

APPROVED

**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2012 – 2:30 P.M.**

MEMBERS	FEB 2012/JAN 2013				
		REGULAR MTGS		SPECIAL MTGS	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Bradley Deckelbaum, Chair	P	4	0	1	0
Mel Rubinstein, Vice Chair	P	3	1	1	0
Anthony Abbate	P	4	0	1	0
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	3	1	1	0
Ina Lee	P	4	0	1	0
Dan Matchette (arr. at 2:32 p.m.)	P	3	1	1	0
Melissa Milroy	P	4	0	1	0
Judith Scher	P	3	1	1	0
Tim Schiavone	P	4	0	1	0
Aiton Yaari	P	3	1	1	0

Staff

Diana Alarcon, Director, Transportation and Mobility
Don Morris, Beach CRA Director
Earl Prizlee, Beach CRA
Jonathan Luscomb, Supervisor of Marine Facilities
Matt Little, Public Information Specialist
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
Jamie Operlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call – Bradley Deckelbaum, Chairperson

The meeting was called to order at 2:31 p.m. by Chair Deckelbaum.

Roll was called by Ms. Operlee.

- **Quorum Requirement**

As of this date there were 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 would constitute a quorum. It was noted there was a quorum at the commencement of the meeting.

[Mr. Matchette arrived at 2:32 p.m.]

II. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Motion by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Ms. Jarjura, to re-elect Mr. Deckelbaum as Chair. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Ms. Milroy, to nominate Mr. Rubenstein for Chair. Mr. Rubenstein declined the nomination.

Motion by Ms. Scher, seconded by Mr. Yaari, to nominate Mr. Rubenstein as Vice Chair. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes

- **April 16, 2012 - Regular Meeting**

Motion by Vice Chair Rubenstein, seconded by Ms. Milroy, to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- **May 7, 2012 - Special Meeting**

Mr. Abbate brought up several corrections:

- p. 9, 5th paragraph, change “most residents” to “many residents”
- p. 15, 5th paragraph, change “have other levels of experience” to “have other means of activating the space.”

Motion by Ms. Lee, seconded by Ms. Milroy, to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2012, meeting with the noted changes. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Update on the Feasibility Studies for the Beach Master Plan Public Improvement Projects - Bernard Zyscovich, Zyscovich, Inc.; Alan Ward, Sasaki Associates

Mr. Morris began the presentation by pointing out that at this meeting, the consultants hope to receive direction to move forward with specific concepts, then the process will move on to the Public Open House and the City Commission.

Mr. Morris began a PowerPoint presentation (Feasibility Study Updates) at 2:35 p.m. He noted they would not discuss Channel Square at this meeting, because they are still trying to determine the user at that site, or what the site will be if there is no user.

Mr. Zyscovich from Zyscovich, Inc., began his portion of the PowerPoint presentation at 2:37 p.m., covering the Sebastian/Alhambra garage site, the Oceanside Plaza and the Las Olas Beach Plaza. Mr. Zyscovich noted that two of his associates were present: Paul Lambert and Leslie Sanchez. He explained that Mr. Lambert would be elaborating on the financial aspects in the presentation.

Mr. Lambert pointed out that the garage in Option 1 would not be self-supporting, and would result in a negative \$60,500 annually which would have to be funded from a third-party source. Mr. Zyscovich pointed out that in Option 2, the bottom line is worse, since more money was spent on architecture.

Regarding Oceanside Plaza, Mr. Zyscovich advised the Board not to get too worried about the geometry of the open space, as it will vary according to the design of the building.

Ms. Lee wondered where staging could occur at Oceanside Plaza, noting all she saw was a grassy area. She asked if it would be possible to remove landscaping from the street so that when closing the area down, there would be room for people to attend an event. Mr. Zyscovich explained that all the plans show retail space. Ms. Lee thought retail was not allowed, but Mr. Morris noted that at the last meeting, the Board that deferred sending a referendum (to the City Commission) on that matter until they heard the options.

Mr. Zyscovich continued that once an option is selected, they will go into more detail as to specific locations. He brought up the light control issues, and said they hope to have an area with bright lights that would be shielded from the beach by a part of the building. He also noted that the space that looks like grass could be an open space with an orientation toward an eventual stage. They are, however, resisting the idea of a formalized amphitheatre, as they tend to be "dark and unused" unless an event is taking place. Mr. Zyscovich said there could be a temporary or permanent stage.

Gerry Marston, landscape architect, working with Zyscovich Inc., said that all three schemes have the green form which is high at one end and low at the other, with a series of steps in between. That results in an informal stage.

Regarding Oceanside, Mr. Yaari said many were concerned having another retail "monster" on the beach and wanted it more family oriented. He liked the idea of the splash park, parking space and open space. Mr. Yaari thought that Las Olas Plaza was the most critical focal point for Fort Lauderdale, and he felt it needed to be much more impressive and make a statement. He suggested doing a "swap of the land" to keep expenses down.

Vice Chair Rubenstein said they wanted use of a park with staging, events, and a water park for children. He said, however, it looked like just a grassy area. He emphasized that people do not go to the beach to shop, and he disliked encouraging retail space. He was concerned there would be a lot of empty stores. Mr. Morris noted it could be restaurants or cafés also, and perhaps calling it “commercial space” would be more accurate. Vice Chair Rubenstein expressed concern about a glut of restaurants and bars.

Mr. Abbate was curious about the development of the triangle of bathrooms at Sebastian, and wondered if parking was sufficient to cover that. Mr. Lambert replied that additional parking (approximately \$6 per space per day) should cover the improvements. Mr. Zyscovich pointed out that the CRA fund has allocated \$4 million for the garage and public areas.

Mr. Abbate suggested more iconography at Oceanside due to the importance of the area.

Regarding Las Olas Plaza, Mr. Abbate suggested modern and simple traffic signals, and using any leftover money for something iconic for the gateway. Mr. Zyscovich responded that his team felt creating an iconic statement there is problematic in several ways. One issue is how long the community wants to look at the same thing - perhaps it would be better to have temporary commissioned art. Secondly, there is the physical reality which encompasses lighting (not being able to use it) and the whole idea of entering A1A and seeing the beauty of the beach, which is the best view to have there. Mr. Abbate continued that the repurposing of A1A at that segment becomes a conceptual threshold to indicate arrival at the Las Olas gateway.

Ms. Scher remarked an open lawn at Oceanside would be great for concerts, and she did not think it was necessary to dress it up. People will already have their beach chairs or blankets.

Mr. Ward, Sasaki Associates, presented his segment of the PowerPoint presentation beginning at 2:14 p.m., covering Almond Avenue and the Intracoastal Promenade.

Mr. Ward said he would be joined by Erin Hague and Ken Caban from TetraTech, who would address environmental permitting and FDOT.

In describing Almond Avenue, Mr. Ward reminded the Board that the street would be one-way northbound and closed to vehicular traffic after 11:30 a.m. The design would convert the area to a more pedestrian oriented street, with sidewalk dining and the like. The pavers are concrete unit pavers extending from building face to building face. He noted that the cost estimate includes the undergrounding of overhead power lines.

Regarding the west side of A1A, it would feature an eight and a half foot clear sidewalk zone. North of Alhambra, Mr. Ward said only the lighting being turtle compliant and the setback from the curb would be changed.

Mr. Caban reported that FDOT indicated they are prepared to give a design variance for the clear zone from 4' to 2'6". In addition, in the northern portion of A1A, they requested that the turtle lighting be designed keeping the spacing in mind, so that lighting is optimized while meeting the turtle lighting requirements.

Ms. Hague reported there was a conference call on June 4, 2012, with several different environmental agency representatives from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Broward County, Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems, and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and she reviewed the feedback from that call.

Mr. Morris clarified that the \$1.5 million dollars (p. 66 of presentation) was left from the **JPA**, and they hope to be able to apply that money to the lights outside of the CRA. It was noted that was additional money beyond the money for repaving.

Mr. Abbate wondered if any of the proposals take into account the change in the FIRM maps regarding flood elevations. Mr. Ward replied that they are looking at roadway improvements, limited to the sidewalk zone. Mr. Morris said they would make adjustments if necessary.

Mr. Ward then discussed the Beachfront Promenade.

Ms. Hague reported that Option 1 did not get positive feedback on the June 4 conference call, particularly on the two-acre impact on the beach. Some permitting could take as long as two years.

Regarding Design Option 2, Mr. Ward explained how they propose a pedestrian crossing with tactile warning strips and signs for safety. He said in order to create a walking zone of 8 feet, some portions of the wall are shifted 2.5 to 4 feet into the beach (which is an impact of .15 acre). He said the most serious hurdle with this plan is the FDOT concern about losing bike lanes on the north and south side of the street.

Mr. Ward then explained Option 3, and Mr. Caban reported FDOT was more receptive to this option, although there were a few concerns. The third option does not impact the beach.

Chair Deckelbaum asked if the permitting obstacles for Option 1 were insurmountable, and Mr. Ward answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Lee asked about obstacles in Option 2, and Mr. Ward said they might come up with a hybrid plan.

Mr. Ward explained that on the southbound side of the street as well as the northbound, they would reduce the travel lane width, gain one foot, and put that foot in the bike lane. Mr. Yaari asked about the number of bike lanes, and Mr. Ward said the bike lanes will remain where they now are, but they will be wider.

Ms. Alarcon informed the Board that the City and Broward County have already identified A1A as a greenway, which is a 14-foot shared use path (which coincides with Option 2). She said, however, it could be modified.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered whether such changes could be constructed beyond the CRA in the near future. Ms. Alarcon said there is a project in the FDOT work plan for a greenway to be built from Oakland Park to Flamingo Avenue, and an RFP has already gone out. Chair Deckelbaum then asked if that design would be consistent with what they are now considering for the Beachfront Promenade. Ms. Alarcon assured the Board that when plans are developed, they will make sure they are consistent.

Ms. Lee wondered if the City was addressing what FDOT required regarding bike lanes being used for transportation, and Ms. Alarcon said it was. She said if the Board went with Option 2, the City could push for it, in order to be consistent with the other greenway plan.

Mr. Abbate asked about the width of the wall shift, and Mr. Ward said it varies from two and a half to four feet in 1500 linear feet from Oasis Café to Sunrise Boulevard.

Mr. Yaari appreciated the change of direction on Almond Avenue. He wondered if the sewer would also be underground, and Mr. Ward answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Yaari wondered how the closure of Almond Avenue would impact access to parking lots. He said he had been asked if Almond Avenue could be used for valet service. Mr. Ward said the design is a "managed design," and changes are possible to fit needs.

Mr. Ward then discussed the Intracoastal Promenade.

Mr. Ward noted that the landscaping improvements were the key feature in Option 1A. Option 1B has the same landscaping design, but updates the marina.

Design Option 2 features a larger marina expansion, relocation of parking into a structure, and the creation of a marina village (convenience retail and upper level marina level space and some food and beverage outlets). He felt that more activity in the area would bring more interest than simple green space. Instead of a garage, surface parking would be an option.

Ms. Hague said that agency concerns for the Intracoastal Promenade would center on any dredging (Option 2) or impact to seagrass habitat. She added that they would have

to take another look at the peninsula feature, as it may prove difficult. She added that the County is leery of seagrass mitigation, as they have not had much success with it so far. She commented that the County would be the biggest hurdle.

Ms. Scher mentioned that the original plan was to bring the Intracoastal and the ocean together with the views, and she thought a two-story garage would be taking away the view of the waterway. Mr. Ward responded that the garage opens up the land for open space and marina use, and without it, the site would mostly be a parking lot.

Mr. Ward pointed out that an updated marina would bring in more revenue over time.

The PowerPoint presentation was concluded at 4:15 p.m.

Vice Chair Rubenstein said he was anxious to get the projects going, and wanted the consultant's opinion on the possibility of overcoming obstacles (such as permitting), especially in the Intracoastal side. Mr. Ward replied that the first option is the simplest, because there are not any environmental permitting issues, but then the net benefit/gain has to be considered. He continued that when the Marine Advisory Board said that boating is the second largest industry in the region and the marina is not state-of-the-art, the consultants attempted to make a contribution to the overall beach as well as the marina. Mr. Ward predicted that if they do Option 1A or 1B they will be back in ten years to revisit the parking lot.

Vice Chair Rubenstein reiterated that he wanted to know what was doable, or if some of the challenges have to be changed to make the plan doable. Ms. Hague pointed out that in Option 1B there are still seagrass impacts which need to be addressed because of shading effects of the floating docks.

Vice Chair Rubenstein confirmed that Option 2 is the most challenging, but doable, and the most difficult part is the extension. Mr. Ward added that the seagrass mitigation is also challenging. He said that higher risk equals higher reward. He commented that it is a big political decision, involving influencing the State and other jurisdictions in terms of permitting.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered if Option 2 raises more concerns in the consultant's mind as to its ability to do it in a timely manner (overall) than Option 1B. Ms. Hague responded that the timeframe is longer because of dealing with the feasibility of the mitigation, more coordination with the agencies, and the peninsula redesign issue.

Mr. Ward remarked that another hurdle in Option 2 is the parking garage, as the City would have to bear some cost initially.

Mr. Yaari brought up Option 2B, noting there is no parking garage, but there is surface parking. He said it is more feasible economically, and did not think a parking garage was a necessity with all the additional parking in the other projects.

Ms. Jarjura asked for a cost summary on Option 2B, but Mr. Ward said that option emerged after the economic analysis.

Vice Chair Rubenstein wondered if Option 2B would change the Promenade. Mr. Ward pointed out that some of the parking garage is in the park space, so it does compromise the best open space to a degree.

Chair Deckelbaum asked Ms. Alarcon to the microphone and asked her how intertwined the parking needs of each area are and wondered how sacrificing some parking would impact the beach as a whole. Ms. Alarcon responded that the marina area is utilized at 38%, but is full on the weekends. She commented that the lot there now is an overflow lot where people go when they cannot find anywhere else to park.

Mr. Yaari said that if it becomes a marina village, that area will have its own attractions. Ms. Alarcon responded that they do have to take that into consideration in planning the parking requirements.

Chair Deckelbaum wondered, aside from the parking that would service the marina, how intertwined the parking spaces are for the marina, as opposed to Alhambra/Sebastian. He wondered if "50 spaces" at Alhambra are equal in worth to "50 spaces" at the marina. Ms. Alarcon said people typically go straight to South Beach or Oceanside. Sebastian is a small lot (76 spaces). She said the marina is too far from Sebastian to impact it.

Ms. Alarcon continued that the parking study showed there were too many parking spaces on the beach, and what was missing was affordable parking. Seventy percent was private parking, and 30% was public parking; 50/50 is the recommended split to give the appearance of availability of affordable parking.

Mr. Abbate asked about the linear feet of dockage in Option 1A, and Mr. Ward said it was 3,400. Mr. Abbate confirmed that Option 1B would add about 1,000 linear feet. He wondered if it would be worthwhile to go to 1B (considering the seagrass mitigation) just for 1,000 additional feet. Mr. Ward said it is not just the lineal dimension involved, but there is also upgrading to contemporary standards.

Mr. Abbate remarked they had not heard anything about Channel Square, and he felt that entered into the whole picture with access to the beach. He felt that if alternate modes of transportation are to be encouraged, the demand for parking would be reduced. Mr. Morris said that the question would be whether a building is designed with an office for maintenance/management, ticket sales and so forth. It could be either a kiosk or a small building.

Mr. Yaari expressed concern that the City could afford the projects. Chair Deckelbaum remarked that most of the projects came in below budget. Mr. Yaari said he would like

to see the numbers in a spreadsheet for comparison. Mr. Morris commented that the CRA program funds have been identified for a number of the options. The only option that has not been identified as to how it will be paid for is the marina project. The estimate was \$5 million, but it is now almost \$9 million. Mr. Ward explained that part of the \$9 million is the extension over the water, and if it cannot be done environmentally, the costs would be lower.

Chair Deckelbaum pointed out that Option 2 for A1A was also over budget. Mr. Morris responded to that by saying that the cost there could be covered by the money left over from the other areas that were under budget. He added that they had "flat lined" their contribution to CIP over the next seven years at \$4.5 million per year. Mr. Morris felt that the revenue estimates were fairly accurate, and they should go forward on that basis.

Ms. Lee thought it was important to expand the marina if possible, but they should find out if it can be done (considering the seagrass issue) before they commit funding to it. She supported exploring the mitigation options before saying it can or cannot be done. She favored Option 2 for the Promenade.

Regarding Almond Avenue, Ms. Lee felt that needed to tie in with what is being done with the ocean side. She wanted a staging opportunity there besides a grassy area, and the opportunity to move out into the street.

Ms. Lee also wanted to know what was happening with the Aquatics Complex and how that tied into the projects discussed at this meeting. Mr. Morris remarked that the Aquatics Complex provides a different function than the Wave Complex. He pointed out they will have to give the City Commission an option on which marina design to approve.

Ms. Jarjura suggested looking at the designs in a macro view, instead of individual projects. She said it would be helpful to see charts showing net increases in items such as parking, open space, and taxi stops for the entire area. She also commented that she objects to projects that generate negative revenue when they were positive before.

***Chair Deckelbaum opened the floor to public comment at 4:41 p.m.**

John Weaver, President of Central Beach Alliance, remarked that residents should have a fair amount of say in the whole process, and felt they were coming in late in the game. He wondered about how the beach parking garage would impact the view when driving over the Las Olas Bridge, and was afraid it would block the view. He was curious if there would be advertising of the retail at the Intracoastal, and thought that would be necessary to draw consumers.

In addition, Mr. Weaver asked if this presentation could be made to the Central Beach Alliance. Mr. Morris responded that the direction from the City Commission was to have

a public open house to receive public input. Mr. Weaver pointed out that they have developers who come to the CBA and they see things that nobody else does. Chair Deckelbaum explained that the BRAB makes recommendations to the CRA, but does not decide. Ms. Lee remarked that at the last meeting, there were many representatives from the CBA present. Mr. Weaver then asked if this presentation would be available for individuals to see, and Mr. Morris said it would be online.

Mr. Weaver was curious if the sidewalks in the entertainment district would add additional walking space. Mr. Morris said it is not taking space away, but channeling the pedestrians so they do not walk out into the street.

Regarding the marina, Mr. Weaver said they should know where the boat show breakdown would be if the parking lot is removed.

Mr. Weaver also felt a surface parking lot would be beneficial at the Sebastian area, and said it would be good to move the parking up at the Central Beach. He hoped to have the parking work for the busiest times, not for the average times. Perhaps utilizing a "lot full" indicator would help, as well an exit at the Yankee Clipper end of the lot.

Robert Dean, member of the Marine Advisory Board, said he has seen other marinas in other parts of the world and their effects on their communities. He paralleled Fort Lauderdale with Monte Carlo. Mr. Dean said to draw yacht owners to the City, they have to view this as a "location" to come to, and then invest in it. He felt a renewed marina would have an incredible impact on the beach and City.

Barry Flanigan, Marine Advisory Board, supported expanding the marina in the way they originally "should have" with surface parking. The MAB did not support filling in for the dock and submerged landings for restaurants, but they talked of a casual eatery at the south side. He said the MAB would prefer to see additional dockage. Mr. Flanigan said he had a letter from the Boat Show supporting the redevelopment of the marina. He noted also that the Marine Industry Association had sent a letter to the City Commission supporting the redevelopment of the marina.

Regarding mitigation issues, Mr. Flanigan acknowledged there would have to be interaction between the City and County, but he felt they could piggyback on dredging going on in the beach areas.

Mr. Yaari asked Mr. Flanigan to clarify his position, and Mr. Flanigan responded that they support the floating docks for all boats.

Jimmy Harrison, owner of Frank and Jimmy's Propeller Shop, said he also represented the Marine Industry Association. He commented that Fort Lauderdale is the yachting capital of the world, and thought people take that for granted. He pointed out that boats are leaving, and they need to work on keeping the boats here. Mr. Harrison favored the final option with the expanded marina with linear docks, and urged them to start now.

***Chair Deckelbaum closed the floor to public comment at 4:58 p.m.**

Ms. Lee requested that the Board eliminate from the options all the ones that are not doable.

Chair Deckelbaum reminded the Board they are supposed to give "strong feedback" now, and next month they will vote on the final recommendations to go to the CRA Board. A short discussion ensued about the next meeting time.

Chair Deckelbaum said he thought everyone favored Option 2 for the marina, but there is worry about the price tag. Mr. Abbate reminded him of Option 2B with surface parking. Chair Deckelbaum continued that the existing parking garage and the one at Sebastian/Alhambra are not for the most part funded by CRA dollars, but by parking bond revenue. Those are not subject to the same timeframe as the other components. If market needs dictate later that a parking garage is needed at the marina, that could be done.

Chair Deckelbaum thought all the projects could be funded if they eliminate the Sebastian Street garage. Mr. Morris said they would have to take a look at the marina costs, and said they were not eliminating \$5 million by eliminating the Sebastian Street garage, because they have to build the bathrooms, realign the roadway, and repave the lot. Ms. Jarjura mentioned that they might be able to cover the cost because they do not know the cost of doing a surface lot at the marina. Mr. Morris said regardless of whether they do the surface lot or the Promenade, there will be a cost.

Chair Deckelbaum suggested that the consultants come back with a comprehensive plan that incorporates Option 2 for the marina with surface parking, Option 2 on the east side of A1A, Option 3 on Sebastian Street (surface lot). If that does not work out financially, they would discuss what alternatives would bring them in under budget. Chair Deckelbaum acknowledged there were still questions with respect to Las Olas and A1A. By consensus, the Board agreed that would be their ideal solution.

Vice Chair Rubenstein pointed out that the Promenade was the initial project in the Sasaki Plan, and urged the Board not to lose sight of the importance of the Promenade in associating the beach, residents, and tourists with the waterway.

Chair Deckelbaum brought the discussion back to Oceanside Plaza and the Beach plaza. Regarding Oceanside, the main issue is the nature of an event venue, plus the question of retail being included in the garage. On the beach side, there is the question of temporary iconic items or looking for a more permanent structure.

Mr. Yaari said there was already plenty of retail and restaurant space, and he would rather see more parking spots and less commercial space. He would rather see that corner be for public use, restrooms, and maybe a substation for the police. Regarding

Las Olas and A1A, where the "100" sign was, he wondered if they could have LED digital signs at the beach entrance to provide information.

Ms. Lee agreed there should not be retail at Oceanside Plaza. Secondly, she did not want to build a permanent structure at Las Olas, but agreed that moving the utilities was a good idea. She requested that the consultants find out what other destinations have done with a flex entertainment space that has the lighting and so forth built in.

Mr. Zyscovich said their intent was to get feedback on volume and design, then take that information to the next stage. He would like the Board to point them in the direction they feel is most appropriate. Secondly, he asked the Board to help them understand if that area is mostly a flex area with a stage or mostly a location set up for performance.

Ms. Lee wanted a flex area with the ability to have a stage when needed. Ms. Milroy explained there is a facility in Colorado that has garage doors that rise up for a built-in stage with permanent seating in addition to lawn seating. She pointed out this would be an advantage in inclement weather. Mr. Zyscovich said that would be a possibility, but they need to know the wishes of the Board.

Ms. Milroy continued that she liked the concept for A1A and Las Olas, and wished that same concept could be repeated at other beach entrances.

Ms. Scher reiterated that open space between the Intracoastal and the ocean is important. She also said that regular retail does not work on A1A, and empty stores do not add to a community.

Mr. Abbate thought the scale and level of the market that the marina expansion would attract would transform the beach. He brought up the analogy with Monte Carlo and pointed out that there is nowhere in Monte Carlo where a public space abuts a parking garage. He suggested something more active on the edges, such as cafés or seating. He added that the design could be made to accommodate such features in the future. Further, Mr. Abbate suggested extending that space onto Las Olas.

Mr. Matchette liked the Oceanside design, commenting that the shape of the building has a timeless look and creates welcome shade on the beach. He also liked the idea of the wave wall being the iconic theme of the beach and said it does not need much enhancement. He suggested eliminating the date palms. Mr. Matchette continued that he agreed with Mr. Abbate's idea of designing for the future.

Regarding the Promenade, Mr. Matchette commented that the garden areas can be problematic in terms of maintenance and vagrants. He did not think tourists would be attracted to them.

Mr. Matchette remarked that the marina is now the focal point and is extremely important to making Fort Lauderdale a destination city.

Ms. Jarjura agreed that the marina is important, and wanted to incorporate the elements of the Sasaki plan. Regarding Oceanside Plaza, she preferred Option 2, because it imitates the wave wall and the iconic architecture of the beach. She wondered if the viewing deck on the rooftop of the garage could also be used as a concert/event venue. She stated that retail does not do well at the beach in general, but said that it could be a revenue generator. Ms. Jarjura continued that the consultants should keep in mind that the purposes of the spot are parking, an amphitheater and open space.

It was noted that the viewing deck would have an issue if a lot of people were there at once, it would require additional stairs and elevators. Ms. Jarjura explained that she meant having the performers on the top, and people could listen from the beach.

Chair Deckelbaum reviewed that all members who stated a preference on Oceanside Plaza picked Option 2. He added that the key thing is to how to make the Promenade attractive, passive and pleasurable on a daily basis, and still be a basis for events that works well without becoming blighted. He said he did not see consensus on whether retail would be included.

Chair Deckelbaum requested a comprehensive plan at the next meeting showing costs, parking spaces, and so forth which incorporates the full marina with surface parking, surface parking Option 3 at Sebastian, Option 2 at Oceanside, and Option 2 for the east side of A1A. He also requested a better analysis of the outside funding for the marina.

Mr. Yaari reiterated that he would like the spreadsheet mentioned earlier that encompasses all of the projects.

Mr. Morris asked for consensus on Las Olas Plaza, which was that the infrastructure was the most important thing, and the existing walls should be cleaned up.

V. Communications to the City Commission

None.

VI. Old/New Business

There was a short discussion on when the next meeting would occur.

It was decided by consensus to cancel the July meeting, but Mr. Morris said there would be two items to discuss in August, and he suggested two meetings in that month. Chair Deckelbaum said they would have the August meeting on the regularly scheduled day (August 20) beginning at 1:00 p.m. (subject to room availability) and schedule an additional meeting if needed.

Hearing no further business, Chair Deckelbaum adjourned the meeting at 5:31 p.m.

Beach Redevelopment Board

June 18, 2012

Page 14

Attachments:

1) PowerPoint presentation - Beach Redevelopment Board, City of Fort Lauderdale, Fort Lauderdale Beach Master Plan Projects, Feasibility Study Updates, June 18, 2012

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