

**APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FEBRUARY 28, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	May 2010 - April 2011	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	6	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	5	2
Jessie Adderley	A	4	3
Phyllis Berry	A	3	4
Ron Centamore	P	6	1
Alan Gabriel	P	5	2
Mickey Hinton (3:35)	P	4	3
Bradley Hubert	A	6	1
Brice Lambrix (3:27)	P	6	0
Doug Sterner	P	5	2
John Wilkes	A	3	3
Samuel Williams	P	5	1

Currently there are 12 appointed members to the Board, which means 7 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

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

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Vice Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was not yet present.

Mr. Battle explained that former Chair Michael Ferber has resigned from the Board. He suggested that the Board proceed with today's meeting although a

quorum was not present, as the change in meeting time and date could have contributed to the lack of quorum.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

V. Director's Report

Mr. Battle provided the Board members with a copy of the Sistrunk Project Status Report #2. He recalled that the project is divided into four sections. Construction is presently underway in sections 1 and 4, which are the western and eastern edges of the project. The demolition phase of the project has occurred quickly, and conversations with the construction manager, contractor, and other members of the project team show that the work continues to proceed at a fast pace. He noted that this could change when the project moves into its next phase.

Mr. Battle continued that the south side of section 1 has been demolished and the curb, planter beds, and pavers are in progress. In section 4, there are more underground utilities, which require more activity in the field. The project team decided to demolish "as much as possible" and rebuild it right away, as it is inefficient to have only one lane of traffic operating.

On Friday, February 25, the project began to move into section 2, which is the between 19 Avenue and 9 Avenue. Mr. Battle advised that there may be complaints about this section, as it will reduce the flow of traffic to two lanes. A public relations group is part of the construction management team and they will address this issue as necessary. He said they have placed advertisements in the *West Side Gazette* and *Go Riverwalk*, among other publications, to highlight the businesses located in the construction zones and to discuss the project and the CRA in general. Events such as Taste of Sistrunk are planned for the coming months to draw interest to the area and help local businesses that are affected by the construction.

Mr. Lambrix arrived at 3:27 p.m.

Mr. Battle said one recent event was an open house to feature the businesses that are affected by construction, as well as the entire business community. Attendees were given the same presentation that was made to the Board in December, and Staff members from the CRA and from Economic Development were available to answer questions about general opportunities. Two sessions were held, one in the morning and another in the afternoon, which brought approximately 100 businesses to the event. These open houses will be held every other month as construction continues.

Mr. Williams commended Mr. Battle's office for the work they have done to help the small businesses that are affected by construction. He asked if any public service announcements could be made on local radio stations to suggest alternate routes of travel, particularly in the two-lane areas. Mr. Battle said part of the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) process is to provide various media outlets with traffic advisories. He said he would look into ways to facilitate getting this information out.

He said another part of the process was becoming familiar with a lot of small businesses that the CRA was not familiar with before the project began. These businesses comprised roughly 50% of the attendees at the recent workshop. He advised that Staff has spoken with some of the proprietors to help them grow their businesses, apply for grants, or improve their business plans. He concluded that the construction project has provided an opportunity to talk with several business owners with whom the CRA had had no previous contact.

Mr. Hinton arrived at 3:35 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from October 27 and December 8, 2010

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to approve the minutes of the October 27, 2010 meeting as amended.

Mr. Sterner noted that no quorum had been present for the December 8, 2010 meeting, and asked if the minutes would be considered official in that case. It was noted that in the absence of a quorum the minutes may be considered notes. Mr. Battle said he would look into this and determine how to address the minutes of the December 8 meeting, which would be brought back before the Board at a later time.

Mr. Sterner noted the following corrections to the October 27 minutes:

- P.6: change "Beach CRA" to "CRA Board;"
- P.7: change "...created an urban village environment" to "moved the project more in the direction of an urban village environment."

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

III. Nomination and Election of Chairperson

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel to nominate Ms. Phillips for Chair. Ms. Phillips declined to accept the nomination.

Motion made by Mr. Centamore, seconded by Mr. Sterner, to nominate Mr. Lucas for Chair. In a voice vote, Mr. Lucas was unanimously elected Chair.

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Centamore, to nominate Ms. Phillips for Vice Chair. In a voice vote, Ms. Phillips was unanimously re-elected.

IV. Update on Joint Workshop

Mr. Battle recalled that the two previous dates for the joint workshop had been cancelled. He is trying to work with the Mayor and the City Commission to schedule a new date in April. The meeting will be held at the Mizell Center at 7 p.m. on the second or fourth Tuesday in April.

Mr. Williams asked how the joint workshop was expected to go. Mr. Battle, using the Commission's recent workshop with the Beach CRA as an example, said Staff would provide an overview of the agency from a historical perspective, as well as its financial position, both in the past and projected forward for "a number of years." This would include both funds dedicated to projects and reserve funds. The City Commission had also wanted to know what could be expected on an annual Tax Increment Financing (TIF) revenue basis. This also meant what could be done with this money and whether or not any of the plans could be accelerated.

He said the process for his own presentation to the City Commission would be to explain the CRA's purpose, actions, and financial position; it would also include everything they have accomplished since 2005. Photographs of these accomplishments would be plotted on a map to show the CRA's impact on the community. The presentation would also include projects currently in the pipeline, and initiatives discussed by the Board such as streetscapes and small business investments in "neighborhoods that don't exist right now." The final part of the presentation would be to give the City Commission an idea of how the CRA can conduct some of its business in the next five years and in following years until 2025.

He encouraged the Board to submit any questions or comments to him if they would like them included in the presentation.

Mr. Williams asked if there was a great deal of dialogue at the Beach CRA/City Commission meeting. Mr. Battle said the Mayor ensured every member of the Beach CRA and the City Commission had the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Centamore asked if the City Commission had laid out any visions for the Beach CRA. Mr. Battle said the Beach CRA's capital improvement-driven plan included a list of specific projects, many of which are not complete. A lot of discussion focused on these projects and whether or not funds should be allocated to all of them. He pointed out that the Beach CRA has recently

discussed funding events, while there is nothing in the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA plan that addresses expenses for events. They are primarily a small business-driven CRA as opposed to a tourism-driven CRA such as the Beach.

Mr. Williams said he was concerned that the original vision and goals for the CRA date back a few years, and there is now “a different set of players” discussing these goals. He hoped that the current plan is viable in the eyes of the City Commission members, and that there is no desire to use CRA funds in another way. Mr. Battle said he hoped to show that this was not the time to “shift” the original goals.

VI. Communication to CRA Board

None.

VII. Old / New Business

Mr. Battle recalled that the Board had previously discussed zoning, particularly with regard to parking changes in the CRA. He said he was disappointed with some of these results, and would present how he hoped to deal with these changes to the City Commission at the upcoming joint meeting. The situation at FAT Village was particularly frustrating, as it was not clear how this work was going to progress. Thus far no money has been spent on a report for this project by the consultant because it is not clear to the property owner whether or not the change would work.

Mr. Lucas asked if the report by the consultant could be solicited by Mr. Battle’s office. Mr. Battle explained that he was not certain how the report should be funded if the property owner did not participate.

Mr. Williams observed that seeking a parking variance along the Sistrunk corridor would at least be an investment in parking reduction studies. Mr. Battle said the property owner wants to lease space for his properties, but no progress can be made until he funds a study to “get the ball rolling.”

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

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