

**APPROVED**  
**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301**  
**MONDAY, JULY 18, 2011 – 2:30 P.M.**

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE</b>	
		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	6	0
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair	A	5	1
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	4	2
Chuck Malkus (left at 4:32)	P	6	0
Dan Matchette	P	5	1
Melissa Milroy	A	5	1
Mel Rubinstein	P	4	2
Judith Scher	P	6	0
Tim Schiavone	P	4	2
Aiton Yaari	A	2	4

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  
Stephen Scott, Economic Development Director  
Karen Reese, Economic Development Assistant  
Cate McCaffrey, Business Enterprises Director  
Diana Alarcon, Parking and Fleet Services Director  
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to City Commission**

None.

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

Chair Deckelbaum called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. Following roll call by Ms. Hartmann, it was determined a quorum was present.

**II. Approval of Minutes – June 20, 2011**

**Motion** by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Ms. Jarjura, to approve the minutes of the June

20, 2011, meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

It was noted that a speaker from the public had asserted that CRA money is not taxpayer dollars, but Mr. Morris said that by definition, a Tax Increment Financed District derives its revenue only from property tax.

### **III. Discussion to Expand Marine Facilities at the Las Olas Marina – Barry Flanigan, Marine Advisory Board**

Chair Deckelbaum provided a brief overview of an alternate plan for the use of the Las Olas parking lot, which differs from what the Board has contemplated and from what is in the Sasaki Plan. He said this project had been previously discussed by the Marine Advisory Board for several years prior to the litigation in the area, when discussions halted. Now that the litigation is resolved, the Marine Advisory Board has begun looking at the area again.

Ms. Jarjura commented that the agenda seems long, and wondered if they could cut down on the number of items discussed at each meeting. Ms. Jarjura requested a discussion on that under Old/New Business.

Due to technical difficulties, the presentation by Mr. Flanigan was moved to later in the agenda.

### **IV. Update on ISHOF Proposal – Bradley Deckelbaum, Chairperson**

Mr. Morris said that at its July 5 meeting, the City Commission said that they wanted the City Manager to bring an update of the business plan for the September 20 meeting. He said that staff is currently working on the business plan with RDC. He mentioned that the City Commission did reinforce the idea of having two 50-meter pools and a dive well.

Cate McCaffrey, Business Enterprises Director, reported that the timeframe beyond September is hard to project, because they are unsure what the City Commission's wishes are with regard to RDC. The meeting was more of a public forum to discuss the pools design and number of pools.

Mr. Schiavone thought the City should build the Aquatic Center since the developer is not "coming to the table with his money needs" at this time.

Neil Sterling, with RDC, said there were a lot of issues to be dealt with, including policy decisions – one being the configuration of the pools. He said that even though the RFP was specific about the pool configuration, it was a subject debated and resolved again at the July 5 meeting. A second issue is what type of development there should be adjoining the pool complex. Third, what is the role of the ISHOF – they have a separate agreement with the City that has to be resolved. He emphasized the magnitude of the

project and noted that it takes time to work through the issues involved.

Chair Deckelbaum asked if they expected to be able to come to the City with a plan that everybody but the City has signed off on by September 20.

Mr. Sterling replied that the City needs to sign off on the Swimming Hall of Fame as a separate project. He said that the ISHOF has a separate contractual relationship with the City and RDC has been saying that the City needs to engage them in a discussion about a new contract.

Chair Deckelbaum asked about Bruce Wigo and his presentation to the Board in December, noting that he appeared as part of RDC, committed to raising funds for it. Mr. Sterling said that at the July 5 meeting of the City commission, the ISHOF reiterated their support for the project. ISHOF has hired a separate consultant to take a look at what operating opportunities there are for the ISHOF there.

Mr. Cerrone stated that to move forward independently and build the Aquatics Center would be a mistake. The parking and traffic all have to be planned in. Building in a phased way is fine, but the planning has to be all together. They are trying to work through issues such as parking with the City.

Mr. Rubenstein commented that when the Board voted on the \$25M for the project, they were looking at a comprehensive project to include making Alexander Park a destination point. He wondered what is happening with that. Mr. Sterling remarked that the \$25M was never intended to fund private development (Wave House or any part of project that was intended to be privately financed). He added that the public portion of the project encompassed the Aquatic Center and some infrastructure. Mr. Rubenstein thought that if the "whole package" does not happen, the Board should revisit funding the \$25M. Chair Deckelbaum clarified that the Board just approved "in concept," and can revisit this when a more comprehensive plan is presented.

Mr. Sterling predicted a classic debate as to what kind of redevelopment activities should be included as they relate to the interests of the beach, and what kind of density/how much additional development should be there.

Mr. Morris read the motion that the Board had originally made when it approved the \$25M. Per that motion, he noted that the RDC will come back to this Board once the final documents have been prepared.

Ms. Jarjura questioned the need for this update and Chair Deckelbaum said it was placed on the agenda because several Board members had expressed concern about the lack of progress on the project.

Chair Deckelbaum asked the developers if they had progressed in seeking funding, and Mr. Cerrone replied that they cannot progress until they know the extent of the entire

project.

Chair Deckelbaum then returned to Item III on the agenda.

### **III. Discussion to Expand Marine Facilities at the Las Olas Marina – Barry Flanigan, Marine Advisory Board**

Mr. Flanigan displayed pictures of the Marina area at various stages in its history, starting in 1936.

He explained that the Marine Advisory Board has looked at several concepts for possible scenarios. Digging out the Marina was looked upon favorably by several environmental and State agencies. He showed a slide of one concept which provided 122 slips and represent 3100 lineal feet of dockage and floating docks. Another concept featured leaving some of the fixed docks.

A third concept featured floating docks in between the fixed docks, a lineal dockage concept, designed to accommodate any sized vessel. The lineal footage represents 9200 feet. Using today's occupancy and economic rates, that would generate an additional \$3.1M per year to the Marina, not counting day dockage charges. There would be 130 feet from the seawall to Birch Road.

At the last meeting of the Marine Advisory Board, they unanimously decided to send a Communication to the Commission that they favored this approach. Mr. Flanigan continued that this setup is popular with the Boat Show people because they can stay there and not have to hurry out after the show.

He pointed out that vessels are charged for their size and it is a win-win situation for both the boat owner and the operator. Mr. Flanigan demonstrated that there is plenty of room at the Marina between the existing "finger piers" for large and small boats to travel.

He continued that he has initial letters of support from show management, FIND (who would provide 50% of financing), Riverwalk Trust, International Yacht Collection, brokers, local property owners' association, small businesses, and former Mayor Naugle.

The project provides a promenade with a view and an opportunity to walk around the Marina. The project would increase the customer base approximately 300% over what is now there, and would be an attraction. He thought that the Marina could help jumpstart the entire redevelopment of the central beach area. It would provide additional day dockage.

Mr. Flanigan stated that the Marine Advisory Board does not wish to work outside of this Board or any identifiable associations from the area. There would be no outside group

formed to develop the project. Perhaps they would have a professional consultant or architect to help with the blending.

Mr. Matchette considered the most important aspect of the development to be traffic, and egress from Venetian Condominium. He said he was also concerned about parking, since the existing parking lot would no longer be there. In addition, the parking structure that was scheduled to be built would no longer be built.

Ms. Scher expressed her main concern: traffic. She asserted that Las Olas Circle is used as an alternate route and shutting it off by the Venetian would be a tremendous problem. She said many people had input with the Sasaki Plan and the main purpose was bringing together the ocean with the Intracoastal and the boardwalk, to have some open space in the CRA. She felt putting in a beautiful area would bring people back to the beach as much as a revised Marina.

Mr. Malkus thought they all wanted to see the Intracoastal and beach brought together. He also thought it was important to have the ability to have boats pull up to a dock. He wondered if would it be possible to create a parking garage on the south side of Las Olas if the marina was planned on the north side of Las Olas. Diana Alarcon, from Parking and Fleet Services, remarked that all of these concerns can be addressed in a CCNA. She added that staff wants to explore all of the opportunities, and not impede on the quality of life at the Venetian and on residents living on the west side of the bridge. She said that staff recognizes that traffic is one of the biggest concerns.

Chair Deckelbaum noted that this property is part of the CCNAs that just went out for design consultants to work on. He wanted to know if the Board wanted to incorporate this idea as an alternative to what they are looking at.

Ms. Jarjura wondered why this proposal was not brought up sooner, and why the marine industry did not meet Sasaki and propose this plan so that the Board could have reviewed and voted on it. Mr. Morris said that a marine component was included in the CCNA for the Streetscape Projects. The CCNAs also include civil engineering and landscape architecture. Mr. Morris added that this Board and the Marine Advisory Board will want to make a recommendation at some point as to what the development should be at the Marina.

Ms. Jarjura asked how the project would be funded, and Mr. Flanigan answered that they would use (FIND) Florida Inland Navigation District money. They would provide 50% of the funding, and Broward Boating Improvement would provide a percentage dependent upon what it was. The City may have to generate a bond, such as what they did for the existing marina. Mr. Morris said that they have not talked about who would actually fund a marina project.

Mr. Flanigan said he could not speak to the exact funding as the City would be the ultimate decider on who and how the bonds are going to go. However, the funding they

have traditionally sought (FIND and Broward County) have expressed support. They do not expect to ask for CRA funds, but that is up to the staff and the City.

Mr. Rubenstein relayed that the Sasaki report cost the taxpayers about \$5M. Of that, \$198K came from the CRA. He remarked that the report was very thoroughly prepared and involved many stakeholders, with lots of public information. He felt that the Marine Advisory Board's proposal is a "back-door entrance" into what Sasaki proposed. Chair Deckelbaum clarified that the original CCNA did not include a marine component. When this went before the City Commission and the Marine Advisory Board, they added a supplement to the CCNA to include marine components in case the CRA decided to go forward with it, so that they would not have to start all over. As a result of that, more consultants could respond to the CCNA.

Mr. Rubenstein continued that the whole idea of the Sasaki report was to bring the east and the west sides of the Intracoastal Waterway together and make Central Beach a destination point. He commented that to him a promenade is like a boardwalk where people can walk, mingle and enjoy the sights. He brought up the proposed Sunset Restaurant, to be on the south side of Las Olas Bridge. North of the bridge was to be a parking garage. He recited the economic importance of parks as stated by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. He felt it was important to bring up the Sasaki Report and hoped that the plan as presented by the Marine Advisory Board would not be approved.

Mr. Schiavone thought the Board should give the nod so that staff and the City Commission can see if it is a viable plan. He pointed out that is different from approving the concept of the plan.

Ms. Jarjura clarified her earlier comment, noting that she thought the timing of this proposal was unfortunate. However, she thought the CRA plan supersedes the Sasaki Plan and the CRA plan calls for promotion of marine uses. She wondered if the Marine Advisory Board could come up with a plan that would incorporate the Sasaki Plan as well as the marine use.

Mr. Morris remarked that the design does not have to be all of one or all of the other, but could incorporate elements of both.

**\*\*Public Comment**

Chair Deckelbaum opened the meeting to public comment.

Shirley Smith stated that she lives in the Venetian. She asserted that Las Olas Circle cannot be closed because motorists need some way to get "through there" to get onto the other streets to go up Las Olas.

Fred Carlson, officially representing the Central Beach Alliance, said that he respects

the people who developed the plan. He said that wrapping that road around under the bridge and reconnecting to Birch Road would be an easy fix. Secondly, he asked specifically that Central Beach Alliance be included in deliberations on the plan as there are many members that want their voice to be heard. He asserted that building a parking structure south of Las Olas would be of significant concern to the people at the Venetian in terms of views. He felt that "double-decking" the existing Las Olas parking lot (south of the Elbow Room) would be helpful.

Art Seitz, former member of the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board, spoke in opposition to the project. He felt it would take away beach access and parking to the people who live on the beach.

Frank Herhold, former Executive Director of Marine Industries Association and member of the Marine Advisory Board, spoke in favor of investigating the project. He said the project would benefit the beach economy, the Boat Show, marina, and beach activity.

Gary Fretz, from Community Boating, and a yacht broker, asserted that the Marine Advisory Board's proposal would produce the "most profit" for the City and help marine businesses. He questioned the impact on the quality of life for the average resident and their ability to use the waterways, and expressed the desire to provide a presentation on an alternate plan.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Deckelbaum closed the meeting to public comment.

**\*\*End of Public Comment**

**Motion** by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Mr. Malkus, that this Board recommends that the staff and City Commission take this proposal under consideration, look at it as it works with or without the Sasaki proposal, with an open mind. The Board recognizes solely that this does not get knocked off the table and stays on the table for consideration until such time as it is decided that it cannot work. This motion was later withdrawn.

There was a discussion with Mr. Rubenstein questioning the reason for looking at this plan when they have already looked at the Sasaki Plan. Chair Deckelbaum said that the question is if this proposal is worth exploring alongside the other options in the Sasaki Plan. He asserted it was worthy of discussion as to whether to do one or both, and he was skeptical if they could be combined. He suggested going to the next stage of the design phase with and without the marina to see if other items such as a parking garage on the south side of Las Olas could be included.

Mr. Schiavone clarified that he wanted staff to do the exploration, not the City Commission.

Mr. Morris explained that the Board does not necessarily have to vote on anything. He said they could do a Communication to the City Commission that they go forward and continue to investigate the marina proposal. He said it was in the CCNA, but nothing has been directed so far as what the end product is going to be. The design professionals can look at the concepts and bring back suggestions. He thought both ideas could be incorporated if it is designed right and they will not know that until the CCNAs come back. He stressed that the CCNA will look at all aspects such as traffic.

Mr. Prizlee added that once the consultants are under contract, the first thing would be to issue them a task order for concepts looking at size, shape and costs. It would be at the same level of detail as the Sasaki report. Chair Deckelbaum wondered how long it would take to get to the point of asking for task orders, and Mr. Prizlee said it would probably be within two months.

Mr. Matchette wondered if there was any structural reason why they should not vote in favor of this. Mr. Prizlee said that removing land goes into an environmental issue, and he did not know if there were any barriers to that. There is an FDOT bridge and abutments that will be looked at.

Mr. Schiavone withdrew his motion.

**Motion** by Ms. Jarjura, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to direct staff that the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board is in favor of exploring the marina option. In a voice vote, the motion passed (5-2), with Ms. Scher and Mr. Rubenstein opposed.

**V. Preliminary Discussion of Holiday Light Funding – Donald Morris, Beach CRA Director (not addressed at this time)**

**VI. Update on Saturday Nite Alive – Dan Barnett, Wizard Entertainment**

Mr. Barnett reported that the 2011 Saturday Nite Alive has been embraced by the audience and beach businesses. He said attendance is growing every week, with 14 Saturdays in the event. He remarked that when doing an event 14 Saturdays in a row, it is easy to make a shift in the brand of the event and the beach. He stated they have Premier Beverage as a title sponsor and Lexus and Isle Casino as presenting sponsors.

Mr. Barnett showed a three-minute video and a one-minute overview of photos beginning at 4:04 p.m.

He said the video is a marketing piece that is also shown on the website. They have changed the website domain to "MyFortLauderdaleBeach.com" since the "new" in the previous website domain name will not be new in years to come.

Mr. Barnett reported that they have sold out their vendors every Saturday night.



Brenda Bailey, also from Wizard Entertainment, stated they are doing print advertising, Showtime ads, pocket folders (up to 30,000 from last year's 10,000), post cards, and pole banners on A1A. There is a surge of people around 6:30 p.m. waiting for the vendors to open up, as opposed to in the past where the beach is vacated by 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Barnett said they have a slogan - "I love MyFortLauderdaleBeach.com" - and this helps highlight the beach destination website. They update the site frequently including restaurant and retail promotions. He said the district is the BID district, and they make sure that the event is taking place in the CRA area at least over 50% of the time.

Regarding the budget overview, Mr. Barnett reported that sponsorship has been very good this year. \$157,920 was the total cost of the event last year, and that number was divided between the BID and the CRA. This year the budget is up to \$208,520 with the help of the sponsors. They have spent more on advertising to grow the event. He said they have a healthy budget and a growing event. Two primary things that they achieve with the event are getting tri-County residents to come back and experience the Fort Lauderdale Beach destination, and drawing the tourists who come to the area.

Mr. Schiavone was curious if the event will pay for itself in the not too distant future, and Mr. Barnett replied it would not fund itself as it is a free event with lots of marketing. He said although they would like to increase the number of events, they could decrease them and spend less money. Mr. Schiavone explained that he just wanted to allow CRA funds for other groups or events that arise. Mr. Barnett clarified that this event has huge momentum and it takes money to continue that.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if they could put on the same caliber of event next year with substantially less money coming from the CRA and the BID. Mr. Barnett said for next year, the answer would be "no" – they need another year or two of growth.

Ms. Jarjura thought that as time goes on, the need for marketing would decline as everyone becomes familiar with the event.

Mr. Rubenstein remarked that he has walked the event and said it is "fantastic." He was impressed with the number of people in that area during the off season. He also mentioned that Mr. Barnett's promises regarding noise levels have been kept and he thanked him for that.

Mr. Barnett commented that the objective of Saturday Nite Live is to get people to come back to the beach on a day and a time that looks like it normally does, as opposed to a major event such as a concert or air show. That way, people regard the beach as a destination point in its own right.

**V. Preliminary Discussion of Holiday Light Funding – Donald Morris,  
Beach CRA Director**

Chair Deckelbaum noted that in 2010 the CRA funding basically covered the "100" sign, and the BID funded the holiday lights themselves. He wondered if the Board wanted to fund a similar marquee item at the Las Olas intersection to supplement the holiday lights.

Mr. Morris explained that since they have to go out with RFPs and have the lights/item up by Thanksgiving, they need to see if there is interest in this Board to fund something at the entry of Las Olas. Last year the group funded \$58K plus \$35K to extend the "100" until September 5.

Chair Deckelbaum said that the question would be if there is any objection to staff looking at some ideas for an item at the Las Olas intersection. The consensus of the Board was that there was no objection.

## **VII. Communication to City Commission**

None.

## **VIII. Old/New Business**

### **• Update on the "100" Display**

Mr. Morris confirmed that the "100" sign is going dark as of August 1, per the Fish & Wildlife. The sign will be removed on September 5, as the contract ends at that time.

Ms. Jarjura wanted to discuss how the agenda gets created and how they could shorten the meetings in the future.

Mr. Schiavone suggested that at 4:00 p.m., they decide if they want to stay for another ½ hour or keep the quorum to take a vote. He pointed out several members are committed to returning to their offices at 4:00.

Chair Deckelbaum explained that Mr. Morris gets agenda items from the CRA, the City Manager's office and others, and from what he has heard at the City Commission meetings. He also consults with Chair Deckelbaum. It was noted that outside of the meeting, Board members can contact Mr. Morris with potential agenda items, but cannot contact each other.

Mr. Rubenstein suggested if there is a heavy agenda, then they do not need an update on a project that can wait.

Mr. Malkus left the meeting at 4:32 p.m.

Chair Deckelbaum reminded the Board that there was no meeting in August.

Beach Redevelopment Board

July 18, 2011

Page 11

**Motion** by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to adjourn the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

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