

APPROVED
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2011 – 2:30 P.M.

MEMBERS	ATTENDANCE	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	8	0
Ramola Motwani, Vice Chair	P	7	1
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	6	2
Chuck Malkus	A	7	1
Dan Matchette	P	7	1
Melissa Milroy (arr. 2:35)	P	7	1
Mel Rubinstein	P	5	3
Judith Scher	A	7	1
Tim Schiavone	P	6	2
Aiton Yaari	P	4	4

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

Staff

Lee R. Feldman, ACMA-CM, City Manager
 Don Morris, Beach CRA Director
 Earl Prizlee, Engineering Design Manager
 Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
 Diana Alarcon, Director, Parking and Fleet Services
 Antoinette Butler, Parking and Fleet Services
 Tim McGovern, Parks and Recreation Department
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

The Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board feels strongly that the redevelopment of the Swimming Hall of Fame and Fort Lauderdale Aquatics site is as important as any other function that the Board will undertake in our remaining eight years, and is committed to seeing that it is done right and benefits the City now and in the future.

The Board supported the original RDC proposal back in March. However, at the time, while the Board loved the design and the concept, the Board had some concerns with the other funding that was required to make the project feasible. At the CRA meetings, the CRA seemed to share these concerns, and instructed RDC to scale back the project in order to cut costs, and the Board has now seen the revised proposal. The Board

finds the result to be inferior to the original one and insufficient for what the Board believes is necessary for the redevelopment of this site, while at the same time it does not substantially lessen the CRA's financial burden, reducing it only from \$25M to \$22.5M.

The reduction in scale of the project and the loss of many of the amenities which the Board thought worthwhile come from the disappearance of the other funds that were committed in the original proposal. With that in mind, the Board encourages the CRA to revisit the optimal use of that site and explore three options:

1. A new RFP in which the City indicates the willingness to explore CRA funding up to \$25M in order to attract a wider breadth of bidders.
2. Continue with the RDC proposal as presented and encourage them to work with staff to make it better if that is the avenue they want.
3. To explore the option of redevelopment of solely the Aquatic Center directed by the City and staff rather than outside contractors utilizing CRA funding.

The Board is making this recommendation in the hopes that the new Swimming Hall of Fame and Aquatic Complex will be not only financially self-sustaining and feasible, but also a key attraction for tourists and Fort Lauderdale residents in the near and distant future.

In a voice vote, the Communication to the City Commission passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Deckelbaum called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes – September 12, 2011/BRAB Meeting - Clarification of TMA Funding Amount Vote

Mr. Morris commented that when the recommendation was made for TMA funding, there was no discussion about reducing \$60K to \$50K. They went back to the tape and found that \$50K was recommended in the motion, rather than \$60K. He asked the Board to reaffirm that they had been discussing \$60K as the amount. Chair Deckelbaum recalled they had talked about \$60K.

Motion by Ms. Jarjura, seconded by Mr. Yaari, to clarify her motion regarding TMA funding. The motion was to approve funding for the TMA for \$60K, not \$50K as requested. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Ms. Jarjura, seconded by Mr. Matchette, to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2011, meeting (as clarified). In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**III. Approval of Minutes
September 12, 2011 / Joint BID & BRAB Meeting**

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Mr. Matchette, to approve the minutes of the Joint BID & BRAB meeting on September 12, 2011. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

[Ms. Milroy arrived at 2:35 p.m.]

Chair Deckelbaum announced they would skip around a bit on the agenda, as the City Manager had not arrived, and others were waiting to speak.

- IV. Discussion with City Manager** (not addressed at this time)
- V. Status of Central Beach Master Plan** (not addressed at this time)
Design Services (CCNAs)
- VI. ISHOF Redevelopment Proposal Update** (not addressed at this time)
- VII. July Fourth Fireworks / 2012 Funding Request** (not addressed at this time)
- VIII. Approval of Easements Located on CRA Property**

Ms. Alarcon said they are trying to do ADA improvements at Channel Square on the corner of Las Olas and the Las Olas Circle, just north of the Venetian. They will be lifting the sidewalk, but there are two FLP light poles in the sidewalk. They want to move them back on the property.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered how these poles affect tentative plans for anything on the property. Mr. Morris said they would either move them, keep them where they are, or underground them.

Chair Deckelbaum verified that they are just approving the move, not funding the project. Ms. Alarcon said the project is being paid through ADA Improvements.

Ms. Alarcon said they put in an ADA ramp and the poles make it impossible for a wheelchair to move down the sidewalk.

Mr. Matchette remarked that working with easements is difficult, and Ms. Alarcon thought getting the easement would not be difficult, but it would be at the City's expense. Mr. Morris added that if the location of their services is changed, an easement has to be provided to them.

[Mr. Feldman arrived at 2:38 p.m.]

Motion by Ms. Milroy, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to approve the easements. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Discussion with City Manager

Chair Deckelbaum announced they would return to the agenda at this point.

City Manager Lee Feldman introduced himself, and said he wanted to take questions and then explain the staff standpoint.

Vice Chair Motwani shared a concern regarding the beach re-nourishment project. She hoped someone would take a lead position on it. She said last year they called the DEP and were told the funding was available. However, the project has not started. She also mentioned that \$12M was allotted for Broward Center, and she thought that was critical. Thirdly, she thought there should be better inter-department communication.

Mr. Feldman said there used to be a lot of federal money tied to beach re-nourishment, but the federal money is gone at this point. He thought waiting for Congress to re-appropriate the money was futile. The County is in Phase 2 of that project. The big issue is where to get the sand, and whether it is trucked in or piped in. The County may come back to the City, and the City may come back to the CRA if they are looking for a portion of that to be funded through a cooperative method. He did not receive a definitive answer whether that will be needed, but it might be. If that happens, he would like to see them agree to extend the life of this CRA beyond the eight-year period as part of the exchange for putting some money into it.

Vice Chair Motwani said that when they did the study approximately 15 years ago, the project came up to Terramar Street, where the Atlantic Hotel is. She said that when they are ready to do the project, she hopes they will not have to redo the study.

Mr. Morris did not think the CRA area was involved in Phase 2 – he thought it was further north. Mr. Feldman thought it went to Cortez Street.

In regard to CBD, Mr. Feldman said he concurred with Vice Chair Motwani. The City needs to get tax dollars coming back into the community. He predicted more of a political than an administrative fight, and they need to provide their elected officials with the appropriate “ammunition.”

With regard to departments talking to each other, Mr. Feldman remarked they are building “cylinders of excellence” to be centered around the core service areas, all of which affect the CRA: Infrastructure, Public Place, Business Development, Communication, Neighborhood Enhancement and Public Safety. Each one of the core service areas will be headed up by a department head who will have lead an interdepartmental team. All departments, including support departments, will be part of the new cylinders. He said they have reduced the number of departments from 15 to 9,

making it easier to communicate. The new Sustainable Development Department is comprised of the old Planning and Zoning Department, Building Services (including Code Enforcement and Building Permits), and the Economic Development Department, which should vastly improve communications.

Vice Chair Motwani mentioned there used to be a Tourist Council, and wondered if there was any way of getting a similar item in place. Mr. Feldman said it would be under Economic Development, and he would take that idea back.

Mr. Feldman then spoke about priorities for the CRA. He said they are working with Mr. Morris to get a good understanding of the projects that are left. His goal is to see if they can create a financing mechanism where all the money can be obtained now by pledging the TIF and get all the CRA projects designed and under construction within the next 12-18 months.

Chair Deckelbaum asked what the Board could do to help move that forward. Mr. Feldman said he has reviewed the Board's priorities, and his vision is to carry out the CRA's vision. He continued that they went out for a lot of CCNAs and it is his intent to bring that back to the City Commission on November 1, so that they can award the feasibility studies on the conceptual planning side for the two parking garages for all the streetscapes and the Channel Square building.

Mr. Feldman continued that they cannot award to one firm from concept through construction management services. It is their intent to make three awards for feasibility concepts and then immediately take those concepts, get them signed off by the Advisory Board and the City Commission, and get them underway. His recommendation will be that one firm gets street landscaping, one gets two parking garages and one firm gets Channel Square.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Mr. Feldman if accelerating the funding by borrowing against the future TIF is a reasonable concept with seven-plus years left (for the CRA). Mr. Feldman replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Rubenstein was curious if Mr. Feldman had read the Sasaki report. Mr. Feldman replied that he has. He commented that planners are very good at generating reports. However, they need to recognize that the Sasaki report is a good report, but not everything in it can be done due to being too expensive or the market not supporting it. He said master plans are created under the premise of unlimited funding. He did comment that he hoped they could implement some basic elements of the concepts in the Sasaki report. He added they have to maintain flexibility, noting that the plans for the Las Olas Marina are different than the Sasaki report.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if whoever is awarded the design and feasibility for that property will be allowed to explore both the marina option as well as the option considered by this Board and Sasaki. Mr. Feldman thought they could consider

between those and maybe other options, noting there may be an even better option.

Vice Chair Motwani thought it would be good to have a visitor center on the beach, and hoped Mr. Feldman would keep that in mind. In addition, she mentioned that monies are earmarked for street beautification, and that project (Birch Road in particular) needs to be looked at some point.

Chair Deckelbaum expanded on that, saying that when properties were redeveloped, developers contributed towards the Streetscape Improvement Fund. Mr. Prizlee said there is about \$200K from developments outside of the CRA, and many of the projects never came to fruition. He commented that the Birch Road project is outside the CRA. He said the monies are in an account specifically for implementing master plan approved projects outside the CRA.

Regarding the visitor center, it was noted that there would be a welcome center at Channel Square. Mr. Morris said they have not yet determined how it would be staffed. The concept would be similar to a European tourist center.

Mr. Schiavone (and Ms. Milroy) wondered what is planned for Sunrise Boulevard in terms of cleaning up the whole boulevard from I-95 towards the ocean. Mr. Feldman responded that they have just developed a new department, Transportation and Mobility, and that will be one of their functions, as well as being Ms. Alarcon's responsibility. He commented that the whole Sunrise/Federal Highway/eastern piece gateway area is prime for a traffic circle. He thought it would be a nice entrance feature to the beach.

Mr. Feldman continued that another issue regarding transportation in the beach area is determining a better way of moving pedestrians from the east side to the west side. He promised more definitive proposals from the City in the next few months.

Further, Mr. Feldman said the City is working on a new beach concession agreement and also is hoping to have a different involvement with the restaurants on the beach side so that they can serve food and possibly alcoholic beverages. They want to create a phone app for the restaurants (registered beach vendors) so a person can place an order off a menu, enter a credit card, enter the location on the beach and have the food delivered to them at the beach. The City could take a cut of the fee and put it back into the beach.

Mr. Feldman concluded his discussion, and Chair Deckelbaum skipped ahead on the agenda to accommodate members of the Park and Recreation department.

VII. July Fourth Fireworks / 2012 Funding Request – David Miller, Parks & Recreation

Mr. McGovern, from Parks & Recreation, stated that this year was the first year they

closed A1A. He reviewed that they put the stage facing north at the Elbow Room, and had many different activities right on A1A and on the beach. This year they shut down the beach activities at Las Olas and it was a “monstrous success.” They had a tenfold increase in attendance.

For 2012, they are looking to do the same thing. They are seeking \$84K in funding to pay for the barge and fireworks. The whole event will run from noon – 10 p.m., culminating with the fireworks.

Vice Chair Motwani asked if they had heard anything from Ford about sponsorship, and Mr. McGovern said the individual they worked with last year was transferred so they are working with someone new. Vice Chair Motwani asked how a sponsorship would affect the CRA contribution, and Mr. McGovern replied that if they get both, they would like to expand the event.

Ms. Jarjura remarked that they allocated a certain amount of money for events, and wondered if they are now being asking for more money if they approve the \$84K. Mr. Morris said they have handled the events on a first-come, first-served basis. He said there were two events, this one and the air show, that came forward and asked for \$184K that they did not have. They anticipated \$123K leftover from all the events funded in the past.

Ms. Jarjura asked about the Christmas lights. Mr. Morris said that this year the City Commission did not approve the tree, so they will pay \$14,800 for the “100” sign extension (which will be done in-house with the City Manager), and also participated with holiday lighting. This year they anticipate a few musical acts during Christmas, and the amount of \$7500 is all the CRA will be paying. Mr. Morris clarified that the CRA did not pay for the Las Olas lighting last year. He reiterated that the \$7500 is for the celebration, and the \$14,800 would be paying for the ‘100’ to remain up and lit until the beginning of turtle season.

Mr. Morris said they have to make a decision where they want to spend their money. He is not recommending that they go over the \$371K. Ms. Jarjura remarked that at the last meeting her issue was that they have looked at the events piecemeal rather than cumulatively, and she feared that they will now have to cut from an event they already approved. Mr. Morris said the Board did not approve any events when they approved the \$371K. What they did was show what they did the prior year and how they came up with the numbers that they anticipated for the current year.

Mr. Morris continued that one of the City Commissioners suggested that the Parks Department look to the CRA to help out with the Fourth of July. There will always be an unanticipated situation that arises, and it may be a priority for either the City Commission or the CRA Board.

Ms. Jarjura was under the impression that this Board had come up with a “wish list,” and

each entity would come before the Board and hopefully it would match up with the \$371K figure. She said they were trying to avoid a shortfall, but now they have one. Chair Deckelbaum confirmed that if they fund everything they anticipated funding and also fund this event, they will have a shortfall.

Mr. Yaari commented that Saturday Night Live was going on its third year, and is a public/private sponsored event. He thought they wanted to support new events by giving them a "push-start." He added the Fourth of July event is a City party that brings all the locals and tourists and is the "best day on the beach." He supports it fully and wants the CRA to support it.

Ms. Jarjura wanted the Board to prioritize events as public vs. private at the beginning of the year when the budget is laid out. She thought that groups should not come before the Board asking for money when there is no money left.

Chair Deckelbaum remarked that at the beginning of the year, they had a list of what they anticipated being asked for and appropriate amounts, but the problem is that they have not said "no" to an event in three years. He said they have to start saying "no" or cutting back.

Ms. Jarjura wondered why they ask groups to present when they do not have the money. Chair Deckelbaum responded that they cannot commit everything upfront for the year, because they do not know what opportunities are going to arise. He thought the problem was not that the item appears on the agenda, but that the Board says "yes" to everybody.

Mr. Rubenstein was glad that a money ceiling does exist, and he understood that last year's anticipated requests are the ones being used, which are not predictable. However, he was in favor of using seed money for events, and then let them go on their own.

Chair Deckelbaum said "everything is in cement" except Saturday Night Live, the Fourth of July and the Great American Beach Party. He added that Saturday Night Live should be able to find substantial funding elsewhere this year. Chair Deckelbaum noted that last year the Board gave Saturday Night Live \$80K and the event received \$30K from Ford. Mr. McGovern noted the event cost \$123K, not counting staff. He thought they could get additional sponsorships this year. Mr. McGovern stated he would confer with the people who are working on sponsorships to see what is needed this year.

Mr. McGovern returned to the discussion of the tree lighting, mentioning that they wanted to enhance that event with a 60-piece orchestra (American Legion Post band) and a big choir in a 90-minute concert. That would be included in the \$7500.

Chair Deckelbaum encouraged Mr. McGovern to pursue as much outside funding as possible, and they agreed to revisit the item next month.

Ms. Milroy brought up an art show, noting that they pay to have the event. Mr. McGovern said that Howard Allen requests a three-day event. Last year for the Beach Party, they partnered with ArtServe, who sells spaces for \$50 to local artists. The City did not get any funds from that.

Mr. Schiavone said that while he agreed the private aspect needs to be separated from the public aspect, it is difficult to do. He wanted to encourage everybody to seek sponsorships, not just those who are established in their events. He liked the idea of saying upfront that an event will get money for "x" number of times - otherwise, he said the CRA will keep "writing the check." He suggested dividing the shortfall between Saturday Night Alive and the Fourth of July, then say that's all that is available to contribute, perhaps cutting \$5K from the American Beach Party.

Mr. Schiavone remarked he would like to see the Fourth of July event keep growing, as it used to be embarrassing, as the show was so short.

Mr. Rubenstein remembered that funding for the Fourth of July has always been problematic. He thought the event was very important for the spirit of the beach and Fort Lauderdale and thought it should be done right and supported as much as possible.

Mr. Rubenstein wondered if the \$25,300 had to come from Saturday Night Alive, July Fourth or the Great American Beach Party. Chair Deckelbaum responded that was true, but the CRA has not yet voted on all of the events so that part is unknown. He added the CRA would be voting on air show funding the next day. Vice Chair Motwani explained that the Fort Lauderdale Air Show is working on the Memorandum of Understanding for the event.

Mr. Morris contributed that the only other event that has not been approved by the CRA Board is the TMA, because of the amount clarification. Mr. Morris recalled that the City Commission generally follows the recommendations of the BRAB, but they do have the final say. He added that he does notify this Board if/when the City Commission makes a change.

At this time, Chair Deckelbaum returned to the agenda.

**V. Status of Central Beach Master Plan – Donald Morris
Design Services (CCNAs)**

Chair Deckelbaum and Mr. Morris felt that this item was sufficiently covered earlier in the meeting.

VI. ISHOF Redevelopment Proposal Update – Donald Morris

Mr. Morris reported that at their last meeting, the City Commission reviewed a staff proposal and a redesign proposal from RDC. The staff proposal included amenities designed to help support the operating costs of the Aquatic Complex for years to come. This proposal carried a higher price tag than the RDC's, and the City Commission went with RDC's proposed redesign.

He showed the information that RDC presented to the City Commission, including a diagram of the complex, noting that the new proposal has a different configuration. The competition 50-meter pool is on the west end of the complex: the dive pool will be centrally located; there is a facility including a number of amenities; and there is a practice pool for warming up before events. This was the concept presented to the City Commission, but the details have yet to be worked out.

Mr. Morris said the total cost from the CRA standpoint calls for \$22,430,804 with a parking garage component of \$5.2M. There will be 350 spaces (200 surface and 150 structure spaces).

Mr. Morris showed the design concept, which proposes

- A minor dock area on the western portion of the area, including a public park
- 350 parking spaces
- FINA Olympic 50 meter pool for competition (includes 2,400 seats)
 - Underneath the seats are restrooms, lockers, and storage
- 50-meter pool with grandstand seating for training
- Dive platform spring boards in diving pool
- Acclamation spa
- 1200 square foot instructional pool
- Bath house to include
 - office space
 - swim and dive team operations
 - weight room
 - conference room
 - rest rooms
 - locker rooms
 - equipment room
 - ocean rescue headquarters (possibly)
 - concessions
- Public plaza on Seabreeze Boulevard
 - wave house structure
 - park

Mr. Morris described the site plan, and floor plans of various sites, noting that copies were distributed to staff.

At the ground level there would be the bath house structure, wave house, the refurbished existing pool, plaza and park. The second floor would include additional

parking, ISHOF within the bath house structure, a dive pool above, and a competition pool. The third floor would include the same elements.

Mr. Morris explained he was not involved in the redesign and all he has available to present is what was presented to the City Commission. There will be a business plan. He said it was a scaled back plan, \$27M plus \$9.7M (private development), as opposed to \$71M before.

Mr. Yaari commented he is pro-development and in favor of developing the ISHOF site. However, he thought that the way the City guided the developer to do it was wrong. He thought the City should design something that will be there forever, and he felt they were rushing to find a solution for a site that is losing money. He felt there should be more planning, and did not think this proposal would make the site profitable.

Ms. Milroy agreed with Mr. Yaari, noting it is not the highest and best use for the property. She confirmed that \$22M is going to fund the western portion of the complex, and she said the CRA is basically funding that. She felt that Alexander Park is where the true income comes from.

Ms. Jarjura asked for a history on the RDC plan. Mr. Morris answered that they had issues trying to get a business plan from RDC initially, but the RDC was never able to come up with a plan for the City Commission to approve. Then there was direction from the City Commission to the City Manager to scale back and explore other options. Staff then worked with a consultant to come up with an alternative. RDC also presented a scaled back plan, which is the one the City Commission picked.

Mr. Schiavone did not understand the City being okay with the idea of losing money because it serves the public use (as a swimming facility for the public).

Chair Deckelbaum stated that rolled into the financial outlooks are two things: the physical improvements, and restructuring the agreements with the swim coaches and everybody who operates there to bring in more revenue. That could happen without RDC or the City redeveloping it themselves or renegotiating the contracts as is. He qualified that by saying it would not be profitable, but it would lose less money.

Mr. Schiavone remarked that if this design meets the criteria for international competition and the design in itself is appropriate, and everybody pays their fair share and receives their fair share, then it would be a win-win. He did not want to see someone get into the deal and line their pockets when the City could be getting that money.

Mr. Yaari said the City could take the \$22M and build it on their own, put the Alexander Park for bid upfront to do something interesting, and make much more money. Ms. Jarjura confirmed that the City had actually discussed doing that.

Mr. Morris commented that the City has asked for a business plan from RDC and this plan is the one they are working on.

Chair Deckelbaum explained there were multiple RFPs. The last one was issued around December, two years ago. It was very open-ended in design, which he thought was worthwhile. However, it encouraged developers to find private funding for any project they were going to bring forward. The only responding bid was RDC. RDC saw the CRA as a possible source of funds and pitched that separately from public funding. That project was a \$71M total budget, of which the CRA was asked to fund \$25M. There would have been \$9M in private funding, and the rest from outside sources (ISHOF money, County money, parking money). Chair Deckelbaum continued that the parking money is still in the plan, the CRA money has been scaled back to \$22M, and the private money is roughly the same. The rest of the money that was indicated seems to have "disappeared." The project is also scaled back, and Chair Deckelbaum thought the new project was inferior in every way from the earlier proposal. The City's cost is only reduced by \$3M, and all the other sources of funding are non-existent.

Chair Deckelbaum recalled that this Board had voted that they supported the concept and wanted staff to work with them to develop a business plan and the Board also wanted the RDC to come back with evidence of pledged monies. Overall, he thought the City could develop the property on its own. He encouraged this Board to encourage the CRA to revisit the project to see if it is worthwhile, and decide if the City can do it themselves. He also wanted the CRA to decide if it is the best use of money using the RDC. or worth going back to RFP for better options.

Ms. Jarjura was concerned that if the City Manager and staff have already given direction to RDC, that if the Board makes a motion, it would contradict that. Chair Deckelbaum clarified that just because staff is working with them, it does not preclude them from exploring other options. He reiterated that this Board is an advisory board and they can make recommendations. He also reiterated that the Board initially recommended a project which was very different from the one they see today. Ms. Jarjura wanted an opinion on that from the City Attorney, but Chair Deckelbaum said they can make a recommendation, and the City Commission can act on it or not.

Mr. Schiavone asked Mr. Yaari what specifically he disliked about the second proposal as opposed to the first. Mr. Yaari said it was just the Aquatic center.

Mr. Schiavone said they should recommend the following:

- Gather the information needed to build a perfect aquatic center
- Eliminate the developer
- Give more thought to what is the best use of the land at D.C. Alexander Park

Chair Deckelbaum presented a potential draft of a Communication to the City Commission for discussion purposes: "We as the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board supported the original RDC proposal and encouraged them to work with staff to

ensure it was financially feasible, as we had concerns of the other revenue sources being available and eventually committed to the project. The City and RDC seem to share those concerns and instructed RDC to work on scaling back the costs of the project. The result, we find, is an inferior and insufficient project than what we originally envisioned, but it does not lessen the CRA's financial burden significantly. It only brought our costs down from \$25M to \$22.5M. It ensured the original concerns we had, which was that none of the other funding options did step forward. We encourage the City to explore three options: 1) new RFP in which we indicate a willingness to put the CRA's \$20 some million out there which might encourage new bidders beyond just RDC; 2) continuing with RDC; and 3) concentrate on redeveloping the Aquatic Center to making it work as that was a City redevelopment instead of going out to RFP - where we would cut the costs, make it more attractive and make it function as it is. The swimming center should be first and foremost, and the Hall of Fame and Fort Lauderdale Aquatic Complex."

Mr. Yaari suggested adding a note that the funding is almost 30% of the entire CRA fund throughout the whole CRA, and it has to make a statement.

Mr. Morris felt if the Board chose to do so, it could make a Communication to the City Commission different than what the City Commission's direction is. He added the Board can make any recommendation it wants, and the City Commission has the final say. He said there should be no legal issue, especially since this is a different project than what they saw before.

A lengthy discussion ensued about how to word the Communication.

IX. Communication to City Commission

The Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board feels strongly that the redevelopment of the Swimming Hall of Fame and Fort Lauderdale Aquatics site is as important as any other function that the Board will undertake in our remaining eight years, and is committed to seeing that it is done right and benefits the City now and in the future.

The Board supported the original RDC proposal back in March. However, at the time, while the Board loved the design and the concept, the Board had some concerns with the other funding that was required to make the project feasible. At the CRA meetings, the CRA seemed to share these concerns, and instructed RDC to scale back the project in order to cut costs, and the Board has now seen the revised proposal. The Board finds the result to be inferior to the original one and insufficient for what the Board believes is necessary for the redevelopment of this site, while at the same time it does not substantially lessen the CRA's financial burden, reducing it only from \$25M to \$22.5M.

The reduction in scale of the project and the loss of many of the amenities which the Board thought worthwhile come from the disappearance of the other funds that were

committed in the original proposal. With that in mind, the Board encourages the CRA to revisit the optimal use of that site and explore three options:

1. A new RFP in which the City indicates the willingness to explore CRA funding up to \$25M in order to attract a wider breadth of bidders.
2. Continue with the RDC proposal as presented and encourage them to work with staff to make it better if that is the avenue they want.
3. To explore the option of redevelopment of solely the Aquatic Center directed by the City and staff rather than outside contractors utilizing CRA funding.

The Board is making this recommendation in the hopes that the new Swimming Hall of Fame and Aquatic Complex will be not only financially self-sustaining and feasible, but also a key attraction for tourists and Fort Lauderdale residents in the near and distant future.

In a voice vote, the Communication to the City Commission passed unanimously.

Mr. Morris said the City Commission would probably see this Communication at the meeting after the next one, and he will let the Board know so that they can attend.

X. Old/New Business

Ms. Milroy thought the landscaping on the east side of parking lot on Las Olas and A1A looked "terrible" and wondered what could be done. Mr. Morris said he would speak to Ms. Alarcon.

Mr. Yaari said he would like to speak at the next meeting about the CRA spending money on a commercial sponsored by the CRA to attract people to Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Morris remarked that they do have some marketing dollars, but probably not enough for a commercial. Mr. Yaari reiterated he would like to put advertising/marketing on the next meeting's agenda.

Vice Chair Motwani noted that the CBC does marketing for Greater Fort Lauderdale, and extra funding would be needed to do specific marketing for the beach. Mr. Rubenstein commented that they do good marketing for certain events, such as the Memorial Day events.

Hearing no further business, Chair Deckelbaum adjourned the meeting at 4:36 p.m.

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