

APPROVED
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2010 – 2:30 P.M.

MEMBERS	ATTENDANCE	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	A	5	2
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair	P	6	1
Jordana L. Jarjura (arr. 2:53)	P	6	1
Chuck Malkus	P	7	0
Dan Matchette	P	5	2
Melissa Milroy (arr. 2:35)	P	4	3
Mel Rubinstein	P	3	1
Judith Scher	A	2	2
Tim Schiavone	P	5	2
Aiton Yaari	P	6	1

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
Stephen Scott, Economic Development Director
Earl Prizlee, CRA Engineering Design Manager
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
Steve Anderson, Parks and Recreation
Mark Almy, Parks and Recreation Department
Tom Terrell, Public Works
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

- None

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Vice Chair Motwani called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present. Vice Chair Motwani reported that Chair Deckelbaum could not attend and she will sit as Chair.

II. Approval of Minutes, August 19, 2010 Special Meeting

Motion by Mr. Malkus, seconded by Mr. Matchette, to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2010 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

III. Cinema by the Sea Proposal – David Miller, Superintendent, Parks and Recreation

Mr. Morris mentioned that there is a memo on the proposal in their packets. He introduced Mark Almy from the Parks and Recreation Department to talk about the funding breakdown.

Mr. Almy explained that Mr. Miller was ill, and he is filling in. He announced that they have a title sponsor (PNC Bank) for Cinema by the Sea for \$30,000. Parks and Recreation is asking the CRA to come up with \$7500 to supplement the remainder. He noted that the expenses for the event total \$36,856 for the entire six-week film festival. He handed out a flyer which will be posted throughout the City announcing the movies to be shown beginning October 23, 2010.

Vice Chair Motwani was curious how this is being marketed. Mr. Almy responded that it is being done through PIO and as well as by flyers and posters throughout the town. Mr. Morris added there will be publicity on the radio, and Mr. Almy remarked that PNC Bank is also doing some advertising.

Mr. Yaari suggested using the water bill as a way to advertise. Vice Chair Motwani concurred and also recommended the Chamber of Commerce and Businesses on the Beach. They have their own websites where the word could be spread.

Mr. Almy did not know if it was possible at this time to get it into the water bill, but he will check on that the following day.

Mr. Yaari commented that he loves events on the beach, but that in previous years they did not get a very good turnout with movies at the beach. Mr. Almy responded that this is in conjunction with the film festival, but showing different movies.

Vice Chair Motwani remarked that the economy is in a different cycle now, and there is more going on now to attract more people to the beach. They could get the word out through HOA's and flyers at businesses on the beach.

Mr. Yaari suggested that the CBA might be able to reach their constituents through an email campaign.

Mr. Almy said they are anticipating a smaller turnout than what they had for Where the Boys Are, but are still hoping for a substantial number of visitors.

Vice Chair Motwani expressed her concern about the short window of time available for

marketing. Mr. Almy responded that he is quite confident in Mr. Miller's marketing ability and he will express this concern to him in their next meeting.

Mr. Almy mentioned that the first two nights of the event will be slightly different from the rest, as it is still turtle season and they have to be off the beach by 9:00 p.m. Therefore, the first two movies will be short ones starting at 6:45 p.m., and everything will be put away by the 9:00 p.m. deadline. They can stay as late as they want for the last four weeks of the festival.

He pointed out that the movies will be shown 540 feet south of Las Olas just north of Southeast Fifth. The screen will be facing north.

Mr. Malkus expressed confidence in the festival and the publicity generated by **Coast** radio, being a family radio station. He thought what really helped Where the Boys Are was the mailing in the water bills. He proposed adding another \$1,000 to the \$7,500 they are being asked for so that they can print and insert a stuffer in the water bills. Mr. Yaari thought there would be enough money already.

Mr. Morris replied that they would first have to find out if it could be done from a timing standpoint. It was noted that the City does print upcoming events on the back of the bills for no charge at all, and Mr. Yaari said then maybe they should leave the bill stuffer for the really big events. Mr. Morris will investigate and keep them informed by email.

Mr. Morris also said that the Parks and Recreation Department will come back at the next meeting and report their progress in marketing. Vice Chair Motwani remarked that their next meeting will not be in time for the beginning of the festival, but it was pointed out that they may be able to get something in the November water bills, as the festival would still be going on at that time.

Motion by Mr. Malkus, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to allocate the amount of \$7,500 to help sponsor the Cinema by the Sea event, which begins October 23, 2010, and then additionally if possible to include, but not be limited to, this information in the form of a utility bill advertisement that would help inform residents of the event. There was no vote.

Motion by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Ms. Milroy, to recommend approval for \$7500 with the encouragement that Cinema by the Sea be promoted through the utility bill.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 5-2 as follows: Chair Motwani, yes; Ms. Jarjura, no; Mr. Malkus, yes; Mr. Matchette, yes; Ms. Milroy, yes; Mr. Rubinstein, no; Mr. Schiavone, yes; Mr. Yaari, yes.

Mr. Rubenstein wanted to know the total cost of the project, and Mr. Almy answered it was \$36,856. Mr. Matchette added that the budget was on the back of the memo that was distributed earlier.

Mr. Rubenstein inquired about the purpose of the \$3,900 consultant fee. Mr. Almy responded that he thought it was for a consultant working with the film festival and coordinating the two events.

Mr. Rubenstein was curious if most of the cost was going for the movies themselves, and Mr. Almy answered in the affirmative. He said they are purchasing the right to show the movies publicly, but was not sure if they were renting or buying the movies.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered who would be taking care of the cleanup afterward and providing police detail. Mr. Morris said that the promoters pick up the tab for all that, and Mr. Almay added that there is no police detail involved, as the crowd is not expected to be very big. Parks and Recreation will be providing staff for cleanup.

Mr. Rubenstein continued that his objection has nothing to do with the event itself; it is in this group that is supposed to address blighted areas and infrastructure using the taxpayers' money for this. He thinks most of the money should go toward that end, not events. He reiterated that he thinks it is wrong to take taxpayers' money for these kinds of events, and for that reason, he will be voting "no."

Mr. Matchette thought Mr. Rubenstein had a good point. He said he was unclear about the Board's mission and charter. He would not mind voting for the expense in question, but he would like the charter more closely defined.

Mr. Morris responded that the CRA is governed by the Community Redevelopment Plan, which outlines goals and objectives that they are required to try to meet. There are many elements to the plan such as public improvement, zoning, and design. He thought there are many ways to accomplish goals, and in the memo they attempted to identify those goals that this proposal meets. He then used as an example the goal for fostering family activity and recreation in the central beach area as well as providing for an opportunity to expand tourist activities on the beach. It could be done via infrastructure, or promoting activities that will bring folks to the beach.

He continued that that will be the question that the City Commissioners will have to answer when the Board and the City Commission talk about long-term priorities up until 2019. So far Mr. Morris has not received direction from the City Commission to limit the amount of money spent each year for events.

He recalled the recent joint meeting between the BRB and the BID regarding what can be done to promote these activities. After that meeting, representatives from the Chamber of Commerce and other groups came back with more specific requests regarding events. The CRA plugged ballpark numbers into those requests.

The Cinema by the Sea proposal will not be heard until after the City Commission has approved the budget, as this is taking money from next year's budget. Mr. Morris

concluded by saying that he does not know what the specific dollar amount should be.

Vice Chair Motwani remarked that it is a great concern. A representative from Expedia met with her last week after coming from Miami and she wondered why it is so quiet here, compared to Miami.

Mr. Rubenstein then read the purpose and objectives of the Board. His impression has been that it is very expensive to follow through with those goals, but whatever the Board does to take care of the blighted areas, it must be geared towards improving the infrastructure, as that is the "long run." He was not sure if that should be the case and suggested perhaps the City Commission should come to them and tell them how they are supposed to use the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Morris agreed that it is up to the City Commission, with input from this Board, who will help set the priorities until the CRA sunsets. He believed that the Board can accomplish the goals also through economic activities which can help spur new business, which in turn increases property values, assessments, and brings more money in the CRA.

Vice Chair Motwani remarked that the businesses do better when they have events, and tax dollars do come back to replenish the CRA. Mr. Morris agreed that not only does the money come back in tax dollars, but also by increased activity on the beach.

Mr. Schiavone noted that everybody has valid points. He said that they do not want things to get out of balance, but if it is good for the beach at one end of the spectrum, it is good at the other end of the spectrum. He added that maybe the letter of the law is not to have special events per se, but it is not just bricks and mortar all the time either. There has to be a personality to that, an event. He thought that the interest generated from the events would be a catalyst for achieving their primary goal of improving the infrastructure.

Mr. Matchette agreed, but qualified it by saying that it is alright as long as there is enough money to accomplish what their charter specifies. He ventured that it appears that when a City department wants to do something now, they start looking around to see who has money in their budget. He said he would vote for this event, but would like concrete clarification from the City Commission as to whether this type of event falls within their purview or not.

Mr. Jarjura suggested having a workshop on their plan.

Mr. Yaari commented on other CRAs and their successes, and reminded the Board that the CRA will sunset "before they know it" so they need to examine what they are doing with their money.

Mr. Morris remarked that the CRA does not do anything unless it has passed through

the City Attorney's office first. He thought the issue is not the appropriateness of doing the events, but rather their priorities.

There was further discussion on the importance of questioning from time to time on how they spend their money, with Mr. Rubenstein commenting that he, too, would like direct guidance from the City Commission on how to spend their funds.

Mr. Morris explained that the reason why this request is coming at this time (close to the event) had to do with meeting schedules out of their control.

He clarified that the Board had put in a placeholder when they voted on the promotional events previously, but they did not approve any specific items. If that money is not used, the money goes to Capital Improvements at the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. Yaari noted that even if they approve an event, it still has to be approved by the City Commission. Mr. Morris concurred.

There was a discussion on whether they should ask the City Commission for direction on their role as Board members. Mr. Morris explained that the City Commission has told him that they need to have a special meeting with this Board this year. He did not have possible dates yet, but he thought that will be the best way to receive the direction.

IV. Holiday Lights Approval – Donald Morris, Beach CRA Director

Mr. Morris reminded the Board of the request from the BID that the CRA match their Holiday Lights contribution to do an iconic symbol and to extend the lights until March. He noted there has been discussion about which symbol to use.

Mr. Morris introduced Mr. Prizlee, the CRA Engineering Design Manager.

Mr. Prizlee reminded the Board that last year was the first year that the CRA partnered with the BID to do the Holiday Lights. He showed some of the lighting designs which were put up from Sunrise to the Clipper. They also wrapped the poles from the beach side with garlands and had red glitter bells on them. They have ground displays in four locations, so no matter which way a person comes to the beach, they see the Happy Holidays ground display.

This year they want to continue special lighting into March. It will be a combination of blue rope lights and white snowflakes. After the first of the year, they will take down the snowflakes, which will leave a subtle blue lighting. In addition, there will some type of element at the portal at the bridge at Las Olas. He showed a picture of the proposed lighting.

On December 1, 2010, they would put out a Centennial display. After January 1, 2011, they would take down the tree wraps, leaving a celebration of lights for the Centennial.

The big "100" would be self-lit from inside and the circles are garlands. He said it will stay up until February 28, as turtle season starts March 1.

During the day, Mr. Prizlee explained that the "100" would stand out with reflectivity of the centerpieces. The numbers are about 14 feet and the base is 4 feet, so all together it would be about 18 feet tall, which is a good photo op site.

Mr. Yaari said that once it is up, a professional photographer should be hired to take photos of it for the Fort Lauderdale website.

Mr. Matchette was curious what organization they would be supporting on this. Mr. Morris answered that the original plan was done by the BID, and they are looking for a tie-in with the Centennial.

Vice Chair Motwani commented that it is a great idea to connect with the Centennial, as it is a once-in-a-lifetime event.

Mr. Rubinstein said he is not sure what they would be voting on. Mr. Morris explained that they had to go out for bid last week on this project so they could meet deadlines of November 22 and 23 for a public lighting ceremony. Mr. Prizlee will explain the options and what he wants the Board to vote on, and if approved, it will go to the City Commission on October 5, 2010, for conceptual approval for the Centennial group. Then it goes to the CRA's October 19 meeting.

Mr. Morris explained that when they sent out the email about the "100" they were asking for feedback, not a vote. The feedback came back 5-1 in favor of the design.

Mr. Morris reported that the BID has already approved \$58,000 for their part, and the CRA is asking for a \$58,000 match from the BRB.

Ms. Milroy and Mr. Yaari expressed their support of the project. Mr. Matchette said this project has more bang for the buck than the movie project.

Motion by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Mr. Malkus, to approve the project. In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion about what they could do with the displays in the future and how the lights are stored in the off-season. Mr. Prizlee explained that the lights are leased for the season and a bid goes out for someone to install and take them down. Mr. Morris added that they are now required to put every contract out to bid.

Mr. Yaari suggested that if they have a main lighting event, it should be public and have music and so forth. Vice Chair Motwani said they are discussing it.

Chair Motwani recognized Art Seitz. Mr. Seitz remarked that there are discussions

about having a promenade around the Bahia Mar Park, and the western edge would be a good place to watch the Christmas boat show and have celebrations.

V. Discussion of New Garbage and Beach Recycling Containers on the Beach – Greg Slagle, Solid Waste Superintendent, Public Works

Mr. Slagle introduced himself, noting his department is responsible for purchasing and installing the waste and recycling containers on the sidewalk area. He noted that Steve Anderson was present, who is responsible for garbage and recycling collection.

Mr. Slagle said he was present to find out what kind of containers the Board would like to go on the beach. They formulated a three-year beautification plan for the beach to replace all the garbage cans on the barrier island, about 300 feet. That would standardize the street furniture on the beach. The first year that the plan was approved, they purchased 100 cans and received a grant and picked up 100 blue recycling containers. Year two of the plan, the City Commission decided it was too expensive to purchase the next 100 cans and were instructed to come back to this Board for a recommendation on what type of containers to put on the beach.

Mr. Slagle continued that in the backup material, there is information on containers. They can range from \$50 upwards. The ones that he is proposing now have to be purchased in lots of 100, and it comes to \$1,046.00 each including shipping and galvanizing. He said those are top-notch cans. He explained that this type of container came along when they remodeled the A1A corridor and they added to that inventory. They are made out of galvanized steel with a 10-year warranty.

Mr. Yaari commented that his business is in the busiest part of the beach. Since the recycling containers were put out, it is a world of change, cleaner, more organized. He was curious if Mr. Slagle was at the meeting for money or for a recommendation.

Mr. Slagle responded that he has the money, he just needs the recommendation. His recommendation was to buy more of the same cans that they have, to keep it standardized. They use black cans for garbage and blue for recycled (blue is the universal color for recycling).

Mr. Slagle gave some details on the cans:

- Durable
- Cannot be spray painted
- Bolted down
- Welded lid
- Locking device on side if needed
- Galvanized finish
- Stainless steel feet

He noted that the standard ones such as the ones at bus stops are \$504 apiece.

Mr. Matchette was curious if there was any difference from a labor standpoint in servicing the cans and Mr. Slagle responded there was not. They have liners inside the cans.

They have dual-container trucks, so they can use each truck for both recycling and regular garbage on one pass.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered which of the two would be more stable in a hurricane and Mr. Slagle responded that the one they propose is bolted down. The plastic ones on the sand are removed or buried down during a storm.

Vice Chair Motwani asked if he was happy with the current cans, and he said that the only concern he has is salt spray on some cans along the wall. The manufacturer is taking a look at that. Mr. Yaari said it is sand with spray.

Mr. Matchette brought up the warranty and asked about the galvanization. Mr. Slagle replied that the warranty is on the structure and on the older cans they had rust. They next tried a galvanized finish, but that also took a beating and discolored, so now this can has a hot dip galvanized finish that is powder coated. Mr. Matchette was curious what the warranty would provide if the weather defeats the finish. Mr. Slagle responded that is why they had the manufacturer come out to discuss the situation.

Motion by Mr. Malkus, seconded by Mr. Yaari, to recommend that Mr. Slagle proceeds with these items as described. Motion withdrawn by Mr. Malkus.

Mr. Matchette was curious if there was an alternate plan if this is not approved. Mr. Slagle answered that there is not, and it is part of a three-year plan funded through the Sanitation Fund. He said they are also going to the Green Committee for their input.

Ms. Jarjura wondered if the Board was supposed to review some other garbage canisters and make a recommendation, or just review the one that was presented. Mr. Slagle explained there are thousands of containers and they picked this one. Ms. Jarjura wondered if the City Commission would be asking him what the top three options were that he presented to the Board. Mr. Slagle said that the backup materials have more information. Ms. Jarjura was expecting a choice of the "top three."

Mr. Morris expressed that it is important for the Board to know the pros and cons of the different kinds of cans. He noted, for example, that with the cans made out of recycled materials, if they get graffiti on them they do not clean up well. He said that if the Board is presented with the pros and cons of different types of containers and their respective costs, they could make a better recommendation.

Mr. Malkus remarked that he thinks they have a good understanding of the desirable qualities of a container, and wondered if there is another comparable can on pages 1-5

of the handout.

There was discussion on what information they need to make an informed recommendation.

Vice Chair Motwani asked Mr. Slagle if he and Mr. Terrell could return at the next meeting. Mr. Terrell said they would come back at the next meeting. He added that some of the criteria the cans must have are durable, street furniture quality, and suitable for a beach. He added they should be allowed leeway to eliminate cans that do not meet that criteria.

Mr. Yaari requested they bring specific information on the warranties.

Mr. Matchette was curious if the bid specs include all the features of the can they initially chose, and Mr. Slagle confirmed that, saying it was all designed by them. They received several bids. Mr. Matchette continued that if it went through the bona fide bid process, all they need to know is that this company won the bid.

Mr. Morris offered that he was at the City Commission meeting and what he heard was that the Sanitation Department had to go back and get the Advisory Board's opinion. He interpreted it to mean the BRB has to have other options to review.

Mr. Slagle informed the Board that four bids came back in, all for the slat-style can, but some of the slat thicknesses were different, and stainless steel feet were not included on some. Mr. Anderson said that some could not be hot-dipped, may have been shorter, and did not have a locking mechanism and so forth.

Vice Chair Motwani asked them to return to the next meeting with three proposals, and her concern is with the warranty. Mr. Malkus asked if the other cans that were part of returned bids had the capability of being galvanized, and had the leveling feet. Mr. Slagle said some did, some did not.

Mr. Schiavone remarked that what has not been tested is the warranty and he speculated on balancing a 10-year warranty on an expensive can versus a shorter warranty on a less expensive can. He wondered if the City was trying to save money and look for a less expensive can.

Mr. Terrell asked that the Board defer their vote at this time and allow them to come back next month and bring the bid specifications and some other options. In the meantime, they will be meeting with the warranty manufacturer and they will have the results of that conversation.

Mr. Malkus suggested having the gentlemen at the front of the agenda at the next meeting.

VI. Discussion of June 14th Beach Walk – Donald Morris, Beach CRA Director

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Ms. Jarjura, to defer the discussion of the beach walk until the next meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

VII. Communication to the City Commission – none

VIII. Old/New Business

Mr. Rubenstein mentioned that at the last meeting he had requested a breakdown of the \$24M. Mr. Morris apologized for not having that available and will bring it to the next meeting.

Motion by Mr. Jarjura, seconded by Mr. Yaari, to adjourn the meeting.

There was a member of the public, Mr. Art Seitz, who had asked to speak. Mr. Seitz talked about the possible building of a pier. He wondered what was happening on this issue. Secondly, he brought up the question of electronic signs advising people of events going on at the beach. He also said there is money to be had from Scenic Highway Funds, including \$100,000 for trash cans.

Vice Chair Motwani told Mr. Seitz that she could not give a specific answer at this time.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was over at 4:25 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc.]