

APPROVED

**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2010 – 2:00 P.M.**

<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	7	2
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair (arr. 2:19, left 3:45)	P	8	1
Jordana L. Jarjura (arr. 2:08)	P	8	1
Chuck Malkus	P	9	0
Dan Matchette	P	7	2
Melissa Milroy (arr. 2:08)	P	6	3
Mel Rubinstein	P	5	1
Judith Scher	P	4	2
Tim Schiavone	P	7	2
Aiton Yaari	P	8	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
Earl Prizlee, CRA Engineering Design Manager
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
Lynda Flynn, Acting Finance Director
Wayne Jessup, Planning & Zoning
Thomas Lodge, Planning & Zoning
Cate McCaffrey, Business Enterprise Director
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Deckelbaum called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

Chair Deckelbaum thanked everybody for attending two meetings this month. He mentioned he was excited at the good turnout for the lighting of the Las Olas entrance

to the beach, even though he was not able to attend.

II. Approval of Minutes, November 15, 2010

Mr. Matchette brought up an error in the comments that he made on p. 8, first paragraph. He explained that the minutes misrepresented his intent by saying, "He felt that tourists do not do anything to aid the area as a destination city." After a short discussion, Mr. Matchette suggested striking the sentence cited above, and replacing it with the following sentence: "In his opinion, he felt that projects Mr. Malkus referred to will bring residents, not tourists."

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Mr. Malkus, to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2010, meeting as corrected. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Board members if they had reviewed the minutes from the joint meeting. Mr. Morris said that the City Commission would like the Board to approve those minutes before the Commission approves them at their December 21 meeting. He requested that the Board members be ready to submit any corrections or amendments, so that they can be voted on at the December 15 meeting of this Board.

Chair Deckelbaum asked if any Board members need hard copies of Board materials to be sent in addition to electronic copies. Ms. Scher was the only one who requested hard copies.

III. Children's Inflatable Waterslide Program – Ralph Reihl

Mr. Reihl introduced himself, noting he has been living in Fort Lauderdale for 30 years. He is the President of the South Florida Tourism Council. For 23 years, they have had an information, ticketing, welcome center and trolley booth at 419 South Fort Lauderdale Beach Boulevard. He reported that the Council began by creating initiatives involving sidewalk cafes and the like. More recently they have been focusing on activities for children, as there are not too many available other than the Discovery Center, Sand Castles and a few others. The Council is considering adding a children's inflatable waterslide to the attractions. Other cities in Florida with the slide are St. Augustine, St. Petersburg and Daytona Beach.

[Mr. Reihl distributed a pamphlet about the slide.]

[Mr. Reihl showed a video of the slide in operation.]

Mr. Reihl stated that he met with the City Manager about a year ago regarding installing a slide on Fort Lauderdale Beach, but it turned out not to be feasible with the turtle protection program. After looking around, they decided the Welcome Center was a good location for the slide: the property is 50' wide and 300' long.

He reported that he has met with the Mayor, staff, and several Commissioners and has

received positive feedback. The project got a sign-off from the DRC procedure, and it meets the ULDR.

He continued that he thinks this project fits in with the purpose of the CRA under family activities, recreation, tourism-related facilities and activities.

Chair Deckelbaum commented that after questions or comments from the Board, the public would be allowed to speak. He advised members of the public to sign in prior to speaking.

Ms. Scher wondered if Mr. Reihl had a rendering of how the slide would look next to the hotel, and Mr. Reihl showed the plan. He said that the ticket booth would remain where it is. The lot is 300' long and the slide is 100' long.

Mr. Malkus asked specifically what the dimensions are on all four sides of the slide. Mr. Reihl responded that the lot is 50' wide and the slide is 10' wide. The maximum length of the slide is 185' if it has all the possible extensions, and the lot is 300' long. He reiterated they have met all the set-back requirements.

Mr. Malkus asked if the paperwork shows a 100' or a 185' slide and Mr. Reihl said they are proposing the 125-130' slide.

Mr. Morris suggested having the planner discuss the site requirements to provide a better grasp on the situation.

Mr. Malkus said he is specifically interested in the length of the slide.

Mr. Lodge of Planning and Zoning reported that what was proposed to them was a 35' high, 47' wide, and 151' long children's inflatable slide.

Mr. Morris emphasized that Mr. Reihl would not be able to vary the request once it has been submitted unless he goes back through the entire permitting process.

Chair Deckelbaum sought clarification on where the slide is in the process, and Mr. Lodge informed the Board that it has been through DRC and has received the pre-Planning and Zoning board sign-off. It had a hearing at the Planning and Zoning Board. The Board recommended a deferral that it be heard at the BRB, and it is going to be heard at Planning and Zoning in January.

Mr. Schiavone wondered if the project has a timed window where it would expire and would have to go back to the City for renewal in terms of licensing. Mr. Reihl answered that the City approved the use of having a recreational slide there, and that would be for as long as they want it. He added there is a five-year life expectancy on the unit itself.

Mr. Schiavone also was curious why the project did not meet with the approval of the

turtle advocates. Mr. Reihl said he did not know. He explained that his first choice for the slide was by the park, on the south end across from Bahia Mar. Mr. Schiavone pointed out that the other cities have turtles, but Mr. Reihl said the turtles here come all the way up to the seawall, whereas the other cities' beaches are wider. Mr. Reihl said they even offered to take the slide down every night and carry it away, but the turtle people refused.

Ms. Milroy commented they do need things for families on the beach, but she thinks it looks too "carnival-ish" for that area. She does not think it fits in with what the City is trying to become.

Mr. Yaari asked about parking and Mr. Reihl said that they had their own parking spaces. Mr. Lodge commented that the Zoning Administrator determined that it would come under pool parking, which would be one space for every 200 square feet of sliding area. They determined it would require six spaces, and six were provided.

Mr. Schiavone agreed with Ms. Milroy that the slide had a "honky-tonk" look that is not in keeping with what is at the beach right now, but he said the families could use it and felt there was a place for it.

Mr. Jarjura was curious about how the slide is maintained. She wondered how it would look five years from now. Mr. Reihl said that the South Florida Tourism Council would be responsible for the operation, and it is deflated every night. A tarp is put on top of it at night, and it is inflated every morning. He said he thought the hotels could be represented by a letter he received from Bill Cunningham at the Marriott which was supportive of adding the slide as a tourist related activity. The letter said that the beach and the hotel could benefit, and families are looking for activities they can do together without leaving the beach area.

Vice Chair Motwani asked about the time frame to have the slide installed. Mr. Reihl replied that once it is approved, it would take 30 days to ship. They have landscaping planned also, so the lot will look better than it now does.

Mr. Yaari wondered what the admission price would be. Mr. Reihl said he did not know at this time, but they might start out at a quarter per ride to get people used to it. They will check the market before establishing a set rate.

Mr. Matchette asked if they had a business plan and revenue projection and Mr. Reihl answered affirmatively. He wondered if that would sustain itself on a quarter a ride, and Mr. Reihl answered that it could over a five-year span. He added there is no financing or borrowing involved. The Tourism Council has a membership of close to 800 corporations and many corporations are involved in backing the slide project. Mr. Reihl added they are not asking for any funds, and the South Florida Tourism Council has never taken government funds.

Mr. Matchette wanted to confirm that it would totally self-sustaining and make a profit. Mr. Reihl said they do not want to make a profit as they are a not-for-profit organization.

Chair Deckelbaum opened up the discussion for comments from the public.

Fred Carlson, President of the Central Beach Alliance, spoke first. He remarked that the important thing is that they do the City's business. The South Florida Tourism Council has long wanted to do something for families, as does the Central Beach Alliance. The CBA looked at the project, and came up with pros and cons. The cons were that it was too garish for that location and might be better elsewhere on beach. The positives were that it would be good for families.

Mr. Carlson reported that one of their debates centered on the footprint of the slide. With a side to side footprint of 45' or 47' on a 50' lot, he said that when people go down the 10' slide and want to go back to the other end to ride again, they have to walk back under the guy wires that hold the slide in place. There would only be 2.5' to go past the guy wire anchors on the outside, and he wondered if a setback issue would be relevant on a temporary structure. The Central Beach Alliance voted to reject the project (36 to 30 votes). When they mentioned their decision to the Planning and Zoning Board, that Board decided they wanted to get more input from the Beach Redevelopment Board.

Mr. Morris mentioned that when they review a development project, they look to see how it relates to their redevelopment goals and objectives, not how it meets ULBR. As the Board discusses this project, he advised them to focus how it meets the goals and objectives of the plan.

Mr. Schiavone commented that he thinks the slide belongs in the sand where it fits in aesthetically with the other play things for children. He does not think it would be successful on the other side of A1A as there is no traffic light there for crossing safety. He asked Mr. Reihl to try to find a way to solve the turtle problem. He reiterated that the slide belongs on the south end of the beach where the picnic tables are, and where there is a lot of parking. He suggested getting the project approved for five years. At the end of that time, if there are issues, then those things could be addressed. He recommended that Mr. Reihl find an attorney to fight the turtle issue.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered if they were supposed to vote on the project. Mr. Morris said that the Planning and Zoning Board expects a recommendation one way or another.

Ms. Jarjura agreed with Mr. Schiavone in terms of the location and asked about making a recommendation with the caveat that Mr. Reihl speak with the City and find another location on the beach. Chair Deckelbaum said they could do that.

Ms. Jarjura wondered if their business plan addressed the issue of parking and no street light or crosswalk. Mr. Reihl said they addressed that a long time ago with the City. There is parking (Las Olas parking lot), but no signal light. He said the Board may

want to recommend crosswalks.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if Planning and Zoning had contemplated the risk of a children's oriented project with no crosswalk to the beach. Mr. Lodge replied that they always take safety into consideration. The project met the ULDR requirements as is. As a Level Three Project, it goes on to the Planning and Zoning Board and they are the ones who make the recommendation to the City Commission. Mr. Lodge added that no concerns came up.

Mr. Jarjura was curious who Mr. Reihl worked with when he was trying to get approval. He replied that he worked with the current City Manager.

Mr. Matchette remarked that the question for the Board to decide is whether or not this project would be a good thing for the beach. The planning and zoning issues do not concern this Board. He believed it is a positive attractant, the lot would be dressed up, and it would be an improvement for the beach. He thought the Board should approve it.

Motion by Mr. Matchette, seconded Mr. Schiavone, that the proposed project for the inflatable slide be recommended by this Board, with the condition that the project be reviewed at the end of a five-year window. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schiavone said he would second the motion with the friendly amendment that the project gets reviewed at the end of the first five years.

IV. Discussion of ISHOF Bid Proposal

Chair Deckelbaum stated that Jim Blosser and Joe Cerrone were present to talk about the International Swimming Hall of Fame proposal.

Mr. Blosser thanked the Board for the support, noting that eight out of ten members voted the ISHOF and world class Aquatic Center being their number one priority for the redevelopment of the beach.

Mr. Blosser introduced the team that he had brought to the meeting:
Joe Cerrone, President of Recreational Design and Construction, Inc. (RDC)
Mr. Bernard Zyscovich, lead architect on the project
Mr. Neil Sterling, fellow consultant
Mr. Alan Jean, associate
Mr. Bruce Wigo, by telephone from New York
Mr. Tim Lockinfeld, the developer of the Wave House, by telephone from San Diego.

Mr. Blosser said RDC's request is for \$25M to be recommended to the City to allocate from the Board's resources over a period of time to be determined. This would be on a contingent basis that other funding become available satisfactory to complete this

project. He noted that if they are “oversubscribed” in funding, they would try to reduce the Board’s contribution.

Mr. Blosser said he thinks the Board has a chance to reposition Fort Lauderdale as a leading aquatic center of the world, as it once was, and to rebuild the ISHOF. It is not just a swimming and diving facility – it is an aquatic sports facility with many aquatic uses. It would be an economic engine on the beach of tourism, entertainment, and development. The associated “heads in beds” and the restaurants and other dynamics would bring new international money to the community.

He thanked Ms. McCaffrey and her staff for everything they have done to move this forward, and to Mr. Morris and his staff for being so accommodating.

Mr. Yaari asked if they are building the parking facility and how many spaces are planned. Mr. Cerrone said they are building it and it is proposed for 300. They know they can bring it up to 400 - 450. He added that parking through the Parking Authority is self-funded.

Mr. Yaari also wondered if the ISHOF would have a land lease on the city property, and Mr. Cerrone replied that they plan to have a land lease only on the property that they occupy. The rest would be designed, built, and turned over to the City for use.

Mr. Yaari was curious who would determine the value and length of the land lease. Mr. Cerrone said that different pieces are still coming together on that part. Mr. Yaari believed that the City would get at least part of its investment of \$25M back over the long run due to the value of the property. He added that when they make a motion on the project, he would like to know how much income can be expected.

Ms. Scher reminded Mr. Yaari that it was brought out at the last meeting that the operation will lose \$1M right at the beginning. She wanted to make sure she understood that maybe it would break even the first year, and the profitability of the project would be in its attraction, not in its income. Mr. Cerrone corrected her, noting it was a break-even projected for the first stabilized year, but they believe the facility can make a profit.

Mr. Rubenstein commented that sometimes the improvement in quality of life is more important than making money. He wondered if spreading the \$25M over a period of years would be acceptable to the project. Mr. Cerrone responded that the City would have to determine the feasibility.

Mr. Rubenstein also had a question about the square footage of Alexander Park. He wanted to visualize what the Park would look like after the project is finished. Mr. Cerrone explained that the whole parcel is Alexander Park (6,000 square feet), but it is just the southern 100 feet that has the deed restrictions, and that is the part that cannot have commercial development. Mr. Cerrone continued to explain they are proposing

the first development option.

[Mr. Cerrone showed the plan.]

Mr. Rubenstein referred to the Sasaki report, noting it recommended the area be a destination for families and for adults. He said they would want a stage, chairs, maybe a marketplace and so forth. He was concerned that the area would not be big enough to accommodate an audience.

Mr. Cerrone explained that #9 is the grassy knoll, a step back that they can sit on. People can also stand on the bridge/deck. All the other area is plaza. The band shell is the stage/amphitheater. Mr. Zyscovich, project architect, added that the knoll is a grassy raised area so people can lay down blankets, chairs, and watch what is going on. Mr. Rubenstein continued that his major concern is not to make the park any smaller, and wondered if it could be just a walkway to get to the other side of town. Mr. Cerrone said it could do exactly that.

Ms. Milroy wondered what would happen if the other proposed funding sources (\$10M) do not transpire. Mr. Cerrone said that this Board would make the recommendation contingent on that funding coming in. If it does not come in, this Board can decide to do something else, or the City can say there is another funding source.

Ms. Milroy was also curious what the developers will make off the aquatic facility. She did not see the Hall of Fame itself being a tourist generating facility. Her concern is that they are asking for the \$25M, but she does not see the money coming back to the City.

Mr. Blosser replied that the \$25M is for the development of the pools, and the public facilities of the aquatic center, and the diving pool. It is not for the development of the parking garage (self-funded), restaurants, Wave House (private sector). The \$25M is to go to the approximately \$42M for the Aquatic Complex, the bleachers, the pool deck, the changing rooms and the IHF, which is a \$10M component. Mr. Wigo is going to undertake a capital campaign to raise money, and is hopeful that he can contribute at least \$3-\$5M. They are working to bring \$10M from the County as seed money to create a jobs and a flow of dollars in the community. He hoped that the Board would not think of the \$25M as an investment for a return on the dollars. Rather, it is an investment in a capital infrastructure to create economic activities and improve the quality of life in the community. He added that it has been structured to eliminate the current \$1M drag on the City.

Mr. Sterling introduced himself, noting he has represented RDC for almost ten years. Before that, he was a former chair of the Downtown Development Authority in Fort Lauderdale and founding chair of the Performing Arts Center Authority. The analogy for this project in their own community is the Performing Arts Center, which was a redevelopment project. He reminded the Board that the location for that facility was in a very challenged location with the highest rate of homicides in the City. He declared that

the Performing Arts Center has had a huge impact on the redevelopment of that area and the City, adding to the quality of life.

Mr. Sterling continued that the current project will have a huge impact on the community, and described the philosophy of the design process. He said the sum of the parts is greater than the individual components. He commented that after the capital funding is put together, the task will be to figure out how the facility should be operated in the future.

Mr. Schiavone asked Mr. Morris if he knew how the current facility loses \$1M a year, and Mr. Morris referred the question to Laura Voet of the Aquatic Center. Ms. Voet said that the operating budget for the entire peninsula is approximately \$2.7M, including the operating budget for the pools, the ISHOF building and the Ocean Rescue operation. The Aquatic complex, the City's pools, brings in approximately \$700,000 in revenue per year through City contracts and concessions on the beach, the swim team and dive team. The \$1.2M is the money that is supporting the entire complex. There is no income to the City from ISHOF or from Ocean Rescue – the City supports the entire complex.

Mr. Schiavone asked if there was any rent paid to the City, and Ms. Voet said there was not. Mr. Schiavone continued that no matter how they define the \$25M, it is still \$25M. His hope is to find that the \$25M will be a catalyst to a project that will improve the quality of life and improve the aquatic center, but still make money. The only way he will support it is if it makes money.

Mr. Blosser suggested framing the motion subject to a business plan that is approved by this Board and the City Commission.

Mr. Schiavone asked how long the lease is proposed to be with the City, and Mr. Cerrone replied it would be a 20-year lease with a series of 5-year renewals.

Mr. Schiavone commented that he thought the number of parking spaces was too low and Mr. Cerrone said the intent is that people will walk to an event from hotels. There is substantial parking within 1500 feet. He added that they do think they have to increase their parking.

In response to a question by Mr. Schiavone, Mr. Cerrone said that the City has not yet determined a rent for the two parcels.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered what the private investment of \$18M was for. Mr. Cerrone said it was for the construction and improvement of the Wave House and facilities to bring them to operational status in their entirety. Chair Deckelbaum confirmed that they will be paying a triple net ground lease.

Mr. Schiavone added that he believes in this project from a philosophical standpoint, but

he fears that the City will not charge a reasonable rent, and does not want to get in a position that costs them a \$1M or more a year once it is up and running.

Mr. Malkus requested that if RDC has spoken to John Webb at the CDB, he would like to hear about it. Mr. Sterling said that Mr. Webb is very supportive, and equated this facility to doing in excess of 200,000 room nights a year. That is a big economic benefit. Mr. Sterling said they are designing the facility so that it optimizes what Mr. Webb believes swim meets will generate.

Mr. Malkus remarked that he believes this is park land, and it will serve residents and tourists. Most parks do not make money and do not bring money into the City, but he thinks this project has the potential to do so. Mr. Malkus wondered if the Board were to make a recommendation that the \$25M be encumbered over a period of 30 months, so that the disbursements would take place by May 15, 2013, if that would that allow RDC to proceed with the project in a fiscally sound manner. Mr. Sterling responded that he would have to ask the City Attorney. Mr. Sterling noted that was a very generous recommendation, and it was not clear to him that that money would actually be needed in that time frame. He continued that the key today is that the Board steps forward to provide leadership. He added that the details of the timing of the money are an issue they cannot give an absolute answer to today. There is no question that the money can be phased out over time, because they will not need it all at one time.

Ms. Scher expressed uncertainty, because she sees the value of the project for quality of life and tourism, but she does not want to see a cost to the City. Mr. Sterling noted that the projections are very conservative and foresee a break even. They do believe they will generate additional funds.

Mr. Matchette commented that it is not just a park, it is a public/private partnership. The public side is scheduled to break even and he thinks the private side is planning to make money. He wanted to see the ideas they have for increasing revenues, and also that portion of the business plan that includes the budget giving an idea of what makes this project worthwhile for RDC to do as a private business. Mr. Matchette wanted to have some confidence that years down the road, RDC would still be thriving and the City would not have to take over the facility. If the project were totally public, he thought it would be very simple to approve. Mr. Sterling replied that he would be happy to share that information at a later date, but they are not at that point. They are working with staff to see how they will all work together.

Mr. Matchette said they had seen the conservative estimate which breaks even, and he wants to see the potential as well. Mr. Sterling said the real key is how the facility is programmed. There is a balance between training, family community use, events and entertainment with the private piece. In regards to the private piece, there will be a negotiated land lease with the City in which the City will receive significant financial benefit. They believe the parking garage is also a good deal for the City, because it will be funded out of parking funds. One of the key ingredients of this project is that the

community is going to have to decide how it wants the facility used. There are many scenarios, some of which make money and some do not. Mr. Sterling mentioned that Mr. Cerrone had conversations with the Royal Caribbean, and they want to use the diving pool not just for training but also for diving entertainment events. Mr. Matchette said that he wants to see other partners like that, and wants to see the project make money. He thought it should be approved as a revenue producing item for the City.

Mr. Sterling echoed Mr. Blosser's suggestion about tying the financial commitment to a business plan. He continued that it is not solely up to RDC to develop the business plan. They have to work with the other partners.

Mr. Matchette wondered why there is no business plan at this point. Mr. Cerrone replied that there is a business plan, but it is based on how the facility is being operated now. Mr. Matchette continued that he wants to see a business plan that is based on what the facility can be like and what the projections are.

Mr. Sterling said he does not control the aquatics end of the facility but has looked at facilities all over the country. He remarked that this is a unique facility. Mr. Matchette reiterated that he wants more detailed information regarding the revenue potential.

Mr. Zyscovich commented that he is also an urban designer and planner. RDC has been the planner for CRAs in many places, including Miami Beach, where they created the CRA for the Convention Center. He briefly outlined their involvement with the Convention Center in Miami Beach. Some of the spaces within the Fort Lauderdale complex are private, and those are the ones they understand, such as the wave pool. The indeterminate parts are on the operations and management side. He mentioned for an example the banquet hall that is proposed for the ISHOF. It could be a significant money maker but has to be operated properly, have the correct marketing, and have a facility that will be able to attract people. Their concept has been that part of the RFP was for the replacement of current public uses with new and better public uses. They are not in a position to say it is their intention to operate the public uses or the quasi-public uses. They are facilitating the construction, and they have added in the private piece (which makes it public/private). The private part will not only generate money, but also put public land back on the tax rolls and will definitely bring people to the beach, resulting in an economic benefit. They are not in a position to quantify the results of the public piece, as they do not yet know if they will be involved in the public piece. It depends on the Board, and that is why it has been difficult to answer some of the questions.

Vice Chair Motwani mentioned that she really loves the project, but she has the same concern as everyone else that there is no business plan. There is a large opportunity for the business people involved, but on the City side but she does not have a clear picture of the details.

Mr. Sterling emphasized that the Board is not being asked to make an unconditional

\$25M commitment. What they are asking is for the Board to take a leadership step and say that they think the project is important enough to spend \$25M subject to the rest of the money coming together on the capital side. The Board's commitment will go a long way towards bringing the rest of the players to the table. He reiterated that Mr. Blosser's suggestion regarding the conditional motion is appropriate. This vote is only a part of the process, not the end of it. He commented that this is something they need - similar to seed money.

Vice Chair Motwani wondered if the private funding would come based on the Board's commitment, and Mr. Sterling answered affirmatively, noting they will all come together. He added that the toughest part of a project such as this is deciding where to start first. In Miami Beach, they started with the CRA and all the monies came in, but they did not start the project until everything was resolved to the satisfaction of all parties. He said it would be no different here.

Mr. Sterling said the next step after approval from this Board would be for them to go to the County seeking funds. He reiterated that this is an important step in the process, but by no means the end of the story, nor is the Board's obligation final.

Mr. Morris was curious if the Board's approval could be conceptual, that they could theoretically agree with the project, but make it subject to numbers and more details. Mr. Sterling replied they are asking for a commitment, and they can make it subject to whatever conditions they desire. He reminded the Board that the City Commission has clearly stated that whatever they do with this project, it has to at least break even.

Vice Chair Motwani asked when they are looking at the County if they are looking at the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) dollars. Mr. Sterling was hesitant to say where the monies would come from, but they would be happy to receive any monies from the County.

Vice Chair Motwani wondered if there was money to come from the State. She reported she had just met with Governor Elect Rick Scott, who was very pro business and is all for tourism.

[Vice Chair Motwani left the meeting at 3:45 p.m.]

Ms. Jarjura remarked that she feels this is the first project on her three years on the Board that purposes to cure conditions of blight. She stressed that the money that RDC is asking from the Board is going toward the public part of this project, not the private part. She thought they were getting lost in details that were not the purview of the Board, and that they should go with a conditional motion. However, she said the Board does not need to be addressing the details - that is for the appropriate City department.

Ms. Jarjura continued that this project would complete the border of the CRA. She remarked that the design is beautiful and enhances the visual and physical atmosphere

of the beach, and also aligns with the goals and objectives of the Board's plan. She said this is their opportunity to have their handprint on the redevelopment of the beach, and that is what the Board is supposed to do.

Chair Deckelbaum commented he generally likes the idea, noting there are questions that need to be addressed as they go along. He said there are two questions they should ask themselves now:

- Does it meet the purpose of the Beach and the CRA?
- Is committing an amount of roughly \$25M (about half of the funds they have to commit to public funds over the balance of the CRA) appropriate?

Chair Deckelbaum then opened the discussion up to the public.

Ms. Voet reported that she just checked the exact numbers and the correct number for the operating costs was budgeted for \$1.62M and the projected revenues are \$519,000.

Mr. Carlson said that he has been deeply involved in many of the meetings with the people at the swimming pool. He brought up some questions and concerns that he has heard the public express:

- Has the Parking Department been instructed to earmark this money for this project? Does that take money away from other needed parking projects like at the south end of Bonnet House and other areas within the beach itself? Is enough parking going in?
- Regarding the wave generated surfing device, only one or two can use it as a time. Is it a good place to spend money?
- Public swimming pools belong to another era.
- Are they planning adequately?
- Is the \$25M just a down payment?

He encouraged the developers to schedule a visit with the CBA and get more public input. He said there is a feeling that the City could, instead, continue having the \$1M a year loss for 25 years until something else comes along.

Mr. Blosser responded with appreciation and accepted the invitation. He reiterated it is a process, and they cannot get ahead of themselves. They are trying to be as strategic as they can so they do not waste time doing something collateral that does not have a benefit.

He continued that the RLI was the first step for the City. They responded and are trying to take the next steps. The funding is the key element and if it is not there, there is no project.

Mr. Rubenstein stated that the Board will be approving a project as presented. If there are substantial changes, there could be a different outcome. In that light, he advised

the Board to be very careful on the wording of the recommendation.

Mr. Jarjura pointed out that RDC responded to an RFP with specific requirements, and the project they are considering has already been approved by the City. The RDC cannot make material changes to the project at this point.

Mr. Yaari remarked that he loves the project. He said he owns both parcels north of the property, and commented on a bridge that goes from the Wave House going over Seabreeze connecting to the Swimming Hall of Fame. He asked if Planning and Zoning had looked at it. Mr. Sterling replied that he went to the Department of Transportation, and they basically said that if the City wants it, the Department of Transportation will approve it.

Mr. Yaari continued that the reason they are building the structure on the north end of the lot is that there is a deed restriction on the south end. He stated he wished that something could be done with SE 5th Street between this property and his properties that would not create the tunnel. Mr. Sterling said he talked to the Department of Transportation about turning the access to the road so that it is a two-way street, but they use it for crowd control. Mr. Yaari suggested a change in the design.

Chair Deckelbaum advised Mr. Yaari that his discussion was inappropriate at this stage of the discussion, and Mr. Rubenstein thought there may be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Schiavone congratulated the Board and the representatives from RDC on their handling of the discussion. He believed everything that was said was eloquent and intelligent.

Motion by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Mr. Rubenstein, to approve this project with the wording that Ms. Jarjura said, to approve it with respect to the RFP, and that our money is the last money in, based on other funds being raised, so when you get your dollars together, the last \$25M you get comes from us contingent to the other dollars that you say you need. And that it will also be accompanied with a business plan.

Mr. Rubenstein wanted to change it to say “maximum of \$25M.”

Mr. Sterling commented that he thinks the issue for the Board is one of contingency, that all of the funding needs to come together. Mr. Schiavone agreed, noting that if they put their money in first, the RDC cannot spend it until they have the rest of the dollars.

Mr. Yaari wondered what would happen if the project turns out to cost more than originally thought. Chair Deckelbaum responded to that, saying that the City attorneys face this issue “every time” and they will address it.

Ms. Milroy wondered at what point RDC would come back with a business plan. Mr. Schiavone reminded the Board this is just the first step. The developers cannot go any

further until they get the Board's approval to move further. He said that the Board will know as they go along whether or not the project is what they thought, and he is all for moving forward.

Chair Deckelbaum recommended that they try to revisit this after the first lease or other first development agreement is drafted to make sure that it stays consistent with the goals in terms of revenues and so forth. Right now the Board is just recommending that staff work with them to get to that point.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Schiavone to withdraw his motion, as there were a lot of comments. He wanted to rephrase it to make it clearer.

Motion withdrawn by Mr. Schiavone.

Mr. Morris brought up the question raised by Ms. Milroy regarding when they were going to see the business plan again. He said it might be good to set a date in the motion for them to come back and share the business plan. If they are not prepared, the Board defer the item until they can come back with the numbers.

Mr. Sterling commented that the motion could include a reporting provision if the Board wants them to come on a regular basis.

Motion by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Mr. Rubenstein, that we recommend to the City Commission, the CRA, that we believe that the response to the RFP and the plan proposed here for the Aquatic Center meets the vision and purpose of the CRA Act. We also feel it would be a valuable asset to the beach of our resources and it would be worth committing not more than \$25M of the CRA funds towards this completion. With that end, we ask the CRA to instruct staff to begin working on a development agreement for a ground lease or other such document that will finalize the details including a business plan pro forma that will allow RDC and the City to obtain other funds from other sources including the County and private sources, and that upon the preparation of such documents that RDC come back to us as well as go through the process of final approval. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sterling said that the City Commission asked for a status report and RDC will be on their conference agenda for December 21, 2011.

V. Communication to the City Commission

None.

VI. Old/New Business

Chair Deckelbaum thanked the visitors for their time.

He said there is a special meeting scheduled December 15, 2011, to discuss the Master Plan and related priorities. The meeting will be at 3:00 p.m. in this room.

Mr. Morris said he will send materials out the next day in preparation for that meeting.

- **Reschedule January 17, 2011 BRAB meeting due to Martin Luther King Holiday**

Mr. Morris commented that the City Hall is not open on January 17. He said he could bring some alternate dates back to the Board at their December 15 meeting. Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Morris to email those dates to the Board prior to the meeting so the members can have a chance to check their calendars.

Hearing no further business, Chair Deckelbaum adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

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