

**DRAFT**

**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301  
MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014 - 1:30 P.M.**

**FEB 2014/JAN 2015**

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>REGULAR MTGS</b>		<b>SPECIAL MTGS</b>		
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Anthony Abbate, Chair	P	4	0	1	0
Ina Lee, Vice Chair	A	3	1	1	0
Thomas B. McManus	A	1	1	1	0
Dan Matchette	P	4	0	1	0
Melissa Milroy	A	2	2	1	0
Judith Scher	P	4	0	1	0
Tim Schiavone	P	4	0	1	0
Andy Mitchell, Jr.	P	3	1	1	0
Shirley Smith	P	4	0	1	0
Aiton Yaari (l. at 3:48 p.m.)	P	3	1	1	0

**Staff**

Don Morris, Economic Reinvestment Administrator  
Eileen Furedi, Clerk II  
Lieutenant Schultz, Police Department  
Tom Green, Beach Engineer  
Kevin Walford, Transportation Planner  
Jeff Stafford, Aquatic Complex Staff  
Valerie Florestal, Budget Analyst, Sustainable Development Department  
Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Guests and Presenters**

Paul Kissinger, EDSA, Inc.  
Kelly Hitzing, EDSA  
Jeff Suiter, EDSA  
Sara Sullivan, EDSA  
Marwan Mufleh, Kimley-Horn & Associates  
Jason Webber, Kimley-Horn & Associates  
Dave Burgering, USA Diving  
Joe Cerrone, RDC  
Christy Brush, Coastal Systems International  
Uday Kirtikar, Walker Parking Consultant  
Isis Mojigar-Hunt, Arquitectonica  
Alan Tinter, Tinter Traffic  
Sheryl A. Dickey, DCS

Scott Woodburn, resident  
Andrea Woodburn, resident  
Jack Newton, resident  
Jonathan Olsen, resident

### **I. Call to Order/Roll Call – Anthony Abbate, Chair**

Chair Abbate called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

### **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.

### **II. Approval of Minutes - Anthony Abbate, Chair**

- **Special Meeting / April 8, 2014**

**Motion** made by Ms. Scher, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, to approve the minutes of the special meeting of April 8, 2014. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- **Regular Meeting / April 21, 2014**

**Motion** made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Yaari, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of April 21, 2014. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

### **III. Beach CRA Operational Budget Recommendation - Don Morris, Economic Reinvestment Administrator**

Mr. Morris directed the Board's attention to the item in the backup material, the FY2015 Proposed Budget. He said the rate was 5.6%, and the revenue numbers are higher than those of FY2014. Mr. Morris reported that they took \$1.5 million from the appropriated fund balance and moved it into the CIP to fund the design of the projects. He continued with a brief overview of the proposed budget.

Mr. Morris referred to a handout outlining three City events that the BID funds every year:

- Fireworks - \$82,500
- The Great American Beach Party - \$40,500 to be reduced by 10%
- Holiday Lights - share funding with BID

He added that the remaining funds (approximately \$193,950) will be available to fund requests.

Mr. Morris stated that they funded the Sun Trolley last year at \$220,000 and are requesting the same amount this year. The amount will come out of Operating Expenses. Since there are no capital outlays planned for this year, the total operating expenditures will be \$1,282,493. Added to the Master Plan CIP projects, the total expenses will be \$8,416,718. Whatever is not spent during the year automatically goes to the CIP.

Mr. Morris pointed out that projected revenues through FY2020 were also provided at two rates: 5.6% and 5%. The resulting difference was approximately \$500,000.

Mr. Morris mentioned that staff will come back to the Board with information on a short-term loan to fund the projects through the revenue.

In response to a question, Mr. Morris clarified that the Fireworks, The Great American Beach Party, and Holiday Lights will come out of the Special Events fund; the trolley will come out of Operating fund.

Mr. Yaari hoped they could resurrect Saturday Night Alive. Mr. Morris responded that it was a BID event, and the BID chose not to do it again. He added this Board could approach the BID to see if they would want to reconsider, but noted that the BID is now concentrating on several major events as opposed to more but smaller events.

Mr. Schiavone said that when the BID first brought the concept forward, they said it would eventually fund itself. Mr. Matchette liked events such as Saturday Night Alive that bring a constant stream of people to the beach.

Mr. Matchette wondered about the Special Events expenditures of \$371,000 for FY2014 being the same (52% of the budget) as for FY2015. Mr. Morris commented that the balance of the remaining special events budget was money available for events.

Mr. Mitchell was curious what caused the 9% revenue increases in the City and also in Intergovernmental, and Mr. Morris replied that was due to a projected increase in the assessed valuations.

Chair Abbate commented they need to keep in mind that the annual events that they fund should be self-sustainable in the future.

Mr. Morris clarified that the \$371,000 is all within the Operating Budget, but it is represented under Special Events to make it a line item.

Mr. Matchette asked what the rationale was for this Board to be funding the Sun Trolley and special events. Mr. Morris replied they only fund the portion of the Sun Trolley that is in the CRA; the CRA was created to increase tourist and pedestrian activity, and to create a destination for residents and tourists. Regarding the Sun Trolley in particular,

Mr. Morris said that tourists really like it. The other events bring people from surrounding areas that helps business and brings people to the beach.

Ms. Scher wanted to know the cost involved in extending Saturday Night Alive.

**Motion** made by Mr. Yaari, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, to accept the FY2015 proposed budget, including the line items under Special Events, with a grand total of \$413,950. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- **TMA (Sun Trolley Funding Request)**

Mr. Morris pointed out that the information was presented in the backup but no one was present to elaborate. It was passed as part of the budget.

#### **IV. Funding Request for Aquatic Center Modifications - Tom Green, Beach Engineer**

Mr. Green showed drawings of the original plan and the proposed changes. This featured a dry training facility with weight equipment, offices moved to the mezzanine overlooking the two-story dry training facility, 4,000 square feet of potential leasable space, and 5,400 square feet of banquet facility. In addition, the movable floor system was deleted. Mr. Green showed a video mockup of the site while he was speaking.

Mr. Green stated it would be a five-story building with a net increase of approximately 2,400 square feet.

Mr. Morris said there would be a concession open during events.

Mr. Stafford said they plan to hold the same type of events there that they currently hold, plus events they had before the grandstands were condemned. He continued that USA Swimming and the YMCA have previewed the modifications and do not have any issues with them.

Mr. Morris reported that they discussed the height of the proposed diving platforms and peripheral vision for the divers with a representative from USA Diving. USA Diving said they have no issue with either matter, as long as the height of the diving platform does not create more than a 2 mph greater wind load between the current height and the proposed height. Mr. Morris said they are going to verify that independently.

Mr. Schiavone wondered what agency or person was going to guarantee that this facility would be the best in the United States, or perhaps internationally. Mr. Abbate had requested support/acceptance letters from FINA, USA Diving and YMCA, but has not received any.

Dave Burgering, Dive Coach at the Aquatics Complex and consultant with USA Diving, stated that USA Diving is waiting for the results of the independent wind study. If it agrees with the 2 mph wind, they will send the letter; if not, they will probably meet with the City Manager. Mr. Burgering added that USA Diving does want to use the facility for more training camps and the dry land training facility.

Joe Cerrone of Recreational Design and Construction (RDC) said they are going over and above what is normally used as a criterion (25 mph) to make sure it is acceptable to the divers. He said they have two letters from USA Swimming and USA Diving (from January and March) saying they meet the criteria.

Mr. Cerrone maintained that the height of the platform relative to the ground is not the issue - it is the distance to the water.

Mr. Yaari wondered if there was any big name sponsor lined up. Mr. Cerrone responded that the City has not yet been interested in entertaining the branding of the facility. However, he mentioned the possibility of building a 26-meter platform with Red Bull sponsorship.

Chair Abbate recalled that attracting pedestrians and building a world-class facility were key concepts of the Board's original intent, and he feared that their facility's criteria would not exceed other similar facilities.

Ms. Smith pointed out that maintenance is an important factor in keeping the facility up to standards.

Chair Abbate stated that he wants an independent assessment of the proposed facility compared to existing facilities in Broward County, as well as facilities such as Greensboro, South Carolina; Omaha, Nebraska; and Windsor, Canada. The assessment would see if they exceed their criteria, so that Fort Lauderdale can be competitive enough to attract business away from the other facilities. It was pointed out that Fort Lauderdale has an advantage in that they can have the activities outdoors year-round.

**Motion** made by Mr. Yaari, to approve and proceed with the project. Motion later withdrawn.

Mr. Schiavone pointed out the difference between trusting and verification, saying they need to verify the specifics of the facility to make sure it meets competition standards.

Mr. Morris thought it would be difficult to establish that the facility would be better than others, because that enters into the realm of opinion.

Chair Abbate commented that he would like to see case studies regarding pool depth, height of bleachers, etc., that were addressed in the letters received in the packet. Mr.

Cerrone reiterated that the facility meets all the USA Diving requirements. The City just wants slight modifications. Mr. Cerrone discussed the City's usage plan. Discussion ensued about the need for a comparison study.

Chair Abbate asked why they are being asked to fund the project prior to the site plan level 4 and the permit. Mr. Morris explained that the site plan which is going to the City Commission on August 19 does not include the modifications - they will come back at a later time for administrative approval. He continued that they want to get a contract amendment in place with RDC to do the modifications.

Mr. Morris reviewed the Board's approval of the site plan on December 20, 2011.

Mr. Yaari maintained it would be difficult for anyone to predict whether the facility will make money. A brief discussion about marketing ensued.

At this time, Chair Abbate opened the floor to comments from the public.

Jonathan Olsen, 2000 Sunrise Key Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, read and commented on his letter that he wrote a letter on this morning to the Mayor, the City Commission, the City Manager and Mr. Morris. He suggested the parking structures be moved to the Intracoastal lots and have the pools on one level. Mr. Olsen spoke about the poor maintenance of the facility in 2004, but said the location is a big draw.

Scott Woodburn, long-time Fort Lauderdale resident, said he used to be a swimming coach and was active in marketing the ISHOF. He is a competitive swimmer, but does not come to the complex because the hours are inconvenient. He was curious how the complex would be marketed to the general public to bring up the usage rates, and said the facility is a financial burden to the City. He lamented the loss of agreements with the USOC and national governing bodies, the loss of connections, and hoped for a solution.

Mr. Matchette asked if Mr. Scottburn thought the facility itself was sufficient to bring in business, if the right people were hired, and Mr. Scottburn felt it met all the criteria.

Jack Newton, a neighbor of the facility, approved the building of a new facility. He was curious if it would have the same number of pools as the current building. He recalled the old pool at D.C. Alexander Park, calling it a "magnificent" use of that property, and suggested rebuilding it to bring in the public. Mr. Newton disbelieved the notion that the wind differential going up 40 feet would be only 2%. He also suggested lowering the parking deck and expanding it so there is more space on top for activities.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Abbate closed the floor to comments from the public.

Mr. Yaari withdrew his motion.

Discussion resumed on what course of action the Board wanted to take. The following opinions/suggestions were expressed:

- Check on the diving board height (wind differential and exposure)
- Make sure the facility would attract the preferred clientele
- If the facility meets the world-class competition criteria, move forward
- Shelter the diving platform
  - Would meets be called because of the wind?
- Definite need for a business plan to avoid losing money
  - Subsidizing is not acceptable
- Eliminate one level of parking - do not need that much parking
  - Save money
- Lift the beach area beyond its prior level - make it world-class rather than just meeting criteria
  - Needs to be “amazing” like Millennium Park in Chicago
- Need maintenance plan
- 5,000 square feet of banquet space was good

Mr. Morris reminded the Board they had already voted for funding, and if it were not for the proposed modifications, they would not be having this discussion. The current issue is about programming.

Mr. Matchette recalled that when they voted for it, they did not have a specific set of plans. He wanted to know if there is still time to consider design changes, or if it was too late.

Further suggestions were as follows:

- Mr. Yaari suggested letting the City Commission know they are concerned with the business plan
- Chair Abbate suggested recommending to the City Commission that they designate a task force to answer questions and report to the Board and the City Commission within a time frame
- Mr. Matchette stated there should be a staff person now in charge of business development for the Aquatics Center
- Parking revenue will go to repay the parking bond
- Ms. Scher observed nobody on the Board is excited about the project and it needs something more
- Mr. Schiavone said that until they see specifics (meeting the criteria and seeing a business plan), they will not approve the project
- Mr. Mitchell said he liked the design, but was concerned about losing millions of dollars because there is no business plan
- Ms. Smith reiterated her concern about the parking garage

- Mr. Mitchell suggested informing the City Commission they want a budget, a marketing plan that provides revenue streams, and profits and losses for the first three years
- Mr. Abbate expanded on that to include events revenue, local use of the pool versus programmed national/international use
  - Also requested a verifiable projection of groups planning to come in
- What is the City's plan for business development including staff, criteria for selection of director, timing of hire, etc.?

Mr. Morris summarized the Board's requests:

- Revenue plan that talks about event revenue and local revenue
- Marketing plan on how the facility will be marketed
- Business development plan to bring new business in, and personnel and timing of such

Board members added the following:

- Request personnel involved in business development and the timing of hire
- Comparative study of other recognized world-class venues to compare amenities
  - Square footage, proposed amenities, dimensional standards in terms of heights, widths, lengths, depths
- How D.C. Alexander Park tie in

**Motion** made by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Ms. Scher, that the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Board of Directors delay approval of the funding request for the proposed modifications to the Aquatic Center, and that the City Commission delay approval of the final site plan for the Aquatic Center until the following information is provided:

- A comparative analysis of the proposed facility with other aquatic facilities in North America to ensure that it meets and exceeds amenities and criteria such as square footages, heights, widths, lengths and depths
- Verification that the design complies with all requirements for international swimming and diving competitions, including providing a wind study
- A marketing and business development plan for the facility, which includes revenue and budget projections and staffing
- A maintenance plan for the facility
- How DC Alexander Park ties in and connects to the Aquatic Center

In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously (7-0).

**V. Las Olas Corridor Improvement Project and Fort Lauderdale Beach Streetscape Improvement - Phase I, Stage I Reconnaissance / Understanding / Outreach - Paul Kissinger, EDSA, Inc. / Marwan Mufleh, Kimley-Horn & Associates**



Mr. Abbate pointed out there was a CD prepared with extensive information on the project; there is an executive summary in the packet. Mr. Morris distributed copies of an update to the executive summary.

Mr. Morris pointed out that this is the fact-finding stage of Phase I. He said they would start the presentation with Kimley-Horn, since the Streetscape Project was vetted fairly well and the issues that need resolving are minimal.

Mr. Mufleh from Kimley-Horn explained that this phase is reconnaissance and data collection. He began a PowerPoint presentation at 3:16 p.m. addressing the streetscape improvements on A1A, Almond Avenue, and Sebastian Park, as well as related issues and conflicts. Mr. Mufleh completed his presentation at 3:26 p.m.

Mr. Yaari mentioned that Almond Avenue is a heavy delivery area for local businesses, and Mr. Mufleh responded that any possible street closure would only take place after delivery hours.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that a lot of pedestrians try to cross the street where there are no designated crossings. He wondered if there had been discussion to arrive at more uniform signage to help the driver; Chair Abbate thought it was an FDOT issue and asked Mr. Mufleh what they could do to improve the situation. Mr. Mufleh advised it takes time to coordinate with FDOT and if they encounter too many obstacles, they may have to call on help from the City leaders.

Regarding the lighting issue, Mr. Morris recalled that previously designed lights were acceptable; however, now the criteria has changed so they are looking for a design modification. He continued there is \$1.5 million left over from the FDOT-Joint Participation Agreement for what was done on the east side, and there is an unresolved issue (tied to roadway versus pedestrian lighting) with using those funds on the west side north of the CRA. Chair Abbate commented that proper lighting solutions could add to the "world-class" status of Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Smith was concerned that it was not safe to walk the beach streets at night due to it being so poorly lit. It was pointed out that if the down lighting on the east side were bright enough, they would not need vertical lighting. Mr. Morris commented they designed the lighting the way they did because it was also supposed to serve as roadway lighting.

Paul Kissinger of EDSA, Inc., introduced the members of his team working on the Las Olas Boulevard Corridor Improvements: Jeff Suiter, Kelly Hitzing, Sara Sullivan, Christy Brush, Uday Kirtikar, Allen Tinter, Isis Mojigar-Hunt, Marwan Mufleh, and Jason Webber.

Mr. Kissinger began a PowerPoint presentation at 3:31 p.m. (2:01 on audio) on the project, covering the goals, opportunities, and constraints related to the improvements

for the Las Olas Corridor Project. He explained what parking utilization means: if there was a parking spot for \$1 per 24-hour day and it had a car in it for 24 hours, it would be 100% utilized; but if it had a car in it only for 12 hours, it would be utilized at 50%; if it was occupied in the 12-hour peak period, it would be 100% occupied. He said the diagram in his presentation was not exact in terms of utilization/occupancy - utilization is based on revenue. Mr. Kissinger advised they need to get more parking counts as they relate to occupancy, since two previous counts did not figure in beach goers. Mr. Suiter spoke about the importance of studying parking in and out of season.

Chair Abbate wondered why the plan did not show the key pedestrian circulation all the way through to the Intracoastal as depicted in the Master Plan; Mr. Kissinger replied it was outside of their study area, but they could add it.

Mr. Suiter mentioned the impact that adding parking spaces to the lots can have on the potential of the beachfront area.

[Mr. Yaari left at 3:48 p.m.]

Mr. Kissinger continued with his presentation, mentioning the multi-modal center with key drop off points. He noted that they would have to cut into Channel Square to make the water taxi stop there feasible.

Mr. Kissinger emphasized that the garages shown in his presentation are not designed; they are just there to see how they fit in the overall scheme.

Mr. Kissinger requested a motion from the Board to approve the proposed program for design to allow them to move forward to Stage II, the 15% design phase (Conceptual Planning).

Chair Abbate asked if it would be possible to reduce the number of lanes on Las Olas Boulevard to repurpose the existing right-of-way for alternative transportation modes including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and Mr. Kissinger agreed.

Mr. Schiavone wondered how long ago it was when the work was done on Las Olas Boulevard on the east side of the bridge, and Mr. Kissinger said it was finished in 2005. He added they did the conceptual design for that but the width of lanes, plans for bicycles and cars, and exit strategies for hurricanes were not part of the design at that time. It was restricted to enhancing the sidewalk.

Mr. Tinter stated a new feature is getting the cars off Las Olas Boulevard as soon as possible east of the bridge to free the roadway for pedestrians.

Ms. Smith declared that there are already too many parking spaces at the beach, and Mr. Kissinger said they were going to do a new parking study (inventory/analysis). As a design team, they were charged to put back 835 parking spaces between the

Intracoastal lots and the Las Olas/A1A lot. They were also to put an iconic open space at the Las Olas/A1A parking area. The lots they take away from the Las Olas/A1A lot will go to the Intracoastal lot, where they will have to have a garage. Mr. Kissinger did not think 835 spaces were necessary, but wanted the Board's feedback. If they do not need the 835 spaces, they can use the money for a best/higher use.

Mr. Mitchell complimented the design, noting that it is not as invasive in certain areas and maintains a good balance.

Mr. Schiavone wondered about this project in relation to the parking at the Aquatics Complex, and also the possible effects from any changes at the Marina. Mr. Kissinger advised that he used the facts that existed at the time so that the Board and the City Commission could make good decisions. He continued that there will be less vehicular traffic in the future as Fort Lauderdale becomes more urban - 20-year-olds are driving in less numbers than before, and tourists will have multi-modal opportunities for transportation. He advised that the Marina decision needs to be made soon to clarify the parking situation.

When planning for parking, Mr. Mitchell said it makes a big difference whether they look at weekend or weekday traffic. Mr. Kissinger said they have to plan for the big events, but it also has to work the rest of the year. He suggested tiered parking rates to accommodate people who will spend the entire day there, and those who are just there for an hour or two.

Mr. Matchette was curious how the iconic space contemplated for the Las Olas lot will fit in with what is planned for DC Alexander Park. Mr. Kissinger said the intention is that there will be synergy.

Mr. Kissinger then returned to his PowerPoint presentation, discussing gathering places. Chair Abbate suggested calling the "gathering spaces" by a different name: "programmed events spaces."

In conclusion, Mr. Kissinger reviewed the streetscape improvements, parking, the garage programs, and a multi-modal transportation center to help people move around the beach and City.

Mr. Matchette pointed out the following:

- the tram concept for the parking garage was probably not viable due to expense
- green roof idea is a problem from a maintenance standpoint
- idea of having events on the roof had been discussed in conjunction with the Alhambra parking lot and was not favorably received

**Motion** made by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, to recommend to the City Commission to provide direction so that EDSA can move forward with the program at this time.

Chair Abbate opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Nelson commented that the traffic on Las Olas Boulevard is worsening, and suggested encouraging development (parking) by Sunrise Boulevard instead.

Chair Abbate closed the floor to public comment.

Mr. Kissinger said that the City Commission will be reviewing the technical document at their August meeting (or thereabouts), and his staff will work with City staff to coordinate all beach projects together with Kimley-Horn. Mr. Morris stated that the deliverables are staggered; EDSA will be delivering their 15% for Kimley-Horn. Kimley-Horn is willing to move their design up so everything can be reviewed at the same time.

Mr. Matchette asked what was going on with the Marina. Mr. Morris said they had received an unsolicited proposal, which is under evaluation; it calls for substantial CRA investment (approximately \$20 million). He said they cannot continue to wait for private development to happen.

In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously (6-0).

[Mr. Mitchell left at 4:32 p.m.]

## **VII. Old/New Business**

There was a brief discussion about the date for the August meeting; Mr. Morris will see if the room is available for August 25, 2014, and get back to the Board.

Mr. Morris advised the Board he will be bringing the future projects to the Board in Special Meetings from now on.

Hearing no further business, Chair Abbate adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc. - 1st draft edits by Eileen Furedi]

### Attachments:

Letter read by Jonathan Olsen - Jonathan Olsen

Handout re: BID-funded events - Donald Morris

Handout re: update on executive summary for Item V - Donald Morris

PowerPoint presentation on Streetscape Improvements - Marwan Mufleh

PowerPoint presentation on Las Olas Corridor Improvements - Paul Kissinger

**DRAFT**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301**  
**MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 2014 - 2:30 P.M.**

MEMBERS	FEB 2014/JAN 2015				
		REGULAR MTGS		SPECIAL MTGS	
			Present	Absent	Present
Anthony Abbate, Chair	P	4	0	2	0
Ina Lee, Vice Chair (l. @ 3:51 pm)	P	3	1	2	0
Thomas B. McManus	P	1	1	2	0
Dan Matchette	P	4	0	2	0
Melissa Milroy	P	2	2	2	0
Judith Scher	P	4	0	2	0
Tim Schiavone	A	4	0	1	1
Andy Mitchell, Jr.	P	3	1	2	0
Shirley Smith	P	4	0	2	0
Aiton Yaari	A	3	1	1	1

**Staff**

Lee Feldman, City Manager  
 Don Morris, Economic Reinvestment Administrator  
 Diana Alarcon, Director of Transportation and Mobility  
 Jenni Morejon, Director Designee, Department of Sustainable Development  
 Tom Green, Beach Engineer  
 Talal Abi-Karam, Public Works Department  
 Jeff Stafford, Aquatic Complex Staff  
 Eileen Furedi, Clerk II  
 Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Guests and Presenters**

Lester Zalewski, LBM  
 Abby Laughlin, Central Beach Alliance  
 Fred Carlson, Central Beach Alliance  
 John Weaver, Central Beach Alliance  
 Scott Wyman  
 Art Seitz  
 Michael Glassman, M.D.

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call – Anthony Abbate, Chair**

Chair Abbate called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

## **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.

## **II. Aquatic Center Modifications - Lee Feldman, ICMA-CM, City Manager**

Mr. Feldman explained that this meeting was arranged so that he could clarify some issues with the Aquatic Center. He provided a brief history of the Center. He said they received a single response to an RFP for a comprehensive facility in the summer of 2011: the proposal included an aquatic complex, restaurants, wave house, bridge, etc. The cost was about \$74 million.

Mr. Feldman continued that the project had issues with traffic, parking, concurrency and zoning, but the biggest issue was the cost. While the CRA would contribute \$25 million, there was doubt where the remainder of the money would come from. The City Commission instructed that the project be designed within the budget. Mr. Feldman continued that staff then presented a design that they thought would be within the budget, and the sole bidder RDC also presented a design based upon the same budget. The City Commission elected to go forward with the RDC design, and a developer's agreement was negotiated with RDC, which is now in effect.

Mr. Feldman then discussed ISHOF, which had been a tenant for many years. The City offered them a built-out space necessary for ISHOF to remain, a shell, and offered to lease the site to them for 50 years at \$1.00 per year. However, Mr. Feldman reported that they could not come to an agreement; ISHOF was seeking a greater financial agreement from the City to the tune of a \$50,000 per year stipend, profit sharing, etc. After that, ISHOF informed the City they were entertaining opportunities out of state, and were not interested in coming back to Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Feldman reported there was a meeting two weeks ago with US Diving regarding the diving platform; they were asked the following three questions:

1. If they had concerns about the diving operations at the facility
2. If there is an issue with the peripheral vision of divers diving from a platform on top of the four-story parking garage
3. If there are wind issues

According to Mr. Feldman, US Diving said they thought the facility would be "great"; and they said the divers are focused on the water only - there would not be a problem with peripheral vision. Regardless of where the platform is, wind speeds exceeding 25 mph would cancel any diving. Based on calculations done by the developer's structural engineer, the difference between winds "at grade" and on the diving platform would be two mph. Mr. Feldman stated that winds here rarely get over 18 mph.

Mr. Feldman then consulted the City's Public Works Department to obtain an independent calculation from a professional at FIU - this is in progress.

Mr. Feldman continued that the City had entered into a development agreement with RDC at approximately \$32 million, \$25 million which is coming from the CRA and \$7 million from the parking fund (in the form of a parking revenue bond or cash contribution from the parking fund). Building plans should be submitted to the Building Division in November.

Mr. Feldman said they are bringing forth a series of change orders dealing with the facility in the previously designated ISHOF space. After considering several options, he said that the first dealt with freeing up space on the fifth floor and creating a nice venue there for the banquet hall. The second change was to create a two-story indoor diving training facility for which there may be a monetary contribution or sponsorships from the diving community. There also may be a credit on the moveable floor option on the pool since it does not provide any intrinsic value to the project. Mr. Feldman stated the scope has been drawn back "dramatically," and it is not the same facility that was first imagined.

Mr. Feldman commented that this facility has been (and still is) characterized to the City Commission as a "municipal pool complex." He said that City staff will be running the facility and book the events, as they have for 20 years.

However, Mr. Feldman stated that this pool will lose money, as do all the municipal pools - it is more of a service than a profit-making operation. The parking garage will generate additional revenue for the parking fund, which will bring dollars back to the General Fund. Those monies could help cover some of the losses incurred by the facility.

Chair Abbate asked the Board if they had read a June 10 letter from Mr. Foley, and a list of 20 questions and letter from Tim and Ron O'Brien. Although they had done so, they had not had a chance to understand the latest drawings and proposed revisions.

Mr. Green reviewed the changes:

- Reworking of the 5<sup>th</sup> floor
- City offices moved to a mezzanine floor (3<sup>rd</sup> level)
- Banquet facility on 5<sup>th</sup> floor (with no on-site cooking)

Mr. Green showed a rendering, pointing out the various areas/features.

Mr. Feldman relayed that there is a new sport: high-platform diving which would require a 28-meter diving platform and a deeper pool (one foot). He said they are looking into incorporating such a feature in the facility by adding 18 meters to the platform.

Chair Abbate wondered why US Diving had not made any accommodations as a result of Mr. Foley's June 10 letter. Mr. Feldman pointed out the letter was written in 2013, not 2014, and much discussion has occurred since then. In fact, Mr. Foley participated in the recent conference call and his concerns have been satisfied. Mr. Feldman continued that the biggest concern they now have with US Diving concerns visibility from the bleachers on the west side of the pool. To accommodate that concern, the City is trying to resolve some ADA issues.

Mr. Feldman added that the matter of attracting cruise ship participation is not the designer's obligation - it would up to the City.

Chair Abbate clarified that the "20 questions" are from Tim O'Brien and his father, Ron.

Ms. Lee wondered about the CVB's role in booking events. Mr. Feldman responded he has not had any conversations with them. Jeff Stafford of the Aquatic Complex confirmed that the YMCA is looking forward to returning, and they consider Fort Lauderdale a family destination.

Ms. Lee was curious if there had been any potential room-night generated studies once the facility would open and if staff has projected into the future regarding room-night revenue. Mr. Feldman replied that analysis has not been done because the City does not collect tourist development tax dollars.

Ms. Smith expressed concerns about the wind affecting the divers.

Mr. Matchette wondered what events they might miss out on because the facility will not "be world class." Mr. Feldman believed they would have the same level of activity that they did in 2006-2007. In addition, they do not want to push out the daily users of the facility by having too many events.

Mr. Stafford stated that the design specifications do meet world-class standards (FINA). Mr. Feldman commented that this will be a first-class, state-of-the-art facility and cautioned against getting caught up in semantics.

Ms. Scher was still concerned that she had not heard confirmation that the dive platform was acceptable. Mr. Feldman replied he would provide that answer when they have the results of the FIU study. If the results are not favorable, he said they would not build the platform. Mr. Abi-Karam (Public Works Department) said the results should be ready within approximately three weeks.

At this point, Chair Abbate clarified that a vote today would be taken on whether to proceed with the modifications costing \$1.238 million. Mr. Feldman did not foresee any more changes to the scope with the exception of possibly modifying the diving platform to 28 meters and deepening the diving pool by one meter.



Mr. Mitchell liked the family/tourist use of the facility and the fact that it will be state of the art. He was concerned, however, about the profitability of the business side. Regarding design, he wanted to see "fresh and exciting" concepts within the budget.

Ms. Milroy asked if there was still a concern about how the complex would look from Seabreeze and how it would fit in with DC Alexander Park. Mr. Morris responded that EDSA is looking only at the public open space areas and connectivity between DC Alexander Park and the Aquatic Center, not the building façade.

Mr. Matchette asked Mr. Feldman what the alternative would be if the FIU study had adverse results. Mr. Feldman replied they would consider relocating the dive tower at the at-grade pool. This might involve redesigning the pool width to accommodate FINA standards, which would encroach into the front design. Mr. Matchette suggested relocating the dive platform to the Intracoastal side, and Mr. Feldman said they had considered that option but have not decided. He added it might be better to have it on Seabreeze in terms of pedestrian and vehicular traffic (so people can see what is going on). They want to keep a park-like environment on the west side to enhance the walking experience along the Intracoastal.

Ms. Lee suggested how the open space can be utilized to create a "wow" factor.

Chair Abbate opened the floor to public comment at 3:28 p.m.

Abby Laughlin, Central Beach Alliance, asked how far in advance of the City Commission meeting they would have the FIU study; Mr. Feldman said there will be two readings of the ordinance and the study should be completed before the second reading. He elaborated that the City Commission will consider the site plan approval and the change orders (a two-step process); the City Commission first meets as the CRA on August 19 and then meets as the Commission on September 3, 2014. Ms. Laughlin also wondered about the deed restriction; Mr. Feldman explained that the deed restriction refers to "a" swimming hall of fame, not "the" ISHOF. Since no swimming hall of fame is contemplated under this plan, the State does have the option to take back the facility.

Fred Carlson, Central Beach Alliance, said that people at several recent meetings regarding DC Alexander Park wanted to wait until the pool is finished before considering what concept to follow for the Park. Mr. Feldman responded that they are moving forward with EDSA to begin design concepts for DC Alexander Park. The City Commission rejected the first design; they had a visual charette discussion at the Aquatic Center to receive public comment, and on July 4 they put up a note-taking project for passers-by to post comments. Mr. Feldman reported they did not get the desired public participation at the meeting - mostly staff and BRAB members responded. He did not think they could wait until the completion of the pool to begin thinking of designs due to the CRA's expiration date.

Art Seitz, former Board member, cited the results of the Visioning process, which indicated very few people had interest in water polo, synchronized swimming, recreational or competitive swimming and the like. He felt it was not certain the YMCA would come back. Mr. Seitz did not like the idea of putting a parking garage on the Intracoastal. He also cited lack of shade, no therapy feature, and too many other pools in the City as negative aspects of the plan; he suggested moving the center somewhere else, such as Holiday Park. Another suggestion was to make room at the top of the diving deck so people could watch Winterfest. He referred to critical articles written about RDC, and to some history of the project design.

John Weaver, President of Central Beach Alliance (CBA), reported that since the Swimming Hall of Fame reversed its position and said it was a great design, the CBA also thought it was good. He said the ISHOF generated 15,000 hotel room nights in 2011 (\$7.5 million) as opposed to \$10 billion for the entire beach. If the design is going to re-open, the CBA would like to see a four-story parking garage on Alhambra. Regarding the diving, he felt the study did not matter much - it was what the divers think that matters. He suggested that Mr. Feldman attend a CBA meeting to receive feedback.

Dr. Michael Glassman, surgeon and lifelong swimmer, expressed concern regarding locating the pool directly above a parking garage. He was worried about the effects of fume exposure from car exhaust. An open-air car garage cannot be vented to guarantee those above it will not be exposed. He also noted exhaust from yachts. He said that when he approached the developers about it, they did not perceive a problem, citing condo pools on top of parking structures. Dr. Glass pointed out the difference in numbers of people and children using the pools. Dr. Glassman left copies of medical studies linking respiratory problems to exhaust.

[Mr. Feldman and Ms. Lee left at 3:51 p.m.]

Lester Zalewski, Lauderdale Beach Management, thought the pool was a "done deal." He was not particularly in favor of the design, but felt the City Commission had made up its mind. He advised that there will be cost overruns, but thought there would be a benefit to the entire City. He suggested leaving CRA money in the CRA for neighborhood improvements, and tap the City for money for the Aquatic Center.

Chair Abbate closed the floor to public comment at 3:53 p.m.

Chair Abbate then summarized a letter from Tim O'Brien and his father Ron O'Brien into the record:

The two men have coached nine U.S. Olympic diving teams, and have spent their lives coaching/competing on a world-class level. They have been encouraging the City Mayor and Commissioners to step back and re-evaluate the current designs for the new Aquatics Center and its flawed business model, as well as trying to repair the relationship with the International Swimming Hall of

Fame so it can remain here. The City of Fort Lauderdale and areas surrounded by water has an incredible opportunity right now to make sure that it remains the central focal point of the aquatic world for decades by keeping the Swimming Hall of Fame here and building a truly world-class facility.

We believe the City can do something really special here and have the best of all worlds by:

- 1) building a world-class facility that is the epicenter of worldwide aquatics
- 2) keeping the International Swimming Hall of Fame in its home of 50 years
- 3) having an aquatic center with a business model that actually makes money
- 4) including the surrounding communities with water attractions and activities
- 5) host events that will benefit surrounding hotels, restaurants, and business for years
- 6) still have the parking garage in the beach area

During our time coaching at the Hall of Fame pool, the City was constantly presenting us with design plans in an effort to build a new aquatic center. These plans included the Hall of Fame and were beautiful designs for a facility that would be the pride of Fort Lauderdale. We were excited to see the vision of the City -- those older plans include shops, restaurants and a wave pool or other water attraction that would include the surrounding community. We always felt there should be something there for tourists as well as for surrounding communities, residents, and children who could happily benefit from the water attraction.

We did not want it to be just a training center for aquatic athletes, excluding everyone else. The City's plans during that time were aligned with our beliefs that to make a new Aquatic Center successful it has to have attractions for everyone and contain a business model that is profitable. Simply stated, you cannot pay bills; it loses money currently. We have not seen any financial projections/analysis which has shown that the new and improved Aquatic Center is anything more than the same business model.

It is not a world-class facility planned regardless of what the City portrays it to be. It will just be another facility - nothing special - with a 10-meter diving platform exposed to the wind and elements.

There is a better way. The current plans for the new aquatic center are the worst version we have seen, dating back to the early 1990s and more importantly, are the status quo. We have never seen competitive swimming and diving pools built on top of parking garages. We have coached on that pool deck for over 40 years, and the wind for a diver on top of that 10-meter platform could be a huge challenge.

The City can hire wind experts but a report is far different from reality. We met with City officials and the developer over a year ago and voiced our

concerns, discussed numerous options - but ultimately the City and the developer ignored our advice.

We have no financial, political, or other motive in this issue. We love the City; we simply want to see officials provide the best possible solution to everyone involved. We believe this falls far short in every aspect. We urge the Mayor, Commissioners, and those involved to pause, step back, re-evaluate, get more insight, another vision, and explore options. Perhaps it would be wise to form a group of experts separate from the City to look at the best options, to talk to facilities with profitable business models and ultimately solicit more bids and do the right thing.

It is not important to do this fast, but to do it right. We only have one chance at this. Respectfully submitted, Dr. Ron O'Brien and Tim O'Brien.

Chair Abbate closed the floor to public comment at 3:58 p.m.

Chair Abbate reminded the Board of their specific charge regarding the Redevelopment Plan. He pointed out that the plan specifically stated "world class," but he noted the discussion had moved to "state-of-the-art." That would cause a change to the Redevelopment Plan. Chair Abbate also stated that everyone on the Board should say whether they are convinced that the plan (as moving forward) will contribute to the economic revitalization of the CRA.

Feedback from the Board was as follows:

- Not convinced that a pool complex on that property is the highest and best use
- Not convinced that the pool complex is going to be the type of driver that the CRA needs for its future
- Thought the project was "unstoppable" at this point, and if so, the proposed changes (catering, setback, etc.) should be recommended
- Sounds like it will be a world-class facility
- Improved pools will bring more local people to use the facility
- If the diving board and the deeper pool work out, divers will come here
- Will the facility fit with the vision for the CRA and beach?
- Where people go to swim has changed in 40 years
- The new facility will enhance the City
- Concern that the new facility will not be maintained based on past experience
- Parking garage is not necessary (too many parking spaces and wasted money)
- New facility will be beautiful
- CVB will market it successfully
- Contributes to revitalization of CRA
- Will be state-of-the-art
- Covered bleachers would be nice
- Perhaps look into fumes from exhaust (unknown factor)
- Would prefer a more tourist-oriented facility tied into DC Alexander Park, but would run into the "trips" issue

- Constitutes a change to the plan
  - No evidence that it will revitalize the area
    - It is a community swimming pool
    - Parking garage will not revitalize area (concerns about parking garages on beach: when empty, attract undesirable elements)
  - Facility would not even be state-of-the-art architecturally

Having heard the comments, Mr. Matchette wondered what any alternative would be. Chair Abbate responded he wanted to be sure there are plans in place to guarantee revitalization - he did not see the connection. He would assess the value of the parking garage as a component. Chair Abbate expressed concern about spending one half of the budget on one facility that is for a single use (swimming).

Chair Abbate pointed out that no members of the Board had seen the updated drawings, and he did not want to pass judgment on a plan that nobody on the Board (except himself) had seen. He also wanted to see the results from FIU. He said he did not know what the “usage plan” was that US Diving needed.

Further, Chair Abbate commented that, as it currently is planned, the Aquatic Center is not the best and highest use of the property.

Mr. Morris reminded the Board that they had previously recommended \$25 million for a project that was \$70 million in December, 2011. The City Commission moved forward based on that recommendation. Now the staff is asking for approval of modifications to the original plan. Chair Abbate commented that the proposed changes do improve the situation.

Mr. Weaver said he attended the meeting because he thought the project was re-opening for review. He thought the CBA membership would be in support of that, and would be interested in seeing more consideration. He thought the thing that attracted people was the Fort Lauderdale beach, not the pool.

Mr. Matchette commented that in 2011, the project was proposed as a swim facility, not as a project being the “highest and best use” of the property. He favored more time for review, noting this is the last opportunity to provide input.

Ms. Scher feared nothing would take place if they opposed the changes at this point, but actually wanted more time for review.

Ms. Morejon stated that the redevelopment plan created by EDSA always anticipated maintaining the Aquatic Center. The Sasaki Plan also envisioned aquatic use at the site. She advised the Board to clarify their language regarding “highest and best use.”

Chair Abbate remarked there are three basic core components in the Master Plan that the Board is charged to implement:

1. Create a world-class atmosphere for residents and visitors
2. Revitalize business
3. Promote pedestrian activity

Chair Abbate continued that during the inception of the Master Plan, certain assumptions were in place regarding the cultural component of the Aquatic Center (ISHOF) in addition to the athletic and the community aspects. He said the cultural component has been removed, the focus of the program to meet budgetary constraints was narrowed, and the pedestrian and connectivity component were removed. Due to those changes, he thought it would be incumbent upon the Board to see if the changed plans meet the original charge.

**Motion** made by Mr. Matchette, seconded by Mr. McManus, to inform the City Commission that the Board has serious reservations about the Aquatic Center being the highest and best use of the property as defined by the Fort Lauderdale Beach Community Redevelopment Plan. If it is determined that the Aquatic Center is the highest and best use, the Board approves these modifications.

There was a brief discussion concerning the meaning of “highest and best use” in the context of the motion, and of the need (or not) for parking.

In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously (7-0).

#### **IV. Old Business - None.**

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Abbate at 4:38 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc. - 1st draft edits by Eileen Furedi]

#### Attachments:

Letter from Tim and Ron O'Brien - Mr. Morris

# MIAMI CHRISTMAS LIGHTS



City of Fort Lauderdale

RFP # 745-11452

**TITLE: Holiday Lights**

August 17, 2014



# PROPOSAL

---

## *PART VIII - PROPOSAL PAGES – COST PROPOSAL*

Cost to the City: Contractor must quote firm, fixed, annual rate for all services identified in this request for proposal. This firm fixed annual rate includes any costs for travel to the City. No other costs will be accepted. This firm fixed annual rate will be the same for the initial contract period.

**Failure to use the City's COST PROPOSAL Page and provide costs as requested in this RFP. may deem your proposal non-responsive.**

TOTAL ANNUAL FIRM FIXED FEE (INITIAL CONTRACT PERIOD) \$\$244,080.00/ANNUALLY

**Miami Christmas Lights payment terms are as follows:**

- 30% due when surfboard and sandcastle custom décor is fabricated with sample pictures provided
- 70% due when décor installation is completed



## PROPOSAL – MELE KALIKIMAKA BEACH



### Project Description

“MeleKalikimaka Beach”, the theme for the City of Fort Lauderdale’s 2014 Holiday display is a; fun in the sun, whimsical, community focused Holiday display. Not only will it boost the City of Fort Lauderdale’s traditional Holiday light display, but bring the community together with its creation. Most importantly, it will attract the attention of locals, out of state tourists and international visitors while creating an identity for the City of Fort Lauderdale.

The foundation of MeleKalikimaka Beach creates an engaging, awe-inspiring Holiday environment for the community. Residents and visitors viewing the MeleKalikimaka Beach display with its iconic sandcastle center piece with accompanying décor along A1A and Las Olas Boulevard will be drawn in to a beach inspired Holiday wonderland unmatched by surrounding municipalities. By utilizing, community school children, local businesses and members of the Fort Lauderdale local government to help design banner artwork, the display will provide the members of the Fort Lauderdale community a unique sense of comradery. Tourists will be welcomed to the City with an unforgettable Holiday memory that represents the City's beach inspired lifestyle.

The banners and surfboards will be visible during both day and night creating a constant Holiday atmosphere on the beach front. At night, the banners will be illuminated by Warm White LED lighting within the frame of a surf board portraying a fun in the sun, Holiday combination. The display will be immaculate and festive during both the daytime and evening.

Miami Christmas Lights will use its previous experience working with local schools and artists to manage the development of the artwork for the banners. Depending on the City's preference, Miami Christmas Lights can work with local schools, artists, charitable organizations, businesses and participating municipal leaders to create the art work. Each piece of art, will be uniquely designed and have a small section at the bottom where the creator will receive recognition for their artwork. Miami Christmas Lights will print and install the custom banners, handling the entire project for the City.

Miami Christmas Lights has created an Iconic display for the Las Olas Portal area including a one-of-a-kind sandcastle decorated with traditional wreaths, Warm White 5MM LED mini lights and a Holiday flag. The castle is complimented by two lobster playing cards in the sun, sand pale with shovel and an elf buried in the sand. On the north side of the Sandcastle, a holiday tree will be displayed decorated with various seashells and a starfish topper. In the background, six Medjool palm trees will be decorated with coastal inspired sand colored lights on the trunk and fronds with a white burst coordinating it with the MeleKalikimaka Beach theme.

MeleKalikimaka Beach will create a unique unmistakable Holiday identity for the City of Fort Lauderdale. Families will come to visit the beach inspired Holiday display for years to come, creating a tradition for residents and visitors alike. The theme is non-denominational in nature and draws inspiration from the beach and local community highlighting Fort Lauderdale's traditions during the Holidays. Miami Christmas Lights is excited to work closely with the City to bring this magical display to life and create a Holiday tradition for years to come.

AREA 1-Las Olas Blvd

Custom made surfboard banner enhancers with locally inspired banner artwork will be attached to the 25' dark metal poles along Las Olas.

*The Artwork for the banner is created by the local community*



10' Decorative lamp post along both sides of Las Olas Blvd will be decorated with a 4' illuminated surfboard silhouette with interior banner.



Area 2-Along A1A-12' lamp posts on both sides of the roadway

A1A east side (beach)-12' lamp posts with dual fixtures on top will be decorated with a 4' illuminated surfboard silhouette with interior banner.



A1A-West side of roadway-25' Cement lamp posts

Custom made surfboard banner enhancers with locally inspired banner artwork will be attached to the 25' cement light poles along A1A.

*The Artwork for the banner is created by the local community*



AREA3- Las Olas Portal at the corner of A1A and Las Olas Blvd





*Area Description*-In the center of the display will be a 15' X 15' spectacular illuminated sandcastle with a "Fort Lauderdale Beach" flag swaying in the breeze on top. The walls, arches and castle tops will all be outlined in Warm White mini LED lighting. The walls will be adorned with traditional wreaths including red bows placed on all sides. Various figurines depict Holiday fun in the sun activities; such as two vacationing lobsters. On the opposite front side of the sandcastle, an elf playfully buried in the sand, wearing sun glasses while basking himself in the fabulous Fort Lauderdale beach sunshine. On the far side of the sandcastle, is a traditional Holiday tree trimmed with sea shells and topped with a starfish. Surrounding the sandcastle display will be a white picket fence to protect the display from the general public.

Encasing the entire display, there are 3-20' Medjool Palm trees on each side. They will be wrapped with golden brown 5MM LED mini lights with a burst of white lights at the top of the tree and the fronds will be lined again with golden brown mini lights.

Miami Christmas Lights  
1330 West Ave - Suite 2012  
Miami Beach, FL 33139

Ph: 305.432.2225  
info@miamichristmaslights.com  
miamichristmaslights.com

Customer Information	Proposal Information
City of Fort Lauderdale James Hemphill Las Olas & A1A Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 Ph: 954-828-5143 Em: jhemphill@fortlauderdale.gov Budget: \$0.00	Estimate #: 14 - 309 Proposal Date: 08/05/2014 Decision Date: 08/25/2014 Desired Install Date: 11/21/2014 Desired Removal Date: 02/25/2015 Contract Expire Date: 2016 Deposit Method: Check

Item	Qty	Price	Total
- Las Olas Blvd Area	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Proposal # B</b>			
- For the 10' lamp posts along Las Olas Blvd, 4' frame shaped like a surfboard outlined in WW C7s and with brackets attached to the lamp post. Banners- 2'- 3' tall attached with in the surfboard structure. The banners are customized to a saying or expression of happy holidays by the community	12	\$1,100.00	\$13,200.00
- For the 25' lamp posts along the North and South Sides of Las Olas Blvd 7' frame shaped like a surfboard outlined in WW C7s and with brackets attached 10' up on the lamp post. Banners-3' wide and 4' tall attached with in the surfboard structure. The banners are customized to a saying or expression of happy holidays by the community	15	\$1,500.00	\$22,500.00
- 12' double lamp posts along Rt A1A on the east side of the road, on the beach	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
- For the 101 lamp posts on the east side of A1A, 4' frame shaped like a surfboard outlined in WW C7s and with brackets attached to the lamp post. Banners- 2'- 3' tall attached with in the surfboard structure. The banners are customized to a saying or expression of happy holidays by the community	101	\$1,100.00	\$111,100.00
- For the 73 25' Concrete Poles along Rt A1A on the west side of the road 7' frame shaped like a surfboard outlined in WW C7s and with brackets attached 10' up on the lamp post. ( 10 poles owned by FPL Near 9th St are not to be decorated as per Scott Sundermier) Banners- 4' tall attached with in the surfboard structure. The banners are customized to a saying or expression of happy holidays by the community, rotating with concrete poles with banner only	65	\$1,500.00	\$97,500.00
- Iconic Holiday Display at the portal of Las Olas at the corner of A1A and Las Olas Blvd, on the Beach	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
- The Holiday Sandcastle on Fort Lauderdale Beach Sandcastle Structure 15' x 15' C7s around the structure Figurines	1	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
- 6-20' Medjools/ 3 on each side of the Sandcastle structure Wrap with Golden Brown 5MM LED Mini lights	6	\$300.00	\$1,800.00
Wrap top 12" of palm with intense Warm White LED "crown" of lights. Maximum of 10 strings of lights will be used per tree. - For the 6-20' Medjools/ 3 on each side of the Sandcastle structure	6	\$200.00	\$1,200.00
- For the 6-20' Medjools/ 3 on each side of the Sandcastle structure 11 frond package with Golden Brown color	6	\$300.00	\$1,800.00
- Platform for the sandcastle display 48' high	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
- Illuminate the "Fort Lauderdale Beach" test on the sandcastle.	1	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>\$305,100.00</b>	
20% Discount for a 3 year agreement - Discount		\$61,020.00	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$244,080.00</b>	
<b>DEPOSIT AMOUNT DUE</b>		<b>\$122,040.00</b>	

Prices include all materials, which are supplied by Miami Christmas Lights and remain the property of Miami Christmas Lights, installation, maintenance, and removal. Customer is only responsible to supply adequate power sources.

**Notes**

**Power**

Outlet Location: By every tree and on every Lamp post  
Circuit Breaker Location: TBD  
Integrated Timers: No Timer Hours: N/A  
Other Notes: TBD

**Insurance**

Miami Christmas Lights carries \$3,000,000/\$4,000,000 commercial liability and \$1,000,000 workers compensation insurance. For copies of either policy, please ask your sales representative.

*Happy Holidays*

MIAMI CHRISTMAS LIGHTS

miamichristmaslights.com  
305-432-2225

