. Schirmacher said Sasaki hoped to provide incentives for "adaptive reuse" in that area rather than putting up new buildings.

BRAB Chair Lee asked if Sasaki took current hotel construction into account in its study as well as existing hotels. Mr. Schirmacher said they did consider buildings under construction, although not necessarily those with pending construction.

Ms. Lopez recommended that parking garages not be constructed to face the waterway, as it was a scenic route. Mr. Schirmacher said it would, however, have to be a consideration, taking into account the depth of the area.

Ms. Lopez also mentioned bike lanes in the Central Beach area. Mr. Schirmacher said this was considered an enhancement rather than a zoning concern, which was why it was not addressed in greater depth.

Ms. Motwani asked for clarification regarding the changes in parking requirements for retail/restaurant areas. Mr. Schirmacher said they were suggesting reducing the restrictions on parking for these businesses, and clarified that Sasaki was making recommendations on what changes to make and how to best go about making them.

BRAB Chair Lee noted that some questions addressing recommendations might be covered when the presentation continued. Mr. Alan Ward of Sasaki and Associates presented their findings regarding zoning and marketing, with the use of some visual aids.

A key part of the Master Plan, he said, was public improvements, which would not only be a catalyst for greater private investments, but would improve the overall quality of life in the Central Beach area. Areas covered in the study included the beach itself, all public land, streets, sidewalks, waterway, and City-owned properties. Part of the strategy, Mr. Ward said, was to consider how to fund and implement these improvements. On City-owned parcels, he said, some private development could be allowed as "revenue generators" to help offset costs. These possibilities included potential retail sites along the Las Olas Gateway and the Alhambra lot, for example. Another strategy besides private revenue generators was to issue bonds and use the general CRA fund.

Mr. Ward first addressed the Aquatics Complex, and stated one goal is to enhance its connections to the beach. He also said the Master Plan includes the Gateway area, including the Oceanside parking lot and a significant area on the Intracoastal and Birch Street lots. These areas are part of an overall vision for the area, including major public open space on the Oceanside lot. He suggested a fountain or sculpture at this location; also, to bring the area to life, he said there should be uses within the area, such as outdoor seating for arts events or concerts, and shade structures. He said some retail or restaurant space could be included here as well.

He also noted that looking westward from this area, a new water taxi stop could be created, and new public parking (a lot or a garage) would replace the existing parking at the Oceanside lot and create even more public parking that provides a four-minute walk to the beach. If traffic crossed the bridge and circled into the proposed garage or lot, Mr. Ward pointed out, it would reduce the circulation of cars along the beach seeking parking amenities.

Ms. Scher asked that Mr. Ward clarify if the recommendation was for a parking lot or a parking garage, and requested the height specifications that a garage would have. Mr. Ward said the existing lot had roughly 243 spaces, and felt a replacement should offer more; he said 240 spaces could be created with only

two levels of a garage. He said a small hotel on this site, which would be a potential public-private partnership for increased funding, would need additional parking – possibly four to five levels. He allowed that the creation of a hotel on the space would require additional discussion and research.

Mr. Ward now turned to the Birch Street lot, which gave an opportunity to create a fairly large public green space, possibly including a restaurant and a public restroom, a children's play area to promote a family-friendly atmosphere, and a water taxi stop.

Mr. Ward said pedestrian connections from redeveloped areas, such as Almond Street, back to the Intracoastal Waterway should also be considered. He referred to the proposed Las Olas Gateway Plaza and Intracoastal Park and noted that to bring such park spaces to life, programming and destinations were needed. He said a restaurant or café on the water would enhance this area. He also pointed out that all the green space in this park area might provide another cultural or entertainment use, such as an aquarium. This would help make this site a destination and not overburden the Aquatics Complex site.

In terms of a parking strategy, Mr. Ward noted that existing parking provided over 1200 public spaces. The two proposed garages, along with a possible garage to replace the Alhambra lot, would provide a net gain of over 500 additional spaces.

Almond Street, Mr. Ward said, could work nicely as a retail area at the center of the beach. Its two-sided configuration is ideal for retail and its narrowness meant customers could "shop both sides of the street." Its location, relative to Oceanside Plaza, where events and concerts are a possibility, helps lead up to a more lively center of the beach area. It would also help create more space on Las Olas. During the day the street would be open to cars, but it could be closed to vehicular traffic on nights and/or weekends to encourage pedestrian traffic. It was believed that this could provide a focal point on the beach area.

DC Alexander Park, Mr. Ward continued, would profit from reorganization of 5<sup>th</sup> Street to make the parking two-way and reclaim unused green space. To increase its appeal to children and families, he recommended a sizable interactive fountain area, small café or restaurant, and a children's play site leading back toward the Aquatics Complex.

The Alhambra site's existing parking lot contains only about 75 spaces, Mr. Ward said. He admitted they did not believe this particular parcel made a great park space, but felt it presented an opportunity to develop the green space along its edges. Some of the parking lot land could be reclaimed as park space. The area also presents another opportunity for public/private partnership, such as



development for a hotel and/or small restaurant. He noted the hotel would need to be properly scaled so it wasn't one large building dominating the entire space.

Water taxi service, Mr. Ward said, could be expanded to add key central stops at some of the locations previously discussed.

Birch Road enhancements would include a median to provide green space, as the entire zone is currently dominated by paved material, Mr. Ward said. The actual street would become a more conventional urban street with parallel parking; parcels of land in the area could be developed to include their own parking lots. Sidewalk and setback zones would be shaded. These changes would completely transform the overall look of the street. Some similar neighborhood streets, also dominated by parking, could be redeveloped with parallel parking as well and a green strip and shaded walk to break up the paved look.

Owners in the Breakers Avenue/Bonnet House area, Mr. Ward said, are interested in retail and restaurants along the street. Bonnet House is interested in providing another entryway. He felt it would be "aggressive" to consider a lot of retail areas here, but said the occasional restaurant near the hotel made sense.

An idea for A1A was to create a multi-purpose path for pedestrian, bicycle, and other (e.g. rollerblade) traffic along the east edge of the wave wall. Mr. Ward stated that there were several options open on ways to create this path. The existing bicycle lanes running north and south are considered dangerous. He said another possible solution would be to combine the two bicycle lanes together and raise them onto a curb, creating a ten-foot path on the west side of A1A, although he doubted this plan would have wide support, as changes on A1A and Sea Breeze would be necessary and the bicycle path would actually be pulled farther away from the beach. Mr. Ward felt the dedicated, multi-purpose path noted above was the best plan for this area. The five feet reclaimed from the former bicycle lanes could be used for planting, which would move pedestrians farther from the roadway.

What the plans add up to, Mr. Ward concluded, was a network of entirely new spaces along the beach, focusing on the Central Beach area but not exclusive to it. Street improvements enhanced pedestrian connectivity and expanded public access to the Intracoastal Waterway. The beach itself would have much greater recreational potential that would make for a better overall beach experience.

With the conclusion of the presentations, BRAB Chair Lee opened the floor for discussion, noting that in the most recent previous presentation there had been mention of underground parking in the Oceanside lot. Mr. Ward said that

suggestion had led to a concern about greater cost as well as safety and security. He noted that the cost of an underground lot would be three to four times greater than above-ground options. This would be a burden for the public to fund, he said, although if a hotel on the property chose to pay for and maintain underground parking, it would not only provide alternative funding but would relieve the City of the burden of maintenance.

Ms. Smith pointed out that parking generates roughly \$1 million in annual revenue for the City, while a hotel on this property would have no room for its delivery trucks, among other considerations. She did not feel a hotel on Birch Lot would be a wise use of space; rather, she suggested that the lot remain used for parking or perhaps developed with a small picnic area. She felt the narrowness of the location would make hotel placement difficult, and advocated strongly that City-owned parcels along the beach should not be leased for private development.

Ms. Scher felt that changing 5<sup>th</sup> Street back to a two-way street was a very good idea.

Ms. Milroy asked if the earlier market analysis took into account the potential hotel rooms that could be added from public/private partnerships. Mr. Ward said the analysis had only included existing properties or those under development. He added, however, that adding hotels to these properties could further enliven the area and make the beach a better overall destination.

Ms. Scher noted that at an earlier time the addition of a small “neighborhood-friendly” post office and grocery had been suggested in at least one of the areas discussed. Mr. Ward agreed that this might be a good public/private development.

BRAB Chair Lee asked how Sasaki had worked with existing owners in the areas targeted for redevelopment. Mr. Ward replied that the owners had been very aware that changes needed to be made in those areas, and that some diagrams that had been drawn up years ago to speculate on development needs had similarities to the ones Sasaki had designed.

Ms. Motwani inquired as to the negotiations that would need to be made with the owners of some properties abutting the public lands slated for changes. Mr. Ward agreed that some negotiations would be necessary, as some of the public parcels of land were in “tight areas” and the addition of retail or restaurant spaces as revenue generators would require a review of parking in most cases.

Mr. Morris pointed out that when the Master Plan is adopted, it will address “neighborhood compatibility” and help with decisions that will need to be made later on regarding the appropriateness of a project.

Ms. Lopez expressed concern that any new garages should not block the view of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Las Olas Bridge. Mr. Ward assured the Board that Sasaki shared this concern.

BRAB Chair Lee asked if Board members had further input before discussion was opened to the public. As the Board had no further questions at the moment, the floor was opened for questions and comments.

Mel Rubinstein of the Central Beach Alliance said it was difficult to disagree with many of the proposals, such as the ones affecting public amenities and access. He was, however, concerned that perhaps people had not heard sufficient details to make an informed decision about the Master Plan as yet. He also pointed out that while retail and restaurants might sound attractive, “people don’t come to the beach to shop,” and retail concerns might be better developed at the Galleria Mall, for instance.

Mr. Rubinstein was particularly concerned about reducing Birch Road from four lanes moving in each direction to two lanes, as any traffic accident might create a jam. He also informed the Boards that while public/private development might sound attractive, some years ago a group of concerned citizens had approached City Hall with their desire to keep this from occurring in the Las Olas area. He stated that Las Olas Circle was of particular importance to residents because it allowed them to avoid A1A at the height of the tourist season.

Mr. Rubinstein concluded that, as the Alhambra Hotel on A1A had deteriorated considerably, it might provide an opportunity for the City to buy that property and convert it into a small park facing the ocean, with the area behind the property providing much-needed parking. Finally, he reminded the Board that the residents of the Alhambra Condominiums had once been prepared to go to court to prevent further hotel development in their particular area.

Mr. Rubinstein summed up by stating the Central Beach Alliance had made it clear that the NBRA and IOA areas should keep buildings low in that area to preserve their unique architectural character. He was concerned that this be stressed by Sasaki & Associates when the Master Plan was presented to the City Commission.

Mr. Ward allowed that in the current planning stage, all details were not yet available, and the specific design of the areas mentioned in the presentations

would be critical to their development. He then noted that the areas along the beach would not necessarily be traditional retail, but would be entertainment and restaurant venues. Mr. Ward did not feel that the traffic demand on Birch Road necessitated four lanes and would make for a better neighborhood if the traffic flow was reduced.

BRAB Chair Lee reminded those present that the public meeting in the evening would be a more appropriate forum for most questions and input that remained from residents.

Mr. Rubinstein asked if the BID or BRAB had the authority to tell the City Commission what was or was not wanted as part of the plan. BRAB Chair Lee said the Boards had advisory authority only, and had the opportunity to request to hear the Plan before the public did because they had assisted in funding the studies carried out by Sasaki & Associates. Mr. Rubinstein expressed concern that items identified as "not wanted" in the Plan were not being removed at this time.

BRAB Chair Lee thanked Mr. Schirmacher and Mr. Ward for bringing their presentations before the Boards, and asked again if members of either group had further questions about what they had heard. She then turned the meeting over to BID Chair Piedra.

#### **IV. Discussion of BID Budget**

BID Chair Piedra asked Mr. Modarelli to bring the Committee up to date on the BID budget. Mr. Modarelli began by pointing out that while the Committee had believed the assessed values for the District would drop significantly, preliminary numbers suggested that the drop might be less than expected. He also said they did not currently have a good idea on how the new properties in the area might be assessed, but they had a fairly good idea that the reduction of the rate might be balanced by these new assessments.

Today, Mr. Modarelli said, the BID Committee was setting a preliminary rate only, which could not go higher once it was set due to its advertisement (although it could go lower). He felt it would be a good idea to choose the same rate as the current year, which was .9156, and then, in September when the budget is set, consider either lowering the rate or increasing the budget if necessary. He said they are assuming that properties should come in at least the same or higher value as the current year, from what he could determine regarding assessments.

BID Chair Piedra agreed, stating it is not a time to assess owners for more than they paid this year. Mr. Modarelli reiterated that adjustments could be made once

the Committee set the final rate, although they could not set the rate higher. He felt they would have a more accurate number before the final decision is made in September.

Mr. Geluso asked how new properties coming online could impact the budget, possibly causing an increase. Mr. Modarelli explained that three numbers were in play: the rate, the assessed value of all the properties in the BID, and the budget. If values increase, he said, there was the option to recommend decreasing the rate, or the rate could remain the same and the budget could be increased. He noted again that while all necessary information was not at hand, he believed the assessed value for the upcoming year should be higher than the previous assessed value, which he felt called for setting the rate to be the same.

**Motion** made by BRAB Chair Lee, seconded by Mr. Geluso, to set the same rate as last year for the Business Improvement District. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion regarding Live Nation's plans followed. BID Chair Piedra said "tremendous progress" has been made with the City over the last month, and he would like the BID, as original proponents of the plan, to make a motion in support for the City Commission to move forward with the event. Mr. Rodriguez asked for clarification if the event would require closing down A1A or Beach Place. BID Chair Piedra said there would be monitors on that end of the beach, but he did not recall that this would necessitate closing the area or making it inaccessible to traffic. He noted that in front of the main beach area, where the primary event occurred, there would be some closings, but it would not extend to Beach Place.

BRAB Chair Lee pointed out that the Live Nation event would once again be on the City's conference agenda on Tuesday, June 17, 2008, and it would again be important that BID Committee members be present to show support.

**Motion** made by BRAB Chair Lee, seconded by Mr. Geluso, that the Business Improvement District support the Live Nation event. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

BRAB Chair Lee provided an overview of the event to the BRAB members still present, describing a three-day event over the Memorial Day holiday weekend intended to bring in high-profile acts such as the Rolling Stones or Barbra Streisand. She explained that it would have the most impact on the Harbor Beach area, but large screens would be set up all along the beach so the public did not have to be concentrated in one area. She also pointed out that the event would require no funding whatsoever from the City of Fort Lauderdale, and was

BID/BRAB Joint Meeting  
Wednesday, June 11, 2008  
Page 14

open to all members of the public, with a target demographic of 25- to 40-year-olds. BRAB Chair Lee then requested a motion in support of the event from the BRAB as well as the BID Committee.

**Motion** made by Ms. Motwani, seconded by Ms. Jarjura, that the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board also support the Live Nation event. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Boards, the joint meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

(Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.)