

**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING and WORKSHOP**

November 30, 2005 – 3:30 P.M.

CITY HALL

100 North Andrews Avenue

8th Floor Conference Room

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Board Members	Present	Cumulative from 01/01/05	
	Absent	(P)	(A)
James Brady	P	P-8	A-1
Stan Brown, Chairman	P	P-9	A-0
William Cain	P	P-9	A-0
Jim Carras	P	P-5	A-4
Jerry Carter	A	P-6	A-3
Albert Fils	A	P-6	A-3
Tim Hernandez	P	P-6	A-3
Brice Lambrix	A	P-8	A-1
Laura Mutti	P	P-9	A-0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	P-9	A-0
Rosalind Osgood	A	P-5	A-4
Marcia Barry Smith	A	P-5	A-4
Clare Vickery	P	P-9	A-0

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, NPF CRA

Mina Samadi, Engineer, NPF CRA Staff

Jeanette Johnson, Administrative Aide – NPF CRA

DJ William-Persad, Assistant City Attorney

Bob Wojcik, Planner- NPF CRA Staff

Joan Oliva, Planner- NPF CRA Staff

Richard Ewell, Procurement

Ann Debra Diaz, Procurement

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The November 30, 2005, Chairman Brown called meeting of the Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board to order at 3:45 P.M. A quorum was achieved with eight board members present.

A roll call was conducted, the results are above.

II. Approval of Minutes – November 17, 2005

The minutes of the November 17, 2005, regular meeting were not available due to staff time restraints. Only the motions were provided to Board members. **Ms. Mutti** suggested the approval of these minutes be taken up at the next regular meeting. **Ms. Mutti** also inquired as to Item III, noting that she did not remember making that particular motion. A review of the notes by the court reporter revealed that **Mr. Brady** made the motion. The record shall so reflect that **Mr. Brady** and not **Ms Mutti** made the motion to approve Item III.

III. Evaluation Committee Policies and Procedures

At the November 17th meeting Mr. Battle gave the Board some background as to this item. The RFP Evaluation Committee idea was formulated to try to protect the city from persons possibly challenging future procedures, and providing a clear understanding for future bidders. CRA staff recommends that the CRA Advisory Board chose evaluation committees for each RFP issued. Said committee should consist of no more than five to seven members. Staff suggests that evaluation time frames be staggered so that board members and the public have the opportunity to attend the meetings. Mr. Battle worked with the City Manager's office and the Purchasing Director to produce the recommendation that was before the Board at the last meeting, and is again recommending that these policies and procedures be approved today as outlined.

At the November 17th meeting **Mr. Brady** raised several questions regarding meeting attendance requirements in order to vote, whether or not a committee member may read or listen to a missed meeting to qualify to vote, the necessity of CRAAB rendering an advisory opinion on each proposal before it is sent to the CRA, and whether or not a committee member who was absent from a presentation should abstain from rendering an advisory

opinion. **Mr. Brady** detailed each question in writing and forwarded them to the legal department. This Board in a written fashion did not receive the answers; however, Ms. William-Persad from the legal department was present to address those questions and any others that may arise.

Ms. William-Persad noted that the questions dealt more with Board policy than with actual legal issues. As there are no rules in place that speak to these questions, the Advisory Board may make any policy it desires to address their concerns.

Ms. Vickery made a motion to accept staff's recommendation as outlined by Mr. Battle, and in addition added that the persons appointed be advised up front that there may be multiple meetings that they will be expected to attend, and in addition appointees must declare at time of appointment if there are any financial relationships and not accept the role if there is a conflict.

Chairman Brown asked for a second on the motion. Hearing none, the motion failed. **Chairman Brown** asked for discussion.

Mr. Brady noted his displeasure with the answers received from the city attorney's office and asked for clarification, specifically as to the ramifications of our actions. It is his opinion that a written answer for each of the questions should have been provided by the legal department.

At this point **Mr. Carras** left the meeting and the quorum was lost. The meeting continued in a workshop mode.

Ms. William-Persad addressed question number one (regarding attendance requirements of a committee member). She advised that a member of a committee does not have to attend each meeting to be eligible to vote unless this Board decides to make a policy to that effect.

As to the second question (May a committee member who was absent rely on reading, listening or viewing the meeting to qualify to vote?) Ms. William-Persad advised that a member might rely on such material unless this Board instituted policy that would prohibit such activity.

Ms. Vickery clarified for the record that when she spoke of financial interest she was not just referring to owning property in the district, but of having a personal interest in the project that goes beyond working with this Board.

Ms. Mutti agreed that being able to review the materials of a missed meeting would be important for a committee member. In addition to that she would like to see another safeguard put into place to assure that the committee members actually reviewed the material provided to them initially, and that they make an effort to make a fair and impartial evaluation of the applicants. She suggested a questionnaire be used for that purpose.

Mr. Hernandez disagreed with monitoring committee members' actions in that regard.

Mr. Cain inquired if the evaluation committee's choice would be presented to this Board. **Chairman Brown** answered that the choice would proceed directly to the CRA Board and would bypass this Board.

Chairman Brown suggested this Board act as the evaluation committee for the more complex RFPs, and keeps the procedure proposed by staff in place for the less complicated proposals that could be addressed at one meeting. It was the consensus of the Board to follow this suggestion and it was so indicated to staff.

IV. Phase II Workshop Discussion

Mr. Battle made a visual presentation to the Board using a PowerPoint display, outlining progress already made. He then proceeded to the Phase II project areas, which were displayed through maps delineating the boundaries and highlighting the adjacent neighborhoods. The key project areas are Sweeting Estates, the Midtown Business District, Dorsey Riverbend, and Flagler Heights. The total cost for the CRA 5-year plan is in the 46.4 million dollar range. There are 30 projects in some form or stage of development that will ultimately allow the tax increment to grow upwards to 2.7 million dollars.

Mr. Hernandez, who is opposed to road closures, inquired about the wisdom of closing roads. Mr. Battle answered that lessons were learned while engaged in the Sistrunk project and that closing roads is not a wise decision. Issues of security, crime, and traffic were brought to the forefront as this project progressed.

Mr. Brady inquired about the contaminants on the Lincoln Park property, Ms. Samadi answered that an incinerator had been located on or close to that site and the ash from burned garbage was dumped there. Staff did not know the details of the types of contaminants but understood a small amount of arsenic was identified. A portion of the site located in front of the One Stop Shop is in the process of being cleaned and capped for use as a playground. **Mr. Brady** inquired if there was an issue on this site of

violating EPA standards or there was the issue of potential public relations fallout. Ms. Samadi noted that there is a stigma attached to this property that needs to be worked on. **Mr. Brady** cautioned staff to be careful to not project more of a stigma than necessary because once a property is labeled; it is hard to get the public to trust it.

Ms. Vickery voiced her opinion that Phase II needs to be community based, focus on a park system, and consider future parking needs, all to be driven by geography and population.

Mr. Brady would like to see an audit and analysis relative to Phase I to answer the broad question: Did the plan carry the progress or was the plan carried on the back of the progress as it was occurring? He also pointed out that their communities drive the areas and that as those communities are diverse, the progress changes from section to section. He suggested that perhaps a consultant should be retained to work the areas and the neighborhoods to their best advantage.

Ms. Phillips noted her concern with the Sistrunk area, since Phase I was not able to accomplish all of the goals that had been accepted.

Mr. Battle passed out a document entitled *Market Based Community Economic Development* for the Board to read at their leisure and perhaps discuss at the next meeting. **Ms. Mutti** had already read the document off the Internet and found it to be germane to Phase II, with many ideas she would like to see woven into the redevelopment plan. The ideas dealt with insuring longevity of life in these areas, not just doing a quick fix.

V. Adjournment

There being no further business being brought before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M. by Chairman Brown.

Respectfully submitted,

Jody E. Lebel
Recording Secretary and Notary Public