

**APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
OCTOBER 27, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.**

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>May 2010 - April 2011</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	P	3	2
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	A	4	1
Jessie Adderley	P	4	1
Phyllis Berry	P	3	2
Ron Centamore	P	5	0
Alan Gabriel	P	4	1
Mickey Hinton	P	3	2
Bradley Hubert	P	5	0
Brice Lambrix	P	4	0
Steve Lucas	A	4	1
Doug Sterner	P	4	1
John Wilkes	P	3	2
Samuel Williams	P	3	1

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
Thomasina Turner Diggs, CRA
Bob Wojcik, CRA
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

1. Progresso Pointe Park Impact Fee Waiver/Funding Request. Motion was made by Mr. Centamore and seconded by Mr. Williams to request allocation of park impact fees for this project, with an amendment by Mr. Wilkes that the dollars be allocated within proximity or within the CRA boundaries. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Trammell Crow Project Street Lights. Motion was made by Mr. Lambrix and seconded by Mr. Centamore to request the CRA Board of Directors require City staff to indicate a firm time line for the installation of these street lights. The motion passed unanimously.

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 thirteen appointed members to the Committee, which means seven would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes from September 22, 2010

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2010 meeting.

Ms. Berry noted the following corrections:

- P.3, paragraph 1: correct "TRA" to TMA;
- P.4, paragraph 4: correct spelling of Mr. Hubert's name; correct "Mr." Berry to Ms. Berry.

In a voice vote, the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.

III. TMA NW Circulator Funding Request – Deferred from September 22, 2010

Mr. Battle recalled that at the previous meeting, the funding request for \$30,000 was deferred so the Board could gain further understanding of how the trolley wraps might specifically benefit the CRA as part of its advertising campaign. Staff was asked to consider how they might measure the efficiency and effectiveness of the campaign in relation to whether or not the Board chose to support the funding request.

From a Staff perspective, the next step would be to enter into an agreement with the TMA with respect to the structure and methodology of how the wraps would be funded, and what would be measured on an annual basis to be reported back to the Board. Measurement goals, initiatives, and recommendations would be identified in the agreement with the TMA. Mr. Battle concluded that Staff is open to the Board's suggestions and remains supportive of this kind of investment, as it provides a non-traditional marketing effort and circulates through heavily traveled areas in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sterner asked how the trolley wrap campaign would compare to advertising on a County bus. Ms. Berry replied that some costs are "in line" with County advertising: for example, on a County bus, the advertising vendor charges \$5500 for artwork, design, installation, and removal. She said the \$20,000 advertising

fee was reasonable, but other costs were not. She pointed out that the bus is a 40 ft. vehicle that is visible "for most of the day" seven days a week.

While she did not have an issue with the concept of the campaign, Ms. Berry felt the Board needs more information, which should be spelled out as part of any agreement. She stated that the proposed contract is for one year, and the advertiser must be assured that they will get the full value of their investment. While normally the advertiser knows "what you want to sell," in this case she felt the Board was not certain what they were selling, which made it more difficult to determine the best possible form of advertising.

Chair Ferber asked Patricia Zeiler, Managing Director of the Transportation Management Association (TMA), to address some of the issues Ms. Berry had raised. Ms. Zeiler said the TMA uses the same vendor as Broward County Transit. She explained that the total of \$30,000 was because she did not know which graphics the Board would elect to use. She provided a copy of the possible concepts, which included highlighting specific accomplishments to be presented to the neighborhood, as well as activities the Board plans for the future, contact information, and other programs in place for businesses.

Mr. Hubert suggested that there may be local businesses without capital for advertising who might be assisted by the Board. He pointed out that this would be helpful for the entire target area, and could possibly attract more businesses.

Mr. Williams asked to know the advertising budget. Mr. Battle said it is \$50,000; the \$30,000 for the proposed campaign would come from the operating budget as approved, but reserve funds could also be used to help cover any unanticipated expenses.

Mr. Williams observed that there is usually a target audience for any advertising, and said he assumed this target audience would be an investor who would be willing to come into the CRA and make an investment, such as purchasing property. He felt that bus wrap advertising would be "a good reminder of a product that's already out there," but would have a broad approach as opposed to a target-specific one.

Mr. Lambrix agreed with Mr. Williams, and stated if the Board is targeting developers to bring them into the area, he did not feel bus advertising would be the most effective campaign. He said if there was "product available or coming online," such as when specific developments were being built, bus advertising would be more effective; however, there is currently nothing in the pipeline.

Ms. Berry said she felt it is a matter of who would be best reached by bus advertising. If the Board wanted to alert the community that reconstruction is

occurring on Sistrunk Boulevard, for example, the buses would reach people who would be affected by the development. If the target is to bring developers into the CRA, however, she agreed it was not an appropriate mechanism. She stated the Board must decide what they want to sell and who would be the best target for this form of advertising.

Chair Ferber said it seemed the starting point of the conversation was whether or not the TMA route was “a good thing in and of itself.” He noted that advertising has been identified as a way to “plug” the operating shortfall for the circulator bus, and one question before the Board was whether this was an appropriate method to meet that shortfall.

He said Mr. Lambrix’s point was another important consideration: if the target was a national development company, for instance, they would use other sources to become aware of the CRA instead of bus advertising. On the other hand, he said Ms. Berry’s point was also well taken, and the advertising could be used to “spread a good word in the community” regarding reconstruction in the area.

With regard to measuring results, Chair Ferber said it may not be critical to establish a methodology for spreading a good word about the CRA. If advertising goes out into national newspapers to bring in development interests, however, it could be more appropriate to determine how to measure results. He also recalled that the TMA had first requested a grant from the Board; when the grant was not made, they asked that the CRA consider advertising.

Mr. Gabriel said the discussion seemed to have moved away from the intent of the project, which was to help the community. He did not feel it was necessary to bring new partners into the community, but to “get the community functioning” and make existing businesses and users of the bus system aware that the CRA is operating “in a positive light.” He concluded that he would recommend the campaign for the purpose of promoting businesses that are in the CRA now.

Mr. Sterner commented that he would like to see a draft contract to review. In addition, he noted the expense would be three-fifths of the CRA’s advertising budget, and asked if there was any other advertising plan for the CRA besides this one.

Mr. Battle replied that Staff does a good deal of direct mail, and attends conferences and events to make contacts for development opportunities. He said there is no coordinated plan to be executed on an annual basis: dollars are put into the budget for different types of advertising or promotional material.

He addressed Mr. Sterner's concern regarding the contract, stating that Staff is requesting for "your conceptual approval of spending some money." The City Commission must authorize Staff to negotiate a contract; if this is done, they can bring the contract back to a Board meeting for review. Further approval by the Board is required as well before this step can be taken.

He concluded that the mission before the Board was "to support something that the community uses to inform them of the good work" going on in the CRA. While the proposed campaign might not attract larger developers, there would be further "penetration of our brand [and] our product" inside the neighborhood.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Hubert, to approve the recommendation of Staff, which includes the funding of the two promotional bus routes, contingent upon the review and approval of the agreement for advertising by the Board.

In a voice vote, the **motion** failed (Mr. Lambrix, Ms. Adderly, Mr. Hinton, Ms. Berry, Mr. Wilkes, and Mr. Williams dissenting; Mr. Lucas abstained from voting).

IV. Funding Request – Progresso Pointe Park Impact Fee Waiver / Funding Request

Mr. Battle explained this was a request from Reliance Housing to cover the costs associated with park impact fees required for the development of this project within the CRA. The park in question is located on Andrews Avenue, and approximately \$21 million in spending is anticipated for the total project, including land acquisition. The project has received a contribution from Broward County, as well as federal stimulus funding. The request is for \$142,500, which would cover all park impact fees for the project, as all 76 units are affordable housing units.

He provided the members with a chart showing what is provided for similar projects by the Board on an annual basis.

Mr. Battle introduced Nectaria Chakas of Lochrie & Chakas, and Sandra Seals, Vice President of Community Development for Reliance Housing Foundation.

Motion made by Mr. Centamore, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the project as presented.

Mr. Wilkes asked if Ms. Chakas or Ms. Seals had spoken to anyone at the Parks and Recreation Department regarding the specific contribution of park impact fees. Ms. Chakas said this would be regulated by the City's Park Impact Fee Ordinance. Mr. Wilkes explained that his intent was to see that funds contributed

by the Board would come back into the neighborhood. He asked that this be an addendum to the **motion**. Chair Ferber added that the **motion** could also be a communication to the City Commission.

Mr. Wilkes noted that the backup materials referred to final approval by the Florida Housing Board. Ms. Seals said this approval was given on October 22, 2010.

Mr. Centamore accepted the following **amendment** to his **motion**: that dollars be allocated within proximity or within the CRA boundaries.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. Director's Report

Mr. Battle called the members' attention to the map provided as part of the trolley project presentation, stating that at the last meeting, an update was provided on various activities and projects since 2005. The map shows where money has been spent. Additional backup includes a list of projects and their locations throughout the CRA, and the total value of assistance provided.

He noted that the Sistrunk project was awarded to a contractor in July; the contractor is now working toward the beginning of the project, and a construction manager has been hired. The contract will require the construction manager to deal with day-to-day decisions, resolve issues, and organize meetings with business and property owners in the community to keep them apprised of the project. There will also be dedicated members of City Staff, including a project manager, engineer, inspectors, and a public outreach representative.

Ms. Berry asked if there is public outreach advertising money to promote where offices will be located. Mr. Battle replied there is a marketing outreach program, as well as a web page with information, and there will be a hotline number and mailbox available. The public outreach representative will be responsible for handling these calls.

He continued that a CRA Board Workshop will be held on November 9, 2010. The Beach CRA would also like to meet with the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA for a workshop on January 25, 2011 at 7:00 p.m., most likely to be held at the Mizell Center.

Mr. Williams asked if the Board should "have some structure" to their meetings with the City Commission, stating that he was uncertain about requesting a meeting without having an agenda, and perhaps not concluding the meeting with the information they want. Chair Ferber said the board serves as a resource for

elected officials, and he felt the members should be deferential to any goals or agenda that the City Commission might have. The Board would then offer suggestions and information.

Mr. Battle continued that the Eula Johnson project was awarded to a contractor the previous Tuesday, and construction will begin soon. He estimated this would occur on a quick time frame, as this project is renovation of an existing structure.

The Northwest neighborhood enhancements are ongoing. As of today, curbing, sidewalk and lighting were being installed. Mr. Williams felt this project was roughly three weeks from completion. Part of Flagler Park is also under construction. The Housing Authority and Carlisle Development are completing the Northwest Gardens Street Project, which involves replacement of the Allen Apartments and renovation of apartments off NW 10 Avenue.

Mr. Battle recalled that the Board had approved funds for a small infill project with DeAngelo Development some months ago. The first duplexes of these projects have been finished.

The Northwest Commercial Project site plan was approved by the Planning and Zoning Board the previous week. Mr. Sterner added that the developer had presented “a significantly... improved site plan” that would put more activity on the street. He concluded that the developer had taken the CRA’s concerns into consideration and moved more in the direction of an “urban village” environment.

VI. Communication to CRA Board

Mr. Wilkes said he would like his earlier **motion** regarding park impact fees within proximity of the CRA to be a communication to the CRA Board. He restated the **motion** as follows: that the Board would make a contribution or waiver toward the required fees, whether it be park impact fees or others, and that consideration be given, standing Ordinances to the contrary, that those funds be allocated and used within the CRA area.

Mr. Williams **seconded** the restated **motion**. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Ferber referred to the street lights at the Trammel Crow projects on NE 4 and 5 Avenue, stating that he had been disappointed to learn the arrival and installation of these street lights was not imminent. The City Engineer will have to “start from scratch” to walk the site and locate the lights, apply for permits, and put out an RFP.

Mr. Lambrix made the following **motion**: that the Advisory Board request of City Staff, and request of the CRA Board that they require City Staff, to indicate a firm timeline for the installation of these lights.

Mr. Centamore **seconded** the **motion**.

Mr. Wilkes recalled that the Board had agreed to contribute funds toward the cost of the lights, and the City Commission had agreed to fund the lights, possibly up to one year ago. He asked if an independent party could do the work on the lights for the same dollar amount it would cost for City Staff to perform the work. Mr. Battle explained that the project "could not connect up to the developer's work that was finished" and had to be done as a stand-alone project, which required that it be advertised and put out for bid.

Mr. Battle said a third party has been hired to do the design and permitting so the project can go out. He stated the timeline was in progress, and Staff is trying to move forward with this project as quickly as possible. Chair Ferber said while he understood that City Staff had "a lot on their plate," the project in question was critical.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

VII. Old / New Business

None.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

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