

**APPROVED**

**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301  
MONDAY, MAY 16, 2011 – 2:30 P.M.**

| <b>MEMBERS</b>               | <b>ATTENDANCE</b> | <b>CUMULATIVE</b> |               |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
|                              |                   | <b>PRESENT</b>    | <b>ABSENT</b> |
| Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair    | P                 | 4                 | 0             |
| Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair   | P                 | 4                 | 0             |
| Jordana L. Jarjura           | A                 | 2                 | 2             |
| Chuck Malkus                 | P                 | 4                 | 0             |
| Dan Matchette (arr. 2:38 pm) | P                 | 3                 | 1             |
| Melissa Milroy               | P                 | 4                 | 0             |
| Mel Rubinstein               | P                 | 2                 | 2             |
| Judith Scher                 | P                 | 4                 | 0             |
| Tim Schiavone                | A                 | 2                 | 2             |
| Aiton Yaari                  | A                 | 2                 | 2             |

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

**Staff**

Earl Prizlee, CRA Engineering Design Manager  
Stephen Scott, Economic Development Director  
Diana Alarcon, Parking and Fleet Services Director  
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to City Commission**

Motion by Mr. Malkus and seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, that at today's BRAB meeting the Board had a thorough discussion on the property known as Intracoastal Park and Promenade. There was a consensus to follow the Sasaki Beach Master Plan and investigate the opportunity for the Intracoastal Park and Promenade and surrounding landscaping. The BRAB requests that the CRA direct staff to begin investigating opportunities to implement the Master Plan improvements on the Intracoastal Park and Promenade and identify funding to support what is currently proposed by the Sasaki Plan. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

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

Chair Deckelbaum called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. Following roll call by Ms. Hartmann, it was determined a quorum was present.

**II. Approval of Minutes – April 18, 2011**

**Motion** by Mr. Rubenstein, seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2011, meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**III. Update on ISHOF Redevelopment Proposal – RDC (not addressed at this time)**

Chair Deckelbaum moved this item to follow Item IV on the agenda.

**IV. Discussion of the Future Redevelopment of Las Olas Marina Parking Lot**

Chair Deckelbaum announced that the City had formally settled the litigation with the prior developers, which frees up the land. He reminded the Board that, other than the Promenade, nothing in that property was included in the CRA fund allocations. The CCNAs will still go forward, but he wondered if the Board wanted to add anything to the project.

Mr. Rubenstein asked if the Sunset Restaurant was considered part of the Las Olas parking lot, and Mr. Prizlee replied that a restaurant and seating area on the southwest corner (Sunset Point) was part of the Sasaki Master Plan. Chair Deckelbaum stated that they had not discussed anything interior to the parking lot. Mr. Prizlee clarified that Sunset Point is part of that parking lot, but it was not part of the Promenade itself. He added the plan was to get the Promenade along the perimeter, and the restaurant was not anticipated at this time.

Chair Deckelbaum wanted to confirm that the Promenade was the only part subject to litigation that the Board had so far approved for the design process, and Mr. Prizlee confirmed that.

[Ms. Alarcon joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.]

Chair Deckelbaum recalled that the Board decided to take the risk on the Promenade even if it was subject to litigation. At this point, the entire parcel is “freed up.”

[Mr. Matchette joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.]

Mr. Prizlee reminded the Board that the Sasaki Plan had, in the southwest quadrant, Sunset Point (a restaurant with outdoor dining and beverage services). In the northern quadrant, there was Intracoastal Parking Promenade, a day-slip marina, settings for restaurants, a play area for children, areas for outdoor performances, and a waterslide. Adjacent to Las Olas Boulevard was a proposed 618-space parking garage. Throughout the rest of the site were 225 surface parking spaces for a total of 843

spaces. Currently, there are only 386 parking spaces. In the Northeast Quadrant was a children's play/learning area that would offer Intracoastal water views adjacent to the day-slip marina.

Ms. Milroy wondered if money for this project would shortfall another project. Chair Deckelbaum answered that it would not, and the purpose now is to decide which projects to fund. He explained that this project is back on the table and the Board needs to decide if they want to go forward with it.

Mr. Malkus brought up the scope of the parking garage project, suggesting increasing its capacity. It was noted that would either add height to the structure, or increased surface area of the parking lot. Ms. Alarcon commented that with the new use and design, the parking will meet the use plus have some for run over. She added it is important to look at the feasibility of the Sasaki Plan as they are going through the CCNA.

Mr. Matchette spoke in favor of the restaurant being situated next to the water, and the placement of the four-story parking garage. This parking garage, being located at the end of a condominium, has no site block to the Intracoastal and leaves free the entire space in front of the condominium next door that faces the parking garage. There is a free view to downtown. He stated that if the parking garage is expanded at all to the north, there will be a lot of resistance from the residents.

Mr. Matchette also spoke about the marina, noting that is if is just pick up and drop off, it would be a waste of money, but Mr. Prizlee said it is a day-slip and people could come for several hours. Mr. Matchette it would still be expensive to build and difficult to permit.

Mr. Matchette brought up a security issue at the public marina, and wondered about the walkway proposed for that area. Mr. Prizlee pointed out plans for a new marina to service the boats.

[Mr. Scott joined the meeting at 2:49 p.m.]

Chair Deckelbaum said to keep in mind that the City is simultaneously looking at other parking sites: Las Olas and A1A, Alhambra site, and elsewhere on the beach outside the CRA. He thought it would be preferable to consider all parking projects together, instead of doing it piecemeal.

Mr. Rubenstein reported that he always sees the word "under utilized" in the Sasaki report in reference to the Birch parking lot. He agreed that is empty almost all of the time, whereas Chair Deckelbaum said it is full on weekends. Mr. Rubenstein continued that if the Sasaki report says it is under-utilized, he does not see any urgency to do anything with the property from a parking point of view.

Mr. Rubenstein then stated that if all the other proposed projects go through, there will

not be any money for “this kind of thing.” He remembered the past, when residents fought development by private entities on City property. He thought the park concept was great for that area (as proposed in the Sasaki report). He recalled that the first floor of the parking structure would be retail, commented that retail does not do well on the beach, and suggested some modification on that design. Chair Deckelbaum pointed out that the reason most parking garages have retail on the ground floor is for traffic flow and efficiency. Mr. Rubenstein suggested talking to experts about it.

Mr. Malkus asked Ms. Alarcon if funding for the parking, the Promenade and the rest of the site would come from parking bonds based on revenues coming in to the parking garage. Ms. Alarcon replied that whatever is bonded would have to be for the garage and surface lot specifically. If the final design ends up being retail on the first floor, that would be included in the revenue bond.

Mr. Malkus then asked if other current beach parking revenue could be used for the remainder of the site development. Ms. Alarcon said it would depend on the timing of the projects and what has been committed to in terms of bonds.

Mr. Rubenstein expressed concern over simultaneous extensive construction in different projects which would require extra parking for construction vehicles, while at the same time, parking is temporarily being taken away due to construction. He suggested seeing how the different projects develop, time-wise. He also suggested setting up priorities within the project and perhaps doing it in steps.

Chair Deckelbaum recommended doing a CCNA and incorporate it into the design process and then make universal choices. Mr. Prizlee commented that the CCNAs are being put out for continuing contracts for landscape, architecture, and civil engineering services. These are multi-year contracts to get the projects to the end of the eight-year period. He thought that if the Board had consensus, they could request the City Commission ask staff to look conceptually at what can be done in the interior of the lot. A CCNA would not need to be done for that - it would be just issuing a task order to the consultants who are working on the project. It would be for ongoing services. If the City Commission directed staff, then the Board could start refining some of the suggestions from the Sasaki report.

Vice Chair Motwani commented that they do not have much time, so they may need to have five or six projects going on simultaneously. She also spoke to the need for additional parking to accommodate future special events and growth.

While saying she loves the project, Ms. Scher expressed her concern over having enough money to undertaking it without taking funds from projects they already approved.

Chair Deckelbaum reiterated that he wants to bring up all the projects at once, and he reminded the Board that several members were frustrated before that the Board could

not get to these projects.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if the Board likes the Sasaki plan, and they want to assimilate it into the eight years, if it would be best to do it as an add-on to the existing CCNA, a new CCNA or another task order once the City has accepted consultants. Mr. Prizlee thought it would be a Communication to the City Commission that the Board desires to conceptually investigate the Master Plan on that site, with the caveat that there is not identified funding. The task order to do that work would cost some dollar amounts. Once the consultants are on board and it is discovered how much the designs are going to cost, one of them could submit a task order to look at the conceptual refinement and then the Board can see how much it would cost.

Chair Deckelbaum was concerned that task orders tend to be more expensive than competitive bidding, but Mr. Prizlee remarked that they go out for CCNA to get the qualified firms, and the City negotiates their fees per hour and then ask for task orders from them – there is no competing, just negotiating. Mr. Rubenstein asked who decided on the final consultant and Mr. Prizlee answered that staff looks at their scores to see who is best fitted for each project. The Board will get to hear a presentation from the consultants and will be able to ask questions.

Mr. Rubenstein stated he wanted to make a “cautionary note” on the garage as proposed by Sasaki. He said there will be resistance because it is a garage on the beach, four stories high. He recalled from the past that this Board had thought there should be a view of the ocean while driving over Las Olas Bridge. Sasaki’s idea of having the parking garage where it is proposed to be is so that when a person is driving over the bridge, they will see the garage and know that there is parking.

Mr. Malkus acknowledged Mr. Rubenstein’s point and said he was sure they all wanted people to have a “wow” impression when they come over the bridge. He continued that the ocean would be straight ahead and the structure would be off to the left.

[Mr. Scott left the meeting at 3:15 p.m.]

Mr. Prizlee remarked that getting people to make the right hand turn at the bottom of the bridge is critical to the success of the parking garage. Chair Deckelbaum mentioned that the Wayfinder system should help people find parking at the beach.

Ms. Milroy thought that this piece of property was the “missing link” in the area and should be developed. She also thought the building would not interfere with the vista coming across the bridge. She said it would be foolish to say they had already committed funds to other projects and pass this one by.

There was Board consensus to craft a Communication to the City Commission as described earlier.

## **V. Communications to City Commission**

Motion by Mr. Malkus and seconded by Vice Chair Motwani, that at today's BRAB meeting the Board had a thorough discussion on the property known as Intracoastal Park and Promenade. There was a consensus to follow the Sasaki Beach Master Plan and investigate the opportunity for the Intracoastal Park and Promenade and surrounding landscaping. The BRAB requests that the CRA direct staff to begin investigating opportunities to implement the Master Plan improvements on the Intracoastal Park and Promenade and identify funding to support what is currently proposed by the Sasaki Plan. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Deckelbaum clarified that they are not approving the plan, but choosing it as a starting point. Mr. Prizlee stated that he understood it.

## **III. Update on ISHOF Redevelopment Proposal – RDC**

This item was brought back in the agenda by Chair Deckelbaum. He noted that it was presented to the City Commission approximately a month ago, and some of the Commissioners, while liking the plan as a whole, had questions and issues in terms of some of the numbers in terms of parking trips, revenue production, and visitors and other logistical questions. The City Commission instructed City staff, led by Kate McCaffrey to begin more thoroughly examining the proposal. They expect to revisit the proposal in the coming months, after staff has had time for their analysis and RDC has had time to refine their proposal.

Ms. Alarcon confirmed that RDC will be coming back with their redefined scope of what they are going to do. The City is working with their consultant on the trips generation as well as the parking.

Chair Deckelbaum urged anyone if they had specific questions to bring those up with staff so that RDC can address them.

Chair Deckelbaum reminded the Board that they have not committed any money to the project, but recommended that they could export \$25M of CRA funds provided they can raise the other funds and that everyone is satisfied with the final design.

## **VI. Old/New Business**

Chair Deckelbaum said there was an add-on item to the agenda, noting it is time to re-appoint a Board's representative to the BID, who is currently Mr. Yaari. By consensus, the Board expressed satisfaction with Mr. Yaari's performance.

**Motion** by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Mr. Malkus, to re-appoint Mr. Yaari as the Board's representative to the BID. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Alarcon asked to give an update on the Wayfinding Program at the beach. She said the City had applied for a Scenic Highway Grant, which they were short-listed for, but when it went to Congress for approval of funding, it was not accepted. The City is working diligently on the Greenway program, and the Committee decided to move forward supporting the Greenway for this year's grant application. However, she said funding is set aside for the Scenic Highway Grant and they will be bringing it back in June to the City Commission with a presentation. They have scaled it down with reduced numbers per the request of the City Commission. They will be requesting to move it forward with the Phase I testing, making sure it meets all of FDOT's standards.

**Motion** by Mr. Rubenstein, seconded by Mr. Matchette, to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

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