

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**SEPTEMBER 22, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<b>Cumulative Attendance</b> <b>May 2010 - April 2011</b>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	A	2	2
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Phyllis Berry	P	2	2
James Brady	A	1	3
Ron Centamore	P	4	0
Mickey Hinton	A	2	2
Bradley Hubert	P	4	0
Doug Sterner	P	3	1
Alan Gabriel	P	3	1
Samuel Williams	A	2	1
Jessie Adderley	P	3	1
Steve Lucas	P	4	0
John Wilkes	A	2	2
Brice Lambrix	P	3	0

**Staff**

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA  
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA  
Mina Samadi, 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 3:37 p.m. by Vice Chair Phillips. As of this date there were fifteen appointed members to the Committee, which means eight would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

**II. Approval of July 28, 2010 Minutes**

Mr. Hubert requested a change on page two to read flats rather than townhouses. Mr. Battle noted on page six, the abbreviation TUFF should be TIF.

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Sterner, to approve the minutes of the July 28, 2010 meeting as corrected.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

### **III. Action Item – TMA NW Circulator Funding Request**

Mr. Battle explained the request from the downtown Transportation Management Association for promotional bus wraps, and reminded the Board members of previous discussions regarding similar funding requests in the past. Mr. Battle also described Staff's idea of using the bus wraps to market past and future projects in the Northwest CRA. The requested funds would be broken down into two trolley wraps for a period of one year.

Ms. Berry expressed concern with the funding going to marketing rather than operations, and felt the requested amount was high for marketing on only two wraps. Ms. Patricia Zeiler, Managing Director, Transportation Management Association, explained some of the funding would also be used for office expenses. Ms. Berry felt the request should more clearly state where the funding would be used, and what portion would be used for operations of the TMA. Mr. Battle explained previous conversations regarding funding were turned down by the CRA Board due to the statute "moving into waters the Board was uncomfortable with," and felt Ms. Berry made a good point.

Mr. Sterner asked for more information regarding the CRA's advertising budget. Mr. Battle was not sure of the total for the advertising budget, however the expenditure would be taken from the approximately \$8 million reserve fund. Mr. Sterner questioned the wisdom of limiting the wraps to a particular route as potential investors may be both inside and outside the CRA routes.

Mr. Lucas, as a member of the TMA advisory board, expressed a desire to help answer questions, but did not feel he should participate in a vote, should there be one. Mr. Lucas provided Board members with a brief history of the TMA operations and advertising monies. Mr. Lucas explained the rates for all the routes were the same, and there were currently seven of fourteen wraps in use currently. Mr. Lucas felt the bus wraps were a moving billboard to tell the people in the CRA "what their dollars were doing for them."

Ms. Zeiler stated by October 1<sup>st</sup> there would be double the buses on the route, connecting the Sistrunk business district to the Tri-County area with the I-95 express

bus and the tri-rail connection. Ms. Berry felt the service was great, and promoting the service made sense, however promoting the CRA was another story, and questioned if this was the best place to promote the CRA. Ms. Berry emphasized she was 100% in support of the service, and commended the TMA buying into the service, however, she also felt the CRA needed to get the most bang for their advertising buck.

Mr. Sterner felt the request was a "back door" for funding the TMA operations. Mr. Sterner felt the route was important, however possibly outside the mission of the CRA to provide operating funds. Mr. Sterner felt advertising funds rather than more direct operating subsidy would provide some exposure for the CRA, while also providing benefit to the TMA. Ms. Berry felt if that were the case, it should be clearly stated in the request.

While Mr. Centamore did not object to the funding for the bus wraps, he did feel the Board should know what the advertising would say before approving the expenditure. Ms. Berry did not feel advertising on the vehicles was wrong, however the wording of the request needed to be clarified to state what the cost was to advertise on the bus, and which costs would go to artwork, installation, removal, etc. Ms. Berry felt, as written, the request was for \$30,000 for advertising, and was not transparent and clear that some of the \$30,000 was going for expenses other than advertising.

Ms. Berry suggested the wording of request be reworked and brought to the next meeting. Ms. Phillips asked if the ridership and the route could be broken down and provided so the Board would know where the marketing was being directed. Mr. Hubert asked what a pedestrian would learn about the CRA from reading the wrap on the trolley and how the marketing would benefit the CRA.

Mr. Lucas stated the other vendors worked with TMA to come up with their own creative advertising, and the CRA would be able to decide what to promote. Mr. Lucas explained the grant was very specific on what monies could and could not be used for, and this would be overhead, not operational. Mr. Gabriel asked if advertising for the CRA would be an appropriate expenditure. Mr. Battle stated advertising by newspaper or newsletter was done in the past, however this was a unique method which was not an option in the past. Mr. Gabriel suggested the request come back as an actual advertising proposal.

Ms. Berry asked what would preclude the Housing Authority for asking for similar funding. Ms. Berry also asked if the earlier Board objections Mr. Battle referenced were objections to the service or objections to providing operating assistance to the TMA. Mr. Battle explained the earlier request was specifically to subsidize the day-to-day operations of the Northwest circulator route of the TMA, and the request was turned

down as the Board did not want to pay for the gas, a driver, maintenance, and other overhead charges having to do with the bus running through the area. Mr. Battle stated in this case the request was for a sponsorship or a promotional package, not to subsidize the bus route operation.

Mr. Lucas explained the routes ran from the BCT, to the Winn Dixie on Powerline, through the Powerline and 9<sup>th</sup> neighborhood, into Lauderdale Manors, throughout Sistrunk, to the African American Library at 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue, south to Broward Boulevard, then back to the BCT station. Mr. Lucas stated the route was a feeder route, with a majority of the passengers were residents going to the courthouse using the BCT terminal as a connector, and the route had the second highest ridership within the system. Mr. Lucas stated the Beach CRA had thus far agreed to a similar proposal for \$60,000 to fund operations.

Mr. Sterner felt Mr. Hubert earlier raised an interesting question regarding the benefit for the CRA, and asked what the Board wanted to accomplish with the ads. Mr. Battle felt both touting past successes and attracting new investors into the CRA were possibilities. Mr. Battle felt it might be a good idea for the TMA to come back with possible messages and an agreement with the TMA on how the monies would be spent.

Mr. Centamore felt the decision should be does the Board want to advertise and are they willing to spend \$30,000 for the advertising. Ms. Phillips felt the Board expressed concerns that needed to be addressed, and the request should come back to a future meeting. Mr. Hubert felt there were many other businesses who would be interested in advertising on the buses. Ms. Berry felt the transit advertising was a good medium, and possibly the Board needed to see some type of concept to see what transit advertising could do for the CRA. Mr. Battle explained funding needed to be approved for the artwork to provide a concept to the Board. Ms. Berry did not feel actual artwork was necessary to decide what to advertise.

**Motion** made by Mr. Hubert, seconded by Ms. Adderley, to defer, sending the proposal back to the drawing board with some additional considerations specifically as to how it would benefit the CRA to have wrap advertising on this route.

Mr. Sterner asked who would provide the information. Mr. Battle stated Staff would provide their perspective, and the Board would provide their perspective.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved with Mr. Lucas abstaining.

#### **IV. Discussion Item – CRA Budget Recap**

Mr. Battle stated the City Commission passed the budget on September 21, 2010, and provided the Board members with an expanded spreadsheet showing the tax increment revenues, encumbered and non-encumbered account balances, and reserve funds. A budget of approximately \$2 million was submitted to the City Commission in July, and all City departments were asked to reduce their budgets by 5%. The new operating budget would be \$1.9 million, with the budget reductions coming from planning and engineering dollars.

Financial statements, which were adopted in April 2010, were also provided to show a more expansive overview of the Northwest CRA balance sheets, revenues, expenditures, and fund balances for the year. Mr. Battle pointed out approximately \$700,000 was spent out of the bond funds in the current year.

#### **V. Update on CRA Parking Issues**

Mr. Battle described a meeting with the CRA Board regarding previously discussed parking issues. Mr. Battle felt the area being submitted to the City Commission might need to be expanded as it relates to Flagler Village. The area currently ended at Andrews Avenue, however the discussions from the meeting presented a strong case to carry efforts over to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue from 6<sup>th</sup> Street down to 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The benefits to the west side of the street could also be beneficial on the eastern side of the street as the conditions on both sides were similar.

Mr. Lucas asked why 2<sup>nd</sup> would not be included in the plan. Mr. Battle stated the line for the RAC was at 2<sup>nd</sup>, and anything beyond the tracks would be altogether different zoning.

#### **VI. Director's Report**

Mr. Battle announced Cheryl Dickey's grand opening would be the following Friday at 11:30 on Sistrunk. Also on Friday afternoon at 4:30 would be Dolphin Day for anyone interested in football, followed by a Purvis Young exhibit at the Dickey building.

Mr. Battle stated the Sistrunk project bids were received, and copies were provided to the Board members. Mr. Battle noted the biggest change would be on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue, where a lane of traffic would be lost on the north side of the street. Mr. Battle stated the contracts were signed and the notice to proceed was issued. Mina Samadi stated the contractor was Central Florida Contracting. There would also be a construction management firm to provide day-to-day oversight and a communications liaison throughout the construction process. Ms. Samadi stated there would continually

be at least one lane of traffic open in each direction, businesses would be marked, and information boards would be provided. The start time for construction would probably be October or November, and a ground breaking ceremony would be announced. The construction completion time was estimated at fourteen to sixteen months. Ms. Samadi provided this contractor was previously responsible for Biscayne Boulevard in Miami.

Ms. Samadi announced a public meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue connector to address the approved alternate route, the design, and to answer questions from the public. The meeting would probably be held the second week in October, and a definite date would be provided as soon as possible.

**VII. Communication to the City Commission**

None.

**VIII. Old/New Business**

None.

**IX. Adjournment**

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

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