

**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL**

March 22, 2006 – 3:30 P.M.
**100 North Andrews Avenue
8th Floor Conference Room
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

Board Members	Present Absent	Cumulative from 01/01/06 (P) (A)	
Phyllis Berry	P	P-1	A-0
James Brady	P	P-3	A-0
Stan Brown, Chairman	P	P-3	A-0
Jim Carras	A	P-2	A-1
Jerry Carter	A	P-2	A-1
Albert Fils	P	P-3	A-0
Michael Ferber	P	P-3	A-0
Tim Hernandez	P	P-3	A-0
Brice Lambrix	P	P-3	A-0
Laura Mutti	P	P-3	A-0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	P-3	A-0
Rosalind Osgood, PhD.	A	P-1	A-2
Marcia Barry Smith	A	P-1	A-2
Clare Vickery	P	P-3	A-0

Staff

Alfred Battle, Executive Director CRA
Mina Samadi, Engineer, CRA Staff
Thomasina Turner-Diggs, Project Coordinator, CRA Staff
Joan Oliva, Planning and Design Manager, CRA Staff
Bob Wojcik, Planner, CRA Staff

Visitors

Doug Sterner

I. Call to order/Roll call.

Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 3:40 P.M. A quorum was achieved with ten members present at time of roll call.

II. Approval of Minutes – February 1, 2006 and Workshop Meeting of February 22, 2006.

Ms. Mutti questioned whether she approved the minutes of November 30, 2005 (page 2, Item II). She asked that the tape and notes be double-checked. After review of the notes, it was determined that Ms. Mutti is correct. Mr. Brady made the motion to approve. The record shall so reflect.

Mr. Ferber noted that on page 4, 5th paragraph, the sentence reads: Mr. Ferber noted that this work was anticipated when we extinguished the land in the western portion of the CRA and replaced it with the Northwest RAC. The sentence should read: Mr. Ferber noted that this work was anticipated when we extinguished the existing land “use” in the western portion – etc.

Ms. Mutti noted that on page 4 she elaborated more than what was written. After the words “more than just a study” she requested “we should wait and see what they have to offer, since we don’t know what they are offering” be added.

As there was a problem with the digital recording device at the November 17, 2005 meeting, Ms. Mutti requests that the meetings not be held if they cannot be recorded.

A motion was made by Mr. Ferber to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Lambrix seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Evaluation Committee report – RFP #252-9257

A short listing and final selection meeting was held March 9, 2006 for properties located at 551, 547 and 537 Northwest 7th Terrace. The committee consisted of two Advisory Board members and three city staff members: Ella Phillips, Marcia Barry Smith, Margarette Hayes, Eve Bazer and Victor Volpi.

This RFP item had only one meeting, as there were only two proposers: Westside Gazette (which received a ranking of 465) and Midtown Oasis Project (which received a ranking of 464). A committee recommendation accompanied by a recommendation by the CRA Advisory Board will be forwarded to the CRA Board. Ms. Phillips noted that the process, including reading of the material, preparation for the meeting, and the meeting itself encompassed at least eight hours. It was the general consensus of the Selection Committee that both projects had merit, both brought forth the vision for the area, both met the criteria in fulfilling the need for the Sistrunk Quarter, and both had the means and commitment. It was noted

that the Westside Gazette was an on-going business. The meeting was thorough and all questions were answered.

A motion was made to move the recommendation forward by Ms. Vickery. Ms. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Evaluation Report – RFP #252-9258

A short listing and final selection meeting was held March 15, 2006 for properties located at the 401 Northwest 5th Street project site. The Evaluation Committee consisted of two CRA Advisory Board members, two members of city staff, and the Director of the Executive Airport; Tim Hernandez, Clare Vickery, Clara Bennett, Greg Brewton and Bob LaMattina.

Mr. Battle summarized the process, noting that the original review and ranking of the proposer had been held January 31st. The submitted proposals had included: Sante Fe Lofts, Sistrunk Lofts, Solar, and GBF Engineering Development. At this meeting the proposers were short listed down to three; Sante Fe Lofts, Sistrunk Lofts and Solar. The proposals were evaluated by using the criteria listed in the RFP. At the January 31st meeting Solar was unable to attend and give an oral presentation. The Committee chose to hear and rank the remaining two proposals, Sante Fe Lofts and Sistrunk Lofts. The two proposers were asked to give a 30-minutes presentation, followed by a 15-minute question session.

The ranking given to the proposers: 330 to Sante Fe lofts and 415 to Sistrunk Lofts.

Mr. Hernandez summarized, noting that Sante Fe Lofts was a 10-story building with 54 residential units. Sante Fe Lofts incorporated another site behind it. The marketability and delivery of the proposed product was a problem with Sante Fe Lofts. There were also compatibility issues for that project. Sistrunk Lofts had a parking problem. It is still no clear whether there will be parking along Sistrunk. It was noted that if the city desires retail or office ventures to succeed on the street, there must have parking. The RFP asked for a 3-4 story building on the site. Any deviations must be justified with a strong argument. It was felt by the Evaluation Committee that Sante Fe Lofts did not have a strong argument for deviating from the requested criteria. Ms. Vickery opined that Sante Fe warranted going higher to get attainable housing at \$300K-plus for a 1000-square foot unit. It was noted that Sistrunk Lofts offered their units at a price of \$200-210K with larger square footage. Mr. Hernandez said it was the best selection committee he's ever been on and commented that it was good to have someone from P & Z on the committee to give reality to the process from the government regulatory side.

A motion was made by Mr. Brady and seconded by Mr. Ferber to move the recommendation forward to the CRA Board. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously

V. Progresso Village Street Closures

Mr. Battle noted that we had a request to get involved with some of the concerns from the residents in the community about the road closures. Mr. Brady had requested that staff bring back commentary or possible solutions for this problem. The civic association for this area has approached the city about this problem and is currently looking into procuring a grant. A sit-down session was held with the neighborhood to try and determine the need and desires of the neighborhood. It was stated by the neighborhood that originally they desired that the road closures be permanent. Ms. Samadi did a PowerPoint presentation showing the pictures of the residences in the area and the condition of the temporary road closure apparatus. There were a number of pots that are in poor condition that are being used by engineering for temporary road closures. She noted that the cost for a permanent structure would be in the \$4000-6000K area, with landscaping and irrigation running an additional \$5-10K.

As far as funding, Ms. Samadi noted that NCIP was no longer available but that CDBG funds could be used.

The closure process requires a letter from the homeowners association requesting a permanent closure, identifying the funding source, and a public hearing. There are issues of design, construction, and ongoing maintenance. Based on further conversations and meetings, the neighborhood has been convinced to not go forward with permanent closures, but to continue with the temporary ones. Once the problems in the area settle, they will be removed. It was noted that there are problems and complaints on 8th Street.

Ms. Mutti questioned the prices that were quoted, asking if that figure represented each closure. Ms. Samadi answered, yes, that figure was for each one site. The temporary closure material is already in place, so the only cost remaining is landscaping. Ms. Mutti inquired if newer pots could be installed as the current ones are in dismal condition. Ms. Berry opined that there was no transit on these streets. Mr. Brady inquired if one of the purposes for these closures was to keep vehicular drug traffic at a minimum. Ms. Samadi answered that that was one of the purposes. In addition it served to accomplish traffic calming. Mr. Brady also commented that the pots were not being cared for to the point where the area looks blighted and people did not want to enter the neighborhood. He added that it degrades the area and devalues the neighborhood. He noted if traffic calming were the goal, installing a Sante Fe style entryway would accomplish the task.

Chair Brown opened to the floor to the public. Doug Sterner, Vice President of the Civic Association spoke, noting that what is currently in place is not a good solution,

but from the point of view of the neighborhood, something is better than nothing. The reason they are important is the plague of illegal dumping occurring in the neighborhood on vacant lots, and private property. Loitering is also a problem. He noted that the neighborhood is willing to maintain and contribute to the work. Ms. Mutti opined that road closures do not send a negative message telling people that the neighborhood is run down, but rather that they care and are in control.

The idea was expressed that road closures might deter future development. It was noted that Flagler Heights and Progresso Village also deserve this type of support and perhaps it should be in other neighborhoods as well, especially those areas being used as cut-through streets.

Chairman Brown asked staff to come back quickly with an appropriate solution. Ms. Vickery suggested the Board workshop this item. She noted that there are some single-family homeowners on NE 5th Ave with similar needs that must be addressed also. Mr. Brady agreed the approach should be broadened and the time extended. He noted the city should do something in a meaningful way to let the citizens know they are cared about. He addressed the dumping issue noting there should be a targeted clean up effort by the city. It was noted that some of those lots are city property. The city should not allow their property to be in disrepair and must have the trash removed.

Mr. Ferber suggested that Mr. Battle contact the police department and the code department and request that they address the issue. In some cases these barricades are not a deterrent for crime but a magnet, as criminals are able to elude the police by getting away on foot or on bikes where the police cannot pursue them

Ms. Samadi noted that there is currently no more funding to install new pots and due to the nature of the task, Public Works proceeded as quickly as they could with the materials they had.

Ms. Mutti noted that the situation in her neighborhood is very similar. The City of Fort Lauderdale, along with Commissioner Tim Smith, is aware of the problem. She noted that her neighborhood does not have a strong civic association at the time. In her opinion the city needs to send a message to the neighborhood that the city supports them. The neighborhood requires more than planning and studying; they want the CRA staff to move as soon as possible to construct temporary road closures that could possibly be converted to permanent closures.

Ms. Mutti made a motion that we set forth and let this neighborhood know that we do support them and we want more than just a little planning and studying to be done and we would like to have some road closures set up as soon as possible. Funding should be made available. The road closures should be designed to be made permanent. Ms. Vickery seconded the motion.

Chairman Brown asked for discussion on the motion. Mr. Hernandez strongly opposes permanent road closures without any kind of comprehensive plan. Circulation and interconnectivity are important to any neighborhood. They added that there are times and places for temporary closings and he supports that effort. Mr. Lambrix suggested placing more stop signs in the neighborhood to discourage cut-through traffic. Ms. Vickery opined that a process is needed by which other problematic areas can have a standard to follow.

Ms. Berry agreed and added that more time is needed to find a long-term solution. She added that other neighborhoods would surely come to the table and ask for the same thing. Chairman Brown noted that the word “temporary” needs definition and changes according to the project.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 8-2 with Mr. Ferber and Ms. Berry voting no.

VI. Sistrunk Boulevard Update

Ms. Samadi gave a PowerPoint presentation on the progress, or lack of, of the Sistrunk Boulevard redesign efforts. This presentation was given a few weeks ago at the Mizell Center and is being repeated for anyone who might not have been able to attend at that time. The length of the project is from Federal Highway to the railroad crossing, from 7th to 15th Avenue, and from 21st to 24th Avenue at the city limit. Ms. Samadi quickly recapped the key events as they occurred from 2004-2005. A traffic study was completed, the scope of which was to analyze the reduction effect, review all the previous studies (Broward County requested we use their planning model, FSUTMS 2030), estimate the traffic diversion from the narrowing of the lane through the neighborhoods, review the bus stop locations, review the traffic calming plan, and review the sidewalk width and coordinate with the county. The DOT traffic study showed 21,000 vehicles traversing Sistrunk Boulevard and there was no significant impact when barricades were implemented; 98% of the traffic found its way through Broward Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard. Ms. Samadi noted that with the two-lane scenario the maximum directional peak hour figure for level of service D was 790 vehicles, and 1482 on the four-lane condition. Between 8:00 and 9:00 in the morning and between 4:00 and 6:00 in the afternoon, peak hours, is the only times the traffic will be effected to any degree.

Ms. Samadi contacted the county and inquired if they are accepting the report and in the process of transferring the road to the city. She inquired if there were any further issues to clarify. The county responded that they agree with the numbers but that their interpretation of the numbers are different, claiming their traffic model contains a flaw. The county advised that they will issue a report; however, they report will not be available to us until it becomes a public record. Ms. Samadi noted that funding is available for traffic calming, as well as grants. She advised

that we have about nine million dollars to complete the Sistrunk project available to us at this time. Without a starting date for the project, these funds are in limbo.

Why the Las Olas model does not work: Sistrunk does not want to be another Las Olas. In addition, the parking along Sistrunk does not welcome commerce as it stands. Las Olas has parking availability in the rear of the businesses. This is not possible on Sistrunk, as there are residences in that immediate area. Community benefits outweigh commuter convenience.

Mr. Brady asked about the report the county refuses to publish to us. He requested that staff email the wording of the report request to him so he may further address that issue with the county.

Chairman Brown said the reason for the update is for preparation for the April meetings that will be taking place on this issue. He also noted that there are different sides to the issue; engineering and political. Ms. Vickery noted that she has been in contact with Commissioner Rodstrom's office and the report has not yet been issued. A compromise is predicted. Ms. Phillips, who has lived in this area all of her life, noted that 6th street is being used as a cut through. She stressed that we need to be aware of what the community is asking for and why. Mr. Ferber believes the CRA Advisory Board is already on record as supporting the 2-lane formal position. In addition he requested staff to research over the last 20 years and see how many pedestrians have been killed or injured in that corridor, and what time and day those accidents took place. He believes those statistics would be pertinent as this discussion moves forward

Mr. Ferber made a motion that his colleagues on the Board draft another letter reiterating our position and send it out again to the CRA commissioners, going on record again saying that the mission of this CRA is to narrow that corridor. Mr. Brady seconded the motion.

Chairman Brown asked for discussion. Ms. Mutti expressed a desire to see the other plan. She approved what was presented to the Board at today's meeting. She feels a vote is premature until all the plans are viewed. Ms. Vickery noted that there are clear responses from the county to some of the issues in the report that Ms. Samadi displayed at today's meeting.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 9-1 with Ms. Mutti voting no.

VII. Director's report. Another

Mr. Battle noted that another evaluation committee would be gathered for the last RFP, the New Visions CDC proposal, in the near future.

In addition Mr. Battle noted that we have received confirmation that the Enterprise Zone designation was re-awarded to Broward County, particularly to the city of Fort Lauderdale. The cities of Dania Beach and Lauderhill are now part of the program, as well several small pockets on unincorporated of Broward County.

VIII. Adjournment

Mr. Lambrix made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 4:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Jody E. Lebel, Notary Public