

APPROVED
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2009 – 2:30 P.M.

BRAB MEMBERS	ATTENDANCE	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Miranda Lopez	P	4	0
Aiton Yaari	A	1	3
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	3	1
Melissa Milroy	P	3	1
Dan Matchette	P	3	0
Art Seitz	A	2	1
Chuck Malkus	P	1	0
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	1	0
Tim Schiavone	P	1	0

As of this date there were 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Don Morris, Beach CRA Director
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
Lindwell Bradley, Community Inspections Supervisor
Mario Sotolongo, Code Enforcement Officer
Sergeant Steve Greenlaw, Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Charlotte Rodstrom, District 2 City Commissioner
Jennifer Picinich, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Mr. Morris called the meeting to order at 2:29 p.m. and noted that the recently elected Chair and Vice Chair have concluded their service to the Board. He asked that the Board members introduce themselves.

New member Tim Schiavone owns the Parrot Lounge, located on the beach. He has been in business on the Fort Lauderdale beach for 36 years and hopes to find out and work toward “what’s best for our beach.”

New member Chuck Malkus owns a public relations firm that performs professional services and consulting work for accountants, attorneys, and small businesses. He is Chair of the Beach Council and is also affiliated with the Broward Alliance and the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce.

New member Bradley Deckelbaum has lived in Fort Lauderdale for the last seven years, near the beach. He is a builder who has worked on several residential projects in the beach area, and hopes to participate further in the redevelopment of the beach.

Mr. Morris recognized City Commission Charlotte Rodstrom, who was present at the meeting.

II. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Morris requested nominations for Chair at this time.

Ms. Jarjura nominated Mr. Deckelbaum for Chair, and Ms. Milroy nominated Ms. Motwani for Chair. In a voice vote, Mr. Deckelbaum was unanimously elected Chair.

Ms. Milroy nominated Ms. Motwani for Vice Chair, and Mr. Malkus was also nominated for Vice Chair. In a voice vote, Ms. Motwani was unanimously elected Vice Chair.

III. Approval of Minutes: April 30, 2009

Mr. Morris referred the Board to the minutes of the April 30, 2009 meeting, as well as an email in response, both of which were included in the members' information packets. He explained that revisions have since been made that "enhance" some of the public discussion in relation to the Beach Master Plan. As many of the Board members have not yet had the opportunity to review the minutes as corrected, he proposed postponing a vote on their approval until the July 2009 Board meeting.

Ms. Lopez noted that the draft minutes should also include, on p. 19, paragraph 7, the concept that a developer has the ability to request yard modifications, but the City retains the right to grant or deny these modifications.

She also requested that the Goals from the Central Beach Alliance be included in the April 30, 2009 meeting minutes. It was noted that Mr. Seitz had previously requested that this document be attached to the April 30, 2009 minutes.

IV. Beach Walk: May 18, 2009

Chair Deckelbaum asked if all Board members had been present to participate in the recent Beach Walk.

Mr. Morris felt the Beach Walk was “very helpful,” as it fostered a better understanding of the beach area for the Board, as well as a concern with how the entire beach is developed. This is in addition to their “first focus,” which is on that part of the beach included in the CRA, from which the Board’s funding is drawn.

He recalled that on previous occasions, the Board members had listed items they encountered on the Beach Walk that they would like to see addressed, such as graffiti, insufficient maintenance of amenities, and other concerns. Mr. Morris explained that Staff makes an effort to examine the area “at least three times a week” and identify items that should be addressed; then they contact the appropriate City or County agencies or departments. He described this effort as “fairly successful,” and encouraged the members to bring items of this nature to the Board’s attention.

V. Beach Mural Discussion

Chair Deckelbaum introduced Mimi Botscheller of the Art Institute, who presented the Board with handouts. Ms. Botscheller is a working artist who has lived in Broward County since 1973. She was pleased that the Art Institute will have the opportunity to work on a mural in the beach area.

She explained that the location is a wooden fence surrounding a vacant lot on A1A. The fence is expected to be temporary, lasting “a couple of years,” and the students would beautify the wall facing traffic. They would develop designs for the mural, based on a theme of the Board’s choosing.

Ms. Botscheller explained that she has created a class called “Art in Public Spaces,” which has done nonprofit murals for Holy Cross, Joe DiMaggio, and Broward General Hospitals, ARC Broward, and the Firemen’s Union Hall.

The class will have 11 weeks total, and 11 students will participate in the class, where they will learn about creating a mural “from start to finish.” They will operate upon a timeline in which Ms. Botscheller presents the selected theme to the students; they develop sketches and concepts to present; the Board makes a selection from among these concepts; and the students amass the materials and begin working. They will meet once a week, on-site, to paint for four hours at a time, most likely in the early hours. Ms. Botscheller will oversee the process to ensure that the City has professional results.

The primary goal for today’s meeting, she asserted, is to put forth a theme so the students may begin working on their sketches. With regard to funding, the students will require materials, as well as “a small honorarium” for the creator of

the selected design. She noted that other concerns include parking, which may be available on-site in the lot, and storage space for the materials, particularly the paint and brushes. The class will place plastic beneath their paint cans to keep from marking the sidewalks. Water will be necessary so they can clean up after themselves when work is done.

She estimated that the timeline will allow “a good eight weeks” of painting, and the mural will be complete in time for the 2010 Super Bowl, the City’s Centennial, and other events.

Mr. Morris noted that Ms. Botscheller and Maureen Kohler, President and CEO of ArtServe, had made a presentation to the Beach Business Improvement District Advisory Committee (BID) the previous week, and that organization has agreed to support the majority of the artists’ needs. He added that Staff will be able to provide a storage area for materials, and will deal with parking considerations as well.

The remaining issue is the theme, and Mr. Morris advised that the property is within the CRA, the BRB and BID will be the best possible groups to provide a theme.

Ms. Botscheller pointed out that the wall in question is roughly half a block in length, and suggested that, with respect to the upcoming Centennial, a progression of the City’s history might be an option; another possibility could be “particular points of interest” throughout the City. These options would allow the mural to flow from one image to another, rather than being one continuous design with a single subject.

She added that she has created art in public space for the County, and has some experience with presenting a “sense of place,” such as what it is like to be part of the Fort Lauderdale community.

Ms. Kohler explained that the BRB and BID will come up with a concept, which will be presented to Ms. Botscheller’s class; there will then be 11 different ideas presented to these advisory bodies by the students. Today, they were seeking a “general idea of where to start.”

Vice Chair Motwani thanked Ms. Botscheller and Ms. Kohler for attending today’s meeting. She expressed concern regarding the surface of the wall, as it is presently “very rough.”

Ms. Botscheller agreed that prep work on “a bad surface” could only accomplish so much; she noted that filling in the surface would not necessarily be warranted for a temporary wall. She added that her class had created a mural on a corridor of Las Olas Boulevard, with “very raw wood” as a surface.

She was not sure how much prep work would be required for the surface in question, but felt on such a large scale that the work would be “very graphic with a little...blending,” which, from a distance, would read perfectly. She felt color would also cover a great deal of inconsistency in the wooden surface.

Vice Chair Motwani requested that Ms. Botscheller “look into it” and the Board would help make the mural “as perfect as it can be.”

Ms. Botscheller advised that the students will use high-quality exterior paint, as any outside mural would be affected by the sun. Should the artwork stand for a longer time than expected, she pointed out she could keep the necessary colors on file and perform touch-ups if they were needed.

Vice Chair Motwani added that if the students had additional parking needs, she could also be of assistance

Ms. Botscheller expressed concern with “keeping the students hydrated.” Mr. Morris confirmed that Staff would take care of this need.

Ms. Botscheller asked if any of the Board members have considered “what you would like to see on that wall.” Mr. Schiavone proposed a “mirror image” of whatever is on the opposite side of the street, such as the beach and the ocean. Ms. Botscheller stated that a beach theme could certainly be done, recalling that the ARC Broward mural was a “continuous ocean theme.”

Mr. Schiavone explained that for some New York City construction sites, where tall buildings are visible behind a wall, the mural shows what a passerby might see if the wall was not there. In this case, the mirror image would be of the first floor of the Swimming Hall of Fame.

Ms. Milroy agreed with the idea of a beach/Intracoastal Waterway theme, pointing out that rather than depicting a Centennial theme, the wall should be reflective of “the beach itself.” Ms. Botscheller proposed a theme that combined the two previous ideas.

Chair Deckelbaum suggested “capturing what’s there now,” including the City’s infrastructure and nature, but including people and items in the mural’s background that are dressed from “the heyday” of the City, so a bit of history is added.

Ms. Milroy offered the idea of integrating different items in the painting that children could seek out as a game. Ms. Lopez felt this could include allowing children to guess when a person in the mural might have lived.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Ms. Botscheller if she would be able to come back to the Board at a subsequent meeting. She stated she would meet with her students after the Fourth of July holiday and present to them that the Board is interested in "something to do with the beach and the east side of Fort Lauderdale." She planned to do some research before bringing the idea to the students.

Vice Chair Motwani informed the Board that the project is being sponsored in part by some BID members, including Ina Lee, Amaury Piedra, Jim Oliver, and herself.

VI. Bahia Mar Proposed PUD

Courtney Crush, representing the lessee of the Bahia Mar Property, introduced Peter Henn, also affiliated with the developer.

She advised that this is a somewhat different presentation than those the members may have previously seen regarding the Bahia Mar proposal. She added that she wished to present this proposed project in the context of the Board's scope. The Board is charged with "implementing and making recommendations about the Beach Redevelopment Plan." Ms. Crush indicated that this is essentially the same as the City's CRA plan.

In 1988, the City created a regional activity center for the entire beach, comprised of 425 acres and excluding the Bonnet House. As there were some areas of Fort Lauderdale that were blighted, the City designated 121 of the 425 acres as a CRA. A revitalization plan was implemented, including various design guidelines that addressed how streetscapes should look, as well as how properties should interact with streetscapes on some key streets.

In 1989, the City came up with the Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Plan, which took 38 acres of Bahia Mar, as well as over 90 acres going north toward the Alhambra, and designated it as the area upon which they wished to place the most focus. Tax dollars generated from the CRA are returned to it, and the Board is one body that makes recommendations on how this money is spent.

In the last 20 years, a great deal of private sector development has been encouraged north of Las Olas Boulevard; upon reviewing documentation to learn what was already there in 1989, Ms. Crush pointed out that a condominium, Bahia Mar, and the Swimming Hall of Fame were south of Las Olas Boulevard at this time.

She described the Beach Redevelopment Plan as being "partly successful," pointing out that north of Las Olas Boulevard, there have been streetscape improvements and A1A. As a pedestrian moves south, however, there has been

little visible change to the area. Ms. Crush advised that the plan she would present “meets a lot of the goals” set forth by the redevelopment program.

She showed a rendering of the proposed Bahia Mar redevelopment program, which plans to build a Waldorf-Astoria with 300 rooms, as well as two residential buildings with 90 units. In 1989, Ms. Crush pointed out, the Beach Redevelopment Plan sought to encourage mixed-use development, as the City learned that there were a great many “isolated” residential buildings that did not interact with the streetscape or offer pedestrian improvements.

This plan, called Bahia Mar Park, includes a project called Beach Walk, which was approved by the City Commission in January 2009. Ms. Crush described this part of the plan as “Phase 1.” It introduces signature pavers, 12 ft. wide; an upgrade in landscaping; parking, much of which is underground; two restaurants; and additional marine-oriented uses. These are in keeping with the mixed-use development originally sought by the Plan. It also provides critical marine-oriented and tourist-related interests on the beach.

The Beach Redevelopment Plan also encourages the development of neighborhood amenities, or retail establishments serving something other than tourist uses. The plan’s authors had pointed out that there is nowhere to go on the beach for amenities, such as a grocery store. The uses called for in the Bahia Mar Park Plan are introduced as contributing to the redevelopment effort, as they involve ground-level, pedestrian-friendly retail.

The next phase of the project extends the Beach Walk down to the charter fishing area, which is not targeted for development in the sense of buildings; the CRA has tried to keep the character of this area intact as well as balanced with a better pedestrian experience. Should the plan be approved, the end result will be 1500 linear ft. of Beach Walk. Ms. Crush stated that the developer finds these improvements to make “a significant contribution” south of Las Olas Boulevard as well as north.

She pointed out the Coast Guard property, noting that her client has stated should this property ever become part of the Bahia Mar lease, there would be no development in this area other than landscaping and parking. Ms. Crush described the project as “a tremendous improvement” in terms of the pedestrian experience with ground-level uses along Sea Breeze Avenue.

The Bahia Mar property today contains a parking lot. Ms. Crush referred again to the Beach Redevelopment Plan, which calls for “the introduction of community amenities,” such as retail properties and landscape parks. The Bahia Mar Park Plan would introduce a “Main Street”-like area, where people can enter the property and dine at one of the two restaurants, as well as enjoy a retail experience or sit and look at the Intracoastal Waterway. A center courtyard will

also feature a coffee shop and bakery for the public to “come onto the property and experience it.”

Ms. Crush moved on to “The Park,” explaining that in the rendering she showed the Board, “what you don’t see...is a parking garage.” The project would recess all parking one-half level below, and create a one-and-a-half-story “parking podium” beneath the streets, as well as beneath the 4.5 acre park. She noted again that this sort of development was called for by the Beach Redevelopment Plan.

What the developer proposes for the 4.5 acres are two things: first, providing a “permanent and improved home” to the Fort Lauderdale International Boat Show. Currently the Boat Show is staged on the property around the parking lot, which has been a success; however, the developer has been partnering with Boat Show management and the Marine Industries Association, and has created a special venue for the show inside the garage area. One level of the garage has extra-high ceilings, special lighting, and electrical outlets, and other considerations that will allow the Boat Show to stage, while its tents may still be placed on top. The result is an increase of nearly 85,000 sq. ft. in exhibition space.

When the Boat Show is not taking place, Ms. Crush added, the property returns to the 4.5 acre park, to which access will be improved by the addition of a “Marina Promenade.” This provides residents with public access to a waterfront park.

She noted that the recent Sasaki Master Plan had mentioned creation of parks throughout the City, and noted that this park will occur as a result of private development. Ms. Crush stated studies have assumed that the City and CRA will use out-of-pocket expense funds to create public amenities. Bahia Mar Park is on leased land within the City, and all its improvements, including almost a mile of pedestrian pathways, landscaping, and the park are all at the private developer’s expense.

She showed the Board a rendering of what Sea Breeze Boulevard looks like at present, contrasted with how it might look in the future when Bahia Mar Park had been developed. She displayed further renderings of the details of the proposed Park, including the walkway and a rebuilt dockmaster area.

She concluded that 20 years have passed since the CRA was developed, and it would be “very nice” if the City brought forth redevelopment in the last 10 years of its existence.

Ms. Crush offered to take questions at this time.

Mr. Matchette asked if there would be a requirement to modify the lease. Ms. Crush replied that she was unaware if this was a requirement, although there is a proposal to extend the lease. She was not able to speak to whether the terms of the lease would be amended or would remain the same.

Mr. Matchette asked if Ms. Crush could describe the terms between the developer and the City as they currently stand, and compare them to what they might be in the future. Ms. Crush advised that any change in terms had not yet been worked out; the present terms of the lease are that her client pays 4% of his gross revenue received on the property, as well as the property taxes. She understood this to be approximately \$1 million in rent payment, as well as roughly \$1 million in taxes.

Redevelopment of the property with the proposed amenities would, regardless of a new lease, increase the value under the existing 4% lease.

Mr. Matchette asked if the client was requesting any further services from the City, such as additional plumbing or electrical services. Ms. Crush responded that this is "all part of the development proposal," and the client has a detailed site plan for the proposed changes, including a 30 year flood plan and retrofitting of all facilities that service the Marina. These would not come at the expense of the City.

Mr. Schiavone asked how the client intends to keep the Boat Show going during construction on the property. Ms. Crush advised that the development will occur in phases; their phasing plan is currently with Boat Show representatives. During the phasing of development, the Boat Show retains roughly 240,000-250,000 ft. of space during each phase.

In addition, the construction timeline has been built around the Boat Show, with a nine-month annual cycle rather than a 12-month cycle of work. Ms. Crush emphasized that the Boat Show partnership is extremely important to her client, and the project has been designed with that partnership in mind.

Mr. Schiavone commented that it would be fairly expensive to place a retail store on a property of this nature, and asked if the proposed retail establishment might be a grocery store for "average" potential customers, with reasonable prices. Ms. Crush agreed that a grocery store is needed, but it is not what is proposed for the property. They are currently considering a coffee shop/bakery.

She added that the developer is being careful not to "overbuild," considering the market. There are 6000 sq. ft. of office space retained for yacht brokers. Ms. Crush pointed out that her client is attempting to find a local establishment to go into the retail space available.

Ms. Lopez noted that in Phase 1, the sidewalks are very wide; she asked how these would appear on the rest of the property. Ms. Crush replied that the sidewalks do not narrow to a width less than 10 ft., although in some areas this was “very challenging.” The sidewalks are 12 ft. wide in some areas.

Mr. Matchette asked Ms. Crush to describe the residential properties included in the development. She described these as 90 units in each tower, a total of 180 units. They will be condominiums on leased property, which, Ms. Crush acknowledged, was being discussed by the City and the City Attorney’s Office. Co-ops are another possibility for these units.

Vice Chair Motwani felt the project would be “a great enhancement to the beach,” and asked where the developer stands on the time frame. Ms. Crush explained that in July of 2008, the City gave her client permission to process the site plan; they are presently “almost done” responding to Staff’s comments. Her client has also spent a good deal of time speaking with neighborhood associations, as well as the CRA and various Boards.

They anticipate going to the Planning and Zoning Board with a site plan in July or August 2009; by this time, the City will have received their report on the lease from their economic consultant, and will have a workshop at some point during the summer. After the plan goes before the Planning and Zoning Board, the lease will “sit” before having its terms worked out, and it will go before the City Commission in fall 2009.

She pointed out that last year, City Commission had wanted Staff to look over the plan; additionally, in response to community input, the towers of the residential building had been redesigned. She described this as “time well spent.”

Vice Chair Motwani asked what the time frame would be, should the plan be approved by the City Commission. Ms. Crush estimated that construction would begin in 2012 and extend through 2018, based upon the previously noted nine-month annual work period.

Ms. Lopez felt the project was “beautiful,” but pointed out that the original Beach Redevelopment Plan had called for the idea of an “urban village.” She did not feel this project qualified for that term, as the buildings seemed too large to fit the concept of a village.

Ms. Crush recalled seeing that phrase as well. She noted, however, that in 1989, the plan’s authors had indicated that buildings should be no taller than 300 ft., and had suggested extending the PRD zoning district further down to encompass the entire CRA. She felt the authors were discussing “how things interacted,” and made it clear that “you should step things down” into a mixed-use environment, with exceptions for the height.

She continued that the Redevelopment Plan had proposed zoning changes to “go beyond the ULDR,” seeking more development and taller buildings in certain circumstances.

Ms. Lopez pointed out that the zoning for the area dictated a height of 120-150 ft. Ms. Crush noted that this was part of the PUD, which she was not prepared to discuss as part of the presentation. Her understanding, she stated, was that the Board’s purpose is to advise the City on implementing the Beach Redevelopment Plan, which calls for development to “a certain number of trips,” and calls for mixed-use, marine-oriented buildings that can be up to 300 ft. tall.

Ms. Lopez pointed out that with regard to height, the PUD was recently created that allows for buildings at the height proposed by the Bahia Mar Park plan. With this in mind, she did not feel the Beach Redevelopment Plan could be cited as a blueprint for the proposed Bahia Mar development.

Ms. Crush reiterated that she was not prepared to discuss PUD, and could schedule a future meeting if the Board wished to cover that subject.

Mr. Morris stated that the Board is “not here to look at the site plan,” and the Planning and Zoning Board would consider aspects such as neighborhood compatibility and other considerations of the plan. What the Board is asked to consider with this presentation is how it complies with the Redevelopment Plan, and other issues, such as zoning requirements, would be the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board.

He added that the BRB does not have expertise in those areas and is not charged with looking at the ULDR. They look at projects that come forward in the CRA in relation to how it meets the Redevelopment Plan and the concepts within the plan. He emphasized that if the Board makes a motion on this issue, it should be within those parameters rather than about the project’s site plan.

Ms. Lopez explained that her intent is to ask whether the proposed project fits into the beach area, or if they might prefer to have a smaller project in this space. Chair Deckelbaum stated that is what the Board is here to discuss, and they would decide on the presentation based on how the project interacts with the beach as a whole.

Mr. Malkus pointed out that the project’s green space is facing the Intracoastal Waterway, which means the boating public, or tourists on boats, would have a first impression of green space. He felt anywhere that green space and trees could be added in the area “is a very good thing.” He felt this aspect of the plan is impressive, and the developer has done “a very good job.”

Ms. Jarjura stated she liked the different uses emphasized within the plan, including the incorporation of marine, retail, hotel, restaurant, and other uses. She noted that the area south of Las Olas Boulevard has not been developed in the same way the north has, as she had noticed during the recent Beach Walk. She praised the wide sidewalk and the addition of restaurant uses to draw people toward the back of the property.

Mr. Schiavone asked if the hotel would close down when the first phase of construction began and “be closed down for 10 years.” Mr. Henn stated this was not the case, and the hotel will be “rehabilitated.”

Mr. Schiavone explained that he was concerned for the economic impact that hotel guests had on the area. Mr. Henn replied that his company managed another property on the beach, where construction had occurred for two to three years and the hotel had remained open; he pointed out that the construction for the project would be even further away than it had been in other cases. He advised that the prices would probably be “lowered accordingly” during the more heavy construction phases.

Motion made by Ms. Jarjura, seconded by Mr. Malkus, to recommend approval of the project as being in line with the Beach Redevelopment Plan. In a voice vote, the motion carried (Ms. Lopez dissenting).

VII. Turtle Light Task Order

Mr. Morris introduced Earl Prizlee, Engineering Design Manager, and referred the Board members to the memo on the Turtle Light Task Order provided for them. He explained that the City has received a \$3,290,000 grant from FDOT, which pays for construction activities only, not design. This means the City must come up with \$238,000 to fund the project’s design phase. Mr. Morris stated that half the applicable area is within the CRA, and would therefore qualify for CRA funds, while funding for the other half would need to come from the General Fund.

He continued that the City Commission had been asked to accept the grant, with the understanding of how the funding would work. Mr. Morris concluded that he was asking the BRB to recommend in favor of the CRA portion, so the task order could be approved by the City Commission in July, along with the General Fund portion.

Mr. Prizlee showed a rendering of the beach and CRA areas, pointing out that the turtle lighting project extends from South Beach along A1A on the east side until approximately NE 9th Street, and on the lights on the east and west sides along the South Beach Lot, showing the project’s limits.

The lights on the east side were installed as part of the wave wall, and are installed on cast-iron poles. Mr. Prizlee advised these are “coming toward the end of their design life,” and the poles are beginning to rust, despite being repainted annually. They are also not turtle-compliant. The criteria for this compliance are through the turtle nesting season, no light must be visible from the sand or may be on the sand itself. He noted that bags are currently placed over the lights during nesting season to meet requirements.

The only visible portion of the light extends to approximately 270 degrees “all the way around, “ which limits how much of the lights may be seen. Mr. Prizlee added that these poles are bolted down into the ground with concrete foundations, which becomes a factor when lights must be replaced.

In front of South Beach along A1A, the lights have been installed somewhat more recently, on concrete poles rather than cast iron. These will also need to be replaced, although in their case the tops must be retrofitted while leaving the poles in place. They would be “clear-coated in black, and a decorative base that matches the other lights would be installed.

Mr. Prizlee continued that after a great deal of time spent working with the Fish and Wildlife Department, a prototype with louvers has been developed, which polarizes the light. Both Fish and Wildlife and FDOT have approved this prototype, and the cities of Riviera Beach and Delray Beach now plan to implement the City’s fixture into their own improvement process. All fixtures have been approved for specific locations rather than generically approved.

He added that the City plans on using the existing foundations for the new fixtures, as to replace both poles and foundations would “tear up the beach” and require new wiring and conduits. The City has made preliminary calculations for these foundations, and have worked with the manufacturers to develop a modified plate so new wires in existing conduits can be pulled without causing too much damage to the beach.

Finally, calculations have been made that would allow some “recessed receptacles” for holiday lights during that season, although Mr. Prizlee noted that this use may be limited

He displayed renderings of the new poles, which are “concrete-spun” poles with anti-graffiti coating. They are much more durable in a marine environment and in the beach’s “harsh temperatures.”

The cost of this original programming was \$4.87 million; the City has received a JPA Grant for \$3.29 million. Mr. Prizlee felt this price could be lowered even more significantly, due to the design for using this item. His goal is to accomplish

the project for \$3.2 million, although he would not know if this could be done until all appropriate individuals have "signed off."

The task order is for \$238,000, with funding to be divided between the City and the CRA, Mr. Prizlee reiterated; the funds being requested were approved for use in fiscal 2007-08, as a \$3 million allocation for "beach improvements" including pavers, turtle lighting, trash receptacles, coconut palms, and signage.

Mr. Matchette noted that Mr. Prizlee is the designer of this system, and congratulated him on both its functionality and its design aspect.

Ms. Lopez asked if the angle of light from the poles is fixed. Mr. Prizlee explained the system is designed to be left up on a year-round basis, with no bags or further maintenance. He described the project as "a permanent solution," noting that the previous "acorn" style threw light in every direction, while the new system more closely resembles "a house with recessed lights."

Mr. Schiavone asked how far turtle lighting extends on A1A. Mr. Prizlee pointed out that lights on the west side of the road are not part of this project, as some of those lights are owned by the City, some by FPL, and some by FDOT; FDOT's and FPL's fixtures have already been retrofitted.

Mr. Schiavone noted that the previous metal design has been switched to concrete, and asked if there had been consideration given for a PVC product that might be "marine-rated." Mr. Prizlee replied that he was not aware of any commercial PVC poles that could withstand the necessary level of wind loading, as well as DOT requirements. The concrete poles have been proven to be the most durable product.

Motion made by Mr. Malkus, seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, to approve \$119,377.37 as outlined in the memorandum from Mr. Prizlee to fund the turtle lighting task order. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

VIII. Police Update

Sergeant Steve Greenlaw of the Fort Lauderdale Police Department advised that he is over the District to the South of Broward Boulevard, including the beach area "as far west as 441." He offered to answer any questions the Board might have, noting that while there is some crime in the beach area, there are no trends or "epidemics" at this time.

It was noted that a "strong-arm robbery" was said to have occurred at approximately 5:00 a.m. Sgt. Greenlaw noted that he did not have any information on such a crime due to scheduling. He pointed out, however, that "strong-arm robbery" can mean an act as simple as using one's hands against

another person and demanding money or property, not necessarily involving a weapon.

He added that the beach is full of both tourists and transients, and robberies can often be drug-related activity “gone bad.”

Mr. Schiavone recalled that roughly four weeks ago, cars were broken into behind The Parrot and property left in view was taken from the cars. Sgt. Greenlaw noted that leaving belongings in plain sight is tempting to people who would sell them for a small amount of money, such as vagrants. He cautioned against leaving “the obvious” property in sight in a car.

He added that while he sees criminal activity every day, it is a concern to its victims; however, this doesn’t mean the activity is “epidemic.” He felt perhaps City residents might make tourists more aware of the need to protect themselves from opportunistic crime.

He noted that the Street Crimes Unit, which consists of both “reactive and proactive” detectives who participate in narcotics sweeps, undercover or surveillance work, and other responsibilities, operates all over the City, but may focus on the beach during particular times of the year, such as during Spring Break. While narcotics sweeps in this area may not bring in major arrests, Sgt. Greenlaw emphasized that the City has changed, and “small” crimes of this nature make a big difference.

Chair Deckelbaum asked if there has been an increase in reported crime in any particular areas of the City. Sgt. Greenlaw advised that the only continuing area he has noticed is near Chair Deckelbaum’s restaurant, where burglaries and break-ins are occurring, and in the South Beach Parking Lot.

Mr. Schiavone added that his business area is also “improperly lit at night,” and an occasional walk-through by police might be of help.

Sgt. Greenlaw encouraged the Board members to call the police when they have uneasy feelings about situations, as when they felt something isn’t necessarily right, it probably isn’t. He added that he would like to keep two officers on the east side of the bridges for safety and other reasons.

He noted that the beach is seen as “its own little city,” and the officers on his shift took all calls seriously.

IX. Code Compliance Update

Lindwell Bradley, Code Compliance Supervisor, introduced Officer Mario Sotolongo, who is the Code Compliance Officer for the beach area.

Mr. Bradley advised that it is currently turtle season, and Officer Sotolongo has been asking shop owners to re-educate themselves on turtle lighting and the necessity of dimming lights near the beach for this time period. He noted that this seems to be the biggest difficulty in the area in recent years, as businesses change managers or owners and may also change their lighting. He requested that the Board help in the effort of educating new businesspeople if they have the opportunity.

He indicated that there is some success, and the turtle lighting is greatly improved over past years.

Mr. Bradley continued that there are some complaints about noise along Almond Avenue, where a bar has recently opened the back portion of its property around the pool. Many of the complaints have come from Jackson Towers. He added that his Department is trying to evaluate whether the noise is unnecessarily loud for the nearby residents.

He offered to answer questions at this time.

Vice Chair Motwani asked what turtle lighting restrictions are on the west side. Mr. Bradley stated these restrictions are the same as those in effect on the east side, explaining if a light source is visible to the beach area, it is a violation. He continued that his Department works with private property and business owners to show them how light may be shielded from the sand.

Mr. Bradley added that his Department, along with Florida's Fish and Wildlife Department, also conducts seminars to educate residents and businesspersons. In response to a question from Chair Deckelbaum, he acknowledged that while compliance has improved in recent years, "a small percentage" of individuals must be educated more than once about this issue.

Mr. Schiavone asked if a light from a business, visible from the beach, means that business is out of compliance. Mr. Bradley confirmed this, and pointed out that the Florida Fish and Wildlife website shows various designs of light fixtures that will address this problem. He noted that turtle lighting is not only an issue for Fort Lauderdale, but is in effect up and down the coast.

Mr. Schiavone requested further clarification, asking if light from a resident's window would also be a violation. Mr. Bradley confirmed this as well, and explained that condominium owners are asked to shield their lights.

He stated that the City is mandated, by the State, to comply with turtle lighting. The Department works with business owners to come up with solutions. He cited examples of buildings that would not have been allowed to open until they

passed City and State turtle lighting ordinances, and pointed out that if these buildings are in compliance, others may achieve that goal as well.

Mr. Schiavone commented that it is preferable to “lose a few turtles” so human beings can go out and enjoy their beaches.

Vice Chair Motwani felt there is a “human safety” issue if there are no lights on the beach, and felt the City should particularly work with small businesses in the current economic climate. Mr. Bradley reiterated that his Department works with businesses and allows them time to make changes and come into compliance.

Chair Deckelbaum noted that he had been advised of a “graffiti spell” in the area. Officer Sotolongo explained this had happened roughly two weeks ago, but there have been “tremendous results” in having this removed within two to three days.

Mr. Bradley added that there is an “action team,” supplied by the County with paint, that address graffiti in vacant property or in City rights-of-way. They also cite offenders for graffiti.

He encouraged Board members to notify him as soon as they see graffiti, and they will attempt to eradicate it “within a couple of days.”

Mr. Morris advised that at their next scheduled meeting, an Agenda Item will be the reappointment of a BRB member to the BID. He explained this must be a “sitting member.”

Chair Deckelbaum requested clarification of the “Communications to City Commission” section. Mr. Morris stated these are “mostly the motions,” and can include other items if the Board wishes to bring to the City Commission’s attention as well. He advised these were items of interest “from the Board as a whole.” For example, he pointed out that tonight’s motions regarding the turtle lighting fixtures and the Bahia Mar project would be included. Should minutes not be approved prior to its next meeting, the City Commission is provided with draft minutes.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.