

APPROVED

**SPECIAL MEETING
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.**

<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	7	2
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair	P	8	1
Jordana L. Jarjura (left 4:02)	P	8	1
Chuck Malkus	A	9	0
Dan Matchette	P	7	2
Melissa Milroy (arr. 3:09)	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
David Rubin, CRA
Chris Augustin, Building Department
Diana Alaron, Director, Parking & Fleet Services
Ella Packer, Planning & Zoning
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 3:04 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes – November 15, 2010

Chair Deckelbaum noted there was a slight typo on the agenda: the minutes for the November 15, 2010, were already approved. They need to approve the minutes from the joint meeting on November 9, 2010.

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Ms. Scher, to approve the minutes of the joint meeting of November 9, 2010. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

III. Saturday Night Alive Proposed Funding Request (\$80,000) – Dan Barnett, Wizard Entertainment

Mr. Barnett said they are looking for matching funds for the event.

[Mr. Barnett showed a brief video of the event.]

[Ms. Milroy joined the meeting.]

Mr. Barnett distributed a one-page overview of the Saturday Night Alive event. It will consist of 20 live events and entertainers along the beach on Saturday nights between 7 and 11 p.m. This will be the third year in a row for this event, and it has been very successful. He also passed around two books, one showing an overview of last year's event, and the other showing the history and projections for the event.

With the BID funding for 2011, the event planners want to do six events between July 30 and Labor Day Weekend. Mr. Barnett remarked that they are asking this Board to match the funding that the BID is putting up (\$80,000), and expand the event to 14 events in 2011. It would start the weekend following Memorial Day on June 4, and go for 14 Saturday nights until Labor Day weekend. That plan is based on them raising \$20,000 in sponsorships. He noted it is easier to get sponsors when the event is bigger and reaches more people.

Mr. Schiavone wondered how \$160,000 would be spread over the 12 weeks. Mr. Barnett replied that \$40,000 of that would be marketing. He said there is a Showtime ad every Friday. The event is a combination of marketing and branding the destination of Fort Lauderdale Beach in addition to the live entertainment. The live entertainment amounts to \$50,000 over the course of 14 weeks. He said the Junkanoo band, which they had in 2010 and want to repeat, is close to \$20,000. They have to pay for police and the sky trackers at A1A and Las Olas. Web and creative services are \$5,000.

Mr. Barnett added that by having the event every Saturday night, it is easy for the consumer to schedule get-togethers on the beach.

Mr. Schiavone asked if the hotels were also putting their entertainers out there, and Mr. Barnett confirmed that. Mr. Barnett estimated they would have 25-30 live entertainers. Because of their special entertainment district permit, they are allowed to have amplified music outdoors between the hours and 7 and 11 p.m. on those Saturday nights.

Mr. Matchette brought up a technical issue he had with the video on the Fort Lauderdale Live website, and Mr. Barnett said he would check into it.

Mr. Yaari endorsed the idea of having the event every Saturday, noting that it would require less advertising in the long run. People could go to the beach any Saturday, knowing that the event would be occurring.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered about the possibility of private sponsorships eventually replacing funding from this Board. Mr. Barnett said they will really push for sponsors once they get the dates set. He hoped eventually that sponsors and consumer products would "take over." He speculated that could happen within two or three years.

Chair Deckelbaum asked how much was contributed in sponsorships for last year's event, and Mr. Barnett said they had about \$5,000. They had only five weeks last year to work on getting sponsors, whereas this coming year they have about five months.

Mr. Matchette asked Mr. Yaari and Mr. Schiavone if they had noticed any measurable impact in their respective businesses resulting from the event. Mr. Yaari said people love it, and it impacts his side of the beach more than Mr. Schiavone's. He likes it especially because it draws the locals.

Mr. Barnett mentioned that the event creates a marketing hub to the website (www.thenewfortlauderdalebeach.com), and every business along the beach can get more involved by putting their own marketing or specials on the web. He said the hotels are doing room packages to stay over a Saturday night. A greater volume of visitors creates more momentum.

Chair Deckelbaum was curious who owned the domain name on the website (www.fortlauderdalebeach.com). Mr. Barnett said the City has the rights to it, and Wizard Entertainment pays for it every year. There is an agreement with the BID that it is totally under their jurisdiction and control.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered what direction the music amplifiers face, and Mr. Barnett said they are generally facing to the east most of the time. They play in front of the businesses on the west side of A1A, facing the ocean. He said they have small two- or three-piece bands. They have not had problems with residents complaining.

Ms. Milroy commented that they had tried for years to get events down to the beach, and she thought this event is the answer to that effort. She thought the sponsorship dollars will come as the event grows.

Chair Deckelbaum invited members from the public to speak on the topic.

Fred Carlson, Chair of the Central Beach Alliance, echoed the positive comments made

so far, noting they have not had any complaints at the CBA regarding noise or density. He asked if helpful changes could be made pertinent to traffic routing and parking, and if so, what they would be. Mr. Barnett replied that they have pocket folders readily available at retailers, and those contain parking information. He explained that they wanted to motivate business owners to make either free or discounted parking available at their locations. Mr. Carlson reiterated his question, and Mr. Barnett replied that he would not make any changes at this time.

Ms. Milroy commented that one thing that could be done is that people can park at the Galleria, then take the Trolley down to the beach.

Chair Deckelbaum asked the Board if they think this event sustains a presence beyond the nights of the event, and if it is a good stepping stone to bring people in year-round.

Mr. Yaari thought that in two or three years this event would really take off, and they would be able to get big concerts and venues. He did not think either the BID or the BRAB would have to finance it for too much longer.

Ina Lee commented that she walked the event from beginning to end several times. One thing she noticed was that the hotels did see incremental increase in business, particularly in food and beverage. They did not track room nights, as they were not set up to do that. The hoteliers felt it was extremely important for their guests to have something "great" to do, so they would come back as repeat visitors. She talked to people from South America, Sweden, Russia, Palm Beach and Miami, and they were all thrilled. It draws not only locals back, but also visitors from around the world.

Ms. Lee said her only concern is with the trolleys, as some charge and some do not - it is hard to tell which is which. She also mentioned that Mr. Barnett has secured the services of Dorian Curry for marketing and to advise them where to spend their marketing dollars.

Vice Chair Motwani agreed with all comments so far. She added that they could draw additional weekend visitors with supplementary events such as arts and crafts fairs at DC Alexander Park.

Chair Deckelbaum remarked that this has the potential to be the type of event that would build a lasting destination feel for the beach.

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, that the BRAB will match the BID's contribution to Saturday Night Alive to extend it from the weekend after Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day weekend, 14 weeks. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Discuss Public Improvement Priorities – Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board

At the request of the Board, Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Morris to provide a brief update.

Mr. Morris commented that the subject matter is complicated. He asked Mr. Prizlee to give a presentation about what they are looking at from a funding standpoint and how they might possibly move forward in the quickest manner. Mr. Morris said that they met with various regulatory agencies, including the Building Department, Planning and Zoning, DEP, Finance Director, Parking Services Director, and Grants Director.

Most of the projects will require DEP, and some will need FDOT permits. All will require City Building and Zoning permits. These are Site Plan Level IV reviews involving DRC, Planning and Zoning Board, and City Commission. He has outlined how long some of the reviews will take.

Mr. Morris noted that development on the beach is much slower than development in other places in the City. He said Mr. Prizlee will show how they may be able to step up the process and hopefully get the projects going sooner, rather than later.

Mr. Morris described the contents of the handouts.

Mr. Prizlee, Engineering Design Manager for the CRA, explained that they took the list of projects identified by the Board, looking at the total project cost identified by Sasaki. Then they extracted out what would be paid for by other funds or by Parking Services, and what would be left over that the CRA would need to provide funds for.

He began by reviewing the Oceanside Plaza project. This project includes a parking garage and site improvements. The parking would be stacked into a garage, creating open space for what Sasaki had created in the Master Plan. The CRA would pick up the tab for the landscaping and improvements outside of the parking garage.

The A1A Streetscape Improvements on the Westside would all be CRA-funded. They would consolidate all the coconut trees, moving them to two feet off the curb line, freeing the pedestrian walkways. Mr. Prizlee noted it may not be all pavers - it might be concrete that could be power washed.

Regarding the Intracoastal Promenade, Mr. Prizlee stated that he proposed a 13-foot pathway with lights and landscaping, and the project might come to \$5M. That is all CRA, specifically just to the perimeter portion.

The Sasaki report expanded the Las Olas Beach Plaza for a cost of \$600,000. Mr. Prizlee was not sure if that would be enough money, and was hesitant to get into a "fight" with DEP about expanding into the sand. He explained that this area is right across the street from the "100" sign. He said the entry feature into the beach would have the same footprint as before, but they would perhaps dress it up a little.

Mr. Prizlee explained that the A1A Beachfront Promenade involves putting some type of multi-use pathway on the seaward side of the wall. He said it would be behind the dunes in some cases. In others, they would have to put in some kinds of dunes or provide some sort of mitigation. Half of this project is in the CRA, and he proposed a large sum of money, as there are unknown parts to the project including possible environmental studies.

They developed the Wayfinding Sign System to the point where they took a concept to the City Commission. The City Commission felt some of the signs were expensive with respect to applying them citywide and the City being responsible for maintenance in the future. Mr. Prizlee elaborated, stating that FDOT now maintains the signage, but if the City puts up non-standard signage, then the City becomes responsible.

Vice Chair Motwani wondered if there could be a reimbursement of what they are paying, with the City paying the difference. Ms. Alaron said that her understanding from conversations with FDOT was that maintenance of the signage becomes the City's responsibility "no matter what." The City Commission requested that they find a sign that is less expensive, and they did. It would stand up to the sea elements, winds, sand and so forth. They found a less expensive product, which brought the total cost of the package down to just over \$800,000. They applied for a grant through the A1A Scenic Highway and they pay 80% of the initial cost (\$1.2M). The City Commission asked them to come back when they hear results on the grant.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if the proposed plan that went to the City was solely on the beach, but the idea was that it would be carried throughout the City. Ms. Alaron said the design of the "family of signs" is something that could be carried throughout the City, but the product to be used would not have to be the same. She added that they would not use the same materials on the beach signs as they would in the downtown signs.

Mr. Matchette remarked that the City does not have a good history of maintaining specialty signs. He cited the Riverwalk signs designed by Ed Stone as an example. He is concerned that if specialty signs are put on the beach that the City will not be able to handle the maintenance on them. Ms. Alaron stated that was one of the concerns of the City Commission. In their responding proposal, they have to spell out ongoing maintenance costs. Mr. Matchette said there needed to be a line item in the budget, or the maintenance would not take place.

Mr. Rubenstein recommended using this meeting as a discussion period and voting at the next meeting.

Mr. Prizlee moved on to the Almond Avenue Streetscape, noting it is different in that it is basically a City road. The amount of \$2.6M came from the Sasaki report.

Regarding the Sebastian/Alhambra site, they have a placeholder for the parking garage

and \$6M for site improvements and property acquisition. They do not own all the contiguous sites. If for some reason they cannot acquire all the sites, they will work with the property owners.

Chair Deckelbaum brought up that the Sebastian site was earmarked at \$22M at the joint meeting. He wondered why it is \$32M now. Mr. Prizlee explained that Ms. Alaron did a study on the parking garage structure itself, and they were using preliminary numbers. He said the numbers will change, and Ms. Alaron will deal with that. The CRA is just dealing with what their portion would be to facilitate the garage.

Chair Deckelbaum also wondered if the parking structure were outlined with retail, would it have to be separated out in terms of funding or would it get rolled into the parking bond. Ms. Alaron said it would all go into the parking bond. Chair Deckelbaum confirmed that it is just the acquisition they have to "worry about."

Mr. Prizlee brought up one other project that was in the Sasaki Plan: a water taxi/café/office space. He said it is an opportunity for the CRA to explore what could be done there. This project had a \$4M price tag, and there are people who could help develop it. Maybe it could turn into a public/private partnership with minimal cost to the CRA. He asked the Board to keep it in mind as a discussion item.

Mr. Prizlee said he wanted to talk about what it will take to get the projects moving, and how they are going to get them moving.

Mr. Yaari commented that the projects with the parking funds mixed in are excellent, as there is a bigger bang for their buck. He wondered if they go ahead with the Oceanside Plaza, for example, would there be a situation where the parking bond would not be able to come up with the money. Ms. Alaron was not sure and would have to talk to the Finance Director about a loan or bond. She said they are in the process of changing over their consultant they have used to provide that service. Until that is done, she does not have a definite answer.

Mr. Yaari is concerned that they will get excited about a project and then have it rejected after six months. Mr. Morris clarified that once the Board has established their priorities, they will take it to the City Commission, who will provide direction. Using the Oceanside Plaza as an example, the City Commission could direct the CRA to use staff to start design on the plaza. First of all, the CRA would make sure the funding is in place. He further explained that the numbers were provided through Sasaki at a time when construction costs were a lot higher than they are now. They might be able to do everything on the list if it is planned correctly.

Ms. Jarjura wondered if, given the \$30M funds they have available, the \$36M would be feasible. Ms. Alaron reiterated that construction costs are down significantly, and the Sasaki numbers are therefore high. She said they have to examine the numbers now and she could come back to the Board with an answer. There are a lot of components

to consider.

Mr. Prizlee returned to his presentation, moving forward to how they get the projects going. After the project has been identified, recommended to the City Commission, and the Commission tells staff to “get started,” then he takes the projects and:

- Looks at in-house staff to see their availability
- Goes to consultants, issues a CCNA (Competitive Consultant Negotiation Act) and solicits the projects, including criteria they are looking for specific to the projects
- Brings back consultants based on qualifications to do the work
- Short lists them, interviews, who can do what best
- Awards multiple consultants
- Starts projects simultaneously
- First part of projects given out are for the preliminary design
- Looks at the projects once more
 - Ms. Alaron plugs in financials
- Project comes back to BRAB
- Moves forward, starts DRC process

Mr. Prizlee showed a preliminary design for the A1A project as an example.

The whole process takes a long time, and they need to get started now. The CRA has eight years left. He said they can go out with these projects and come back with the conceptual design, get the real numbers and decide whether to proceed or not. He warned against starting with a few now and a few later. He said they have to get the monies encumbered and start building.

Mr. Rubenstein commented that he liked the overall plans, and doing it all at one time. He noted that on one document it said \$1M for the signing system, and \$525,000 on another. Mr. Prizlee noted it was split in half, as half is outside the CRA and half is in. Mr. Rubenstein asked who would pick up the tab for the other half, and Mr. Prizlee said it would be the general fund.

Mr. Rubenstein continued that his concern was going after things that they know in advance will not be approved by the City Commission. He felt they would be spinning their wheels and could use the money to do something else. He thought maybe the City Commission would not go for the signage. Mr. Prizlee responded that he thinks it is going to happen, but they are just working through the details. He said it is already designed and does not need to go out to a consultant. He added it is almost shovel ready.

Ms. Alaron said they should be back to the City Commission in late January or early February, because they would have their grant results back.

Mr. Rubenstein also expressed concern about the Beachfront Promenade, noting that they need the State's permission. Mr. Prizlee said it would encroach on the turtle nesting habitat. He said that project might well be a challenge. He suggested that consultants might prepare a quick sketch for consideration. Mr. Rubenstein wondered if they should even have that project on the list. Mr. Prizlee answered that is the Board's decision, saying that the CRA will take it as far as the Board wants to go. Chair Deckelbaum asked for Mr. Prizlee's professional opinion. Mr. Morris reported that the DEP was not very excited about it.

After continuing discussion, Mr. Rubenstein suggested thinking about it and revisiting it in January.

Vice Chair Motwani asked if other cities had built dunes across the beach, and Mr. Prizlee said that Miami's pathway is behind dunes. Mr. Morris said part of the problem is that the north beach narrows, and that presents difficulty, since it would encroach on the turtle habitat.

Ms. Scher remarked that she would like to have staff inform them which would be the simplest way to start from an implementation standpoint. Mr. Prizlee said after going to the City Commission, he will tell the Board which projects can be built within the various schedules and projects. It will all hinge on schedules at that point.

Chair Deckelbaum said after taking into account what the Board wants to commit to the Swimming Hall of Fame and Aquatic Center, they can still do most of what they want to in the plan. He reiterated that if they put together what they want to see, and go through the CCNA process, they should be able to start working on specific projects as they become ready.

Chair Deckelbaum suggested discussing whether each project is worth doing, where they get the most bangs for their buck, and how they all work together. He would look at the Oceanside Plaza, Las Olas Beach Plaza, together with the water taxi/information center. Almost as one, those items will create the Las Olas entrance to the beach. He wanted to make sure whoever works on those projects does it so that it creates a unified impression and function.

Mr. Schiavone was curious where the money to pay the consultants would come from, and Mr. Prizlee said that was built into the numbers. Mr. Schiavone also asked why DC Alexander Park was not on the list, and Mr. Prizlee responded that hopefully it is part of the \$25M for the ISHOF.

Mr. Yaari said that on their initial vote they skipped the connector water taxi (Channel Square) with the welcome center. It is vacated City property, and it is important to have that on the list. He felt that if the A1A Promenade was too much of a headache, that it should come off the list, and they could use those funds for Channel Square. Mr. Morris said that was the only item in the Master Plan that was not selected by the Board. By

general consensus, the Board agreed that they want to consider the Channel Square project.

Vice Chair Motwani asked Mr. Prizlee to clarify the timeframe for action. Mr. Prizlee replied that after getting direction from the City Commission regarding the projects, he will get the “whole thing” started. He suggested going out for consultants for all the projects. Once he gets the consultants on board, they can determine the timeframes of each project. Then he can give the Board a schedule of design, permitting and construction.

Mr. Morris reminded the Board that Channel Square and the Promenade are still in litigation. That does not prevent their inclusion in the CCNA, but they cannot start design until the legal issues are resolved. He is not sure when that will happen.

Mr. Morris continued that they will be looking for partnerships with the Convention and Visitor’s Bureau. One of the beach redevelopment goals was to have a visitor center on the beach. It was supposed to be at the Oasis Café but was moved, and this (Channel Square) would help meet a specific goal that was spelled out in the redevelopment plan. Before they spend a lot of money on it, they will have to discuss how the operation will be staffed. A public/private partnership may be the answer.

Mr. Yaari recommended voting on the plan today so they can get it going to the City Commission.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Morris how much time they have to give the consultants to respond to the CCNA, and if the City Commission has to instruct them to do that. Mr. Morris replied that if the Board provides them with a recommendation at this meeting, they would take that to the CRA on its second meeting in January. He suggested that prior to the recommendation, they ask the CRA to immediately instruct staff to begin the CCNA process for the projects. That would start the process for them to get the paperwork in place. He reiterated that that wording should be in the motion.

Mr. Matchette said he likes the idea of putting it all together into one package. However, he does have questions about several of the projects, so he would have to vote “no” if it was voted on as a package. He said he has questions about the design features for the Intracoastal Promenade.

Chair Deckelbaum commented that he thinks the motion they do today will just be to say that “as a whole” it represents the consensus of the Board. In order to proceed, though, they would be asking the CRA to instruct staff to bring on board consultants in order to work on the specifics of each project so they can decide whether to proceed with them individually. He reiterated they would be endorsing a general vision.

Mr. Morris assured the Board that he would bring designs back to them for comment. There will be plenty of opportunity for the Board to voice its concerns.

Mr. Schiavone suggested pulling the questionable projects out of the package. He said he is not comfortable spending money on consultants for something they may not do. Chair Deckelbaum responded that they are not spending money, they are just getting the consultants cleared so they can do the work. Mr. Morris said they will not contract with a consultant for specific design work on anything within the Plaza where the litigation is until it is resolved. Mr. Morris added, however, that the Promenade would be different, because they have to do preliminary design work for DEP for review.

Chair Deckelbaum reiterated that this motion today is not committing any money. If they exclude a project and later decide they want to do it, then they have to go through the whole CCNA process again.

Mr. Morris met with their auditors who looked at the projections from both the expense and revenue angles through 2019. The auditors felt very comfortable with the projection of \$4.5M per year as being able to cover the projects.

Motion by Chair Deckelbaum, seconded by Mr. Matchette, that the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board has, in conjunction with staff, found a selection of projects that we think we can accomplish within our budgetary means as well as the time frame allowed by the CRA. We would like to proceed with those as presented today including the Channel Square Project. This represents a general vision of what we want, and we ask that the CRA instruct staff to prepare a CCNA to allow them to bring on board the necessary consultants and professionals to start to develop a time frame and budget for us to begin approving these projects individually, and that they include in the CCNA all these projects listed here as well as any others that staff deems necessary in order to complete the vision they have heard from us set forth here. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Deckelbaum opened up the discussion again for public comment.

Mr. Carlson feared there may be a lot of public misunderstanding that the projects cost too much money and that might interfere with projects. He suggested cutting the “questionable” projects now to reduce the negative flack, but he applauded the Board’s “brave and positive” efforts.

Chair Deckelbaum reiterated that this motion was not about committing money, but it was to move forward so that when specifics come back, they can act as quickly as possible to get things done.

Mr. Morris contended that a Communication to City Commission was not necessary. When they do a memo to the CRA, they will include the recommendation voted upon.

Vice Chair Motwani announced that the 100 Sign is supposed to be up until March 1. She wondered if they need a motion to keep the sign up throughout the year. Mr. Morris

said they looked into that. They rent, not own, the sign. They have some preliminary prices on buying it, and he can bring information back to the next meeting if desired. March 1 is the cut-off date for lighting the sign due to turtle season. He noted it is designed to withstand hurricanes. Mr. Morris said that preliminary discussions have indicated it would be cheaper to purchase it rather than to rent it for the rest of 2011. He clarified that they could not purchase it as a CRA and move it outside the CRA. He said if the City purchased it, it could be moved.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Morris to look into options within and outside the CRA.

By consensus, the Board agreed to wait until the next meeting to continue discussion on this agenda item.

V. Communication to the City Commission

None.

VI. Old/New Business

Chair Deckelbaum mentioned that the next Board meeting was scheduled for Martin Luther King's observed birthday, and City Hall is closed on that day. He called the Board's attention to the calendar of optional available dates that Mr. Morris had prepared.

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, to have their next meeting on January 31, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Yaari brought up a serious pigeon problem at the beach. Mr. Morris said he would ask around the City and see what options there are.

Mr. Matchette asked what had happened to the trash receptacle issue. Mr. Morris said the Sanitation Division has a new manager and he will follow up.

Mr. Rubenstein commented that a lot of new cans have been put out, and he said they do corrode. Mr. Morris said they kept some of the old ones, and recoated them. He will find out more information and report back to the Board.

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to adjourn the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

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