

APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
MARCH 24, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance May 2009 - April 2010	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	P	9	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	A	7	3
Phyllis Berry	P	6	4
James Brady	P	8	2
Ron Centamore	P	9	1
Mickey Hinton	P	7	3
Bradley Hubert	P	7	3
Doug Sterner (3:55 arr.)	P	8	2
Clare Vickery (3:53 arr.)	P	3	7
Alan Gabriel	P	6	4
Samuel Williams	A	9	1
Jessie Adderley	P	8	2
Steve Lucas	P	10	0
John Wilkes	P	8	1

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
 Bob Wojcik, CRA
 Angela Wilson, CRA
 Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:36 p.m. by Chair Ferber. As of this date there were 15 appointed members to the Committee, which means 8 would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Approval of February 24, 2010 Minutes

Motion made by Ms. Berry, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2010 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. Information Item – 2008-2009 CRA Annual Report

Chair Ferber introduced Mr. Battle, who indicated Florida Statute Chapter 163 was the statute outlining the Community Redevelopment Act for the State of Florida. The statute requires a report be filed with the State recapping activities and progress for the previous year by March 31st of each year. The report was also given to the City Commission at the March meeting, and the City Commission asked that a copy be provided to the Advisory Board.

Mr. Battle noted the report also contained Beach CRA information, as the report had been filed jointly.

Mr. Brady asked for clarification regarding the southerly CRA boundary off Federal Highway. Mr. Battle stated 4th Street, then due west to Andrews Avenue. Chair Ferber explained the “notch” cut out were all the lands south of 4th Street and all lands east of Andrews Avenue. The northern boundary lies in the middle of the street.

Chair Ferber pointed out the new building assessed at \$40 to \$50 million and was 100 feet too far to the south to add to the CRA. Chair Ferber provided a historical explanation for the decision, relating there were prior elected officials who did not want to create the CRA at all, and those who believed the eastern boundary should be the FEC railroad tracks. The final compromise was to allow North Progresso/Flagler be a part of the CRA; however, the corner would be cut. Mr. Battle added in some instances a portion of the northern part of the downtown was needed for revenue generation purposes. The CRA was created in 1995; however, it did not begin to see a positive revenue stream until almost 2000. Mr. Battle speculated that without the downtown portion a positive revenue stream may not have been seen until a few years ago.

Ms. Berry requested a status update on two items: the vacant property and the midtown business district. According to Mr. Battle, the Mo Homes developer asked for an extension to the development agreement. The type of extension being requested would need to be granted by the CRA Board, and additional research was being done to provide alternate RFP methodologies allowing as many homes as possible to be built under the current conditions within the housing market. Mr. Battle anticipated the research to be completed within the next 30 days. Ms. Berry noted the developer’s

statement indicating they had not heard from the CRA as to their request for an extension was not accurate. This was confirmed by Mr. Battle, adding it was a responsibility of Staff to take the request to the next level. Staff did not want to move forward without development options prepared in advance. Mr. Battle provided examples of conversations held regarding options for development.

Regarding the Midtown Business District, LIN LLC project, Mr. Battle spoke with the developer, and an after-market appraisal would be done on the property. Questions arose regarding the possibility of being over-invested in any project, and an analysis would be completed in approximately three weeks, which then would come before the Board.

Mr. Hubert asked about the Flagler Point project status. Mr. Battle explained since the housing credits were not received the obligation has expired. Mr. Battle did not feel the project would go forward without the housing credits.

Referring to the term "over-invested" used in reference to the LIN LLC project, Mr. Battle explained the revenue did not match up with the amount of increment monies invested in projects.

Chair Ferber asked about the total projects cost, Specialty Automotive Treatments, of \$44.2 million. Mr. Battle confirmed the amount was in error, and should read \$4 million. Chair Ferber then asked about the financing statement on the spreadsheets showing the base year, current year, and total exemptions. Mr. Battle confirmed those exemptions applied to properties on the tax rolls; however, the properties have some type of exemption such as homestead, widow, not-for-profit, or government property.

In response to questions by Chair Ferber, Mr. Battle pointed out the budget for the upcoming year had a section missing which provided an actual percentage increase or decrease from a previous year. Last year, the decrease was approximately 5%, and the year before the decrease was less than 2%. The net taxable value by which the increment was based was \$703 million.

Mr. Battle explained the operating budget was approximately \$2.2 million, and had grown over the past few years due to the increase in square foot obligation in the operating budget for office space, however, there was no staff increase so the operating expenses did not rise dramatically. There was a significant positive up-tick between 2004 and 2006. Since 2006 the revenues have leveled off, and Mr. Battle anticipated the revenues would now begin to decrease, while still allowing for day-to-day operations and "building the war chest."

Mr. Battle confirmed there was no comparison to prior years provided in the annual report. He explained the Finance and Treasury Departments put together the report, and were using the current format in order to maintain consistency between reports. Mr. Wilkes asked about certificates issued, and Mr. Battle confirmed certificates were being monitored from a revenue collection standpoint, and would probably appear in the 2009 and future reports.

Chair Ferber pointed out a possible typographical error regarding a reference to River Bend Corporate Park at the southeast corner of I-95 and Broward Boulevard. Chair Ferber felt that should read, "... at the northwest corner." Mr. Battle confirmed there was an error in the description.

IV. Old/New Business

Mr. Battle introduced Angela Wilson from the CRA, and explained the City Enterprise Zone was conducted through the CRA offices. Mr. Battle advised that the Agency and program were reauthorized in 2005/2006, and the State provides the opportunity every three years for that particular program to go through boundary changes. The total square miles in which the program is encompassed within Broward County could be up to 20 square miles, with the current program being approximately 16 square miles.

Mr. Battle said the Agency was meeting with other cities to see if they qualified to submit an application to participate in the expansion opportunity. The application process would including a justification for increasing to the 20 square miles and what the boundary change would look like. The City was not recommending changing the boundaries due to potential changes from the 2010 census.

Referring to the Sistrunk and Northwest Neighborhood stimulus projects, Mr. Battle explained Phase I would be in the Home Beautiful area, then they would try to expand the program to the west of I-95 and the entire northern part of the CRA. FDOT approval was received and the item would go on the City Commission agenda to begin discussion on construction of the improvements. The project would happen in tandem with the Housing Authority project.

Mr. Battle reported the Sistrunk project is in the final stages of approval from FDOT, and notice would be provided as soon as the approval process was completed. He confirmed all authorizations were in place for the RFP to be published and for the bids to be received. Chair Ferber asked about a timeline for applicants. Mr. Battle was not yet aware of the final approval date, and could not estimate when the approval would be received. Mr. Battle was able to address the bidding time, with the minimum being 14 days, probably allowing up to 30 days. Once the bidding was closed, the City

Commission would either authorize the low bid or choose to do “something different.” Mr. Battle felt Staff was in a position to move quickly once approvals were received.

Mr. Battle warned the Board this would not be a “pretty” project in a short timeframe, due to the need to replace all underground and overhead utilities, and replacing a road. Chair Ferber commented that in these challenging economic times the sight of bulldozers and steam shovels building public infrastructure would send a good message to private capital that something positive was taking place.

V. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. Bierbaum, Prototype, Inc.]