

**SPECIAL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
Meeting Minutes
November 8, 2004- 4:00 P.M.
City of Fort Lauderdale
100 North Andrews Avenue
8th Floor Conference Room**

Economic Development Advisory Board	Current Meeting	Cumulative Attendance*	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
<u>MEMBERS</u>			
Pat Du Mont, Chair	P	4	0
Ruchel Louis, Vice Chair	A	3	1
Alan Forgea	P	1	3
Michael F. McGinn	A	0	4
Andy Mittelman	A	1	3
Cort Neimark	P	4	0
Tim Schiavone	A	1	3
Gwen Watson	A	1	3
Robert Boyd	P	1	0
Gerrie Washington	P	1	0
Mark Budwig	P	2	0
Total Members Present	6		

Staff

Marisol Lotito, NCIP/BCIP
Hal Barnes, NCIP/BCIP
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Clerk

Guests

Marty Sullivan, Galt Ocean Shoppes
Larry Black, Galt Ocean Shoppes
Alan Hooper, Flagler Village Improvement Association
Brien Mastriana, Flagler Village Improvement Association
Peter Feldner, Flagler Village Improvement Association
Jim Ellis, Flagler Village Improvement Association

I. Call to Order

Chair Du Mont called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Board members introduced themselves in turn. Two new members were present for the first time: Ms. Gerrie Washington and Mr. Robert Boyd.

**II. Presentation on Business Capital Improvement Program (BCIP)
Marisol Lotito BCIP/NCIP**

Ms. Lotito announced that the Board will hear application presentations for the Business Capital Improvement Program. Presentations will last five minutes and Board members will then have ten minutes to ask questions of the applicants. Ms. Lotito will appear before the City Commission in December and make her recommendations, and applicants will be informed by phone and mail regarding the status of their applications.

**III. Presentation of Business Capital Improvement Programs (BCIP)
Applicant Presentations - BCIP Applicants**

Flagler Village Improvement Association

Mr. Alan Hooper explained that the local merchants and landowners were working to band and improve this neighborhood. Their slogan was, "We are the neighborhood. Downtown." The area comprised 125 acres between the FEC railroad tracks and Federal Highway, east to west, and from Broward Boulevard to Sears Town, north to south. Future improvements included: new streets, sidewalks and landscaping. Their BCIP project was to install neighborhood signage; a strategic marketing program was already under way.

Mr. Hooper presented design prototypes for the signs and displayed a map of the proposed sites for the posts. Originally, banner posts had been proposed, but Ms. Lotito had suggested a more permanent structure. This particular design included banner arms that could be customized as needed. The posts cost \$2,500 each; the Flagler Village Improvement Association wanted to install twenty of them, using the grant money from the BCIP to cover half the cost and covering the other half themselves.

Ms. Lotito asked Mr. Hooper if they would be open to design change suggestions from her; Mr. Hooper stated that he would. There was discussion regarding the placement of the signs: Mr. Hooper stated they intended to start using the signs on the perimeter of the area and in the future they would install them in the interior. A monument entrance was also planned for the future.

Ms. Lotito confirmed with Mr. Hooper that he would provide copies of the Association's latest meeting minutes.

Galt Ocean Shoppes

Mr. Larry Black, Vice President of the Galt Ocean Village Improvement Association, described their plan to increase the visibility of their neighborhood. They wished to install signage on A1A and lighting on the four streets where restaurants and shops are located.

The Il Lugano condominium, currently under construction at the south end of the neighborhood, had agreed to provide funding for some electrical work on 34th Street. The Association wanted the BCIP grant to install lighting on the center two streets north of Il Lugano.

Mr. Black confirmed that the plan called for an electrical system to power “up lights” for existing trees, decorative crosswalks, and signage. The electrical system could be tapped into at holiday time to light displays as well. Mr. Barnes stated that this additional functional would require the addition of a junction box. This would add little to the original estimate.

Ms. Lotito stated that based on the budget, there was not enough money for the pavers. Staff recommended adding landscaping to the entryway feature for now. Two entry monuments with wing walls were included as well, one on 32nd and one on 33rd. The one on 31st was a monument type. Ms. Lotito explained staff’s estimated project budget:

- \$30,000 for the electrical conduits for lights on the two streets, not to go west of 32nd Avenue
- \$5,000 for an electrical consultant
- \$15,000 for each monument
- \$15,000 for the 2 wing walls
- \$800 for advertising and printing
- \$10,000 to pay for ground cover for the main corridors; this included irrigation and landscaping
- Additional fees for FPL

This was a total of \$125,000. Ms. Lotito confirmed that the Association had received \$100,000 from a developer to use toward this project. She reminded Mr. Black that she required current letters of support from the Association’s Board, and copies of the Board’s minutes in which this project was discussed and motions for the project approved.

Mr. Neimark confirmed that this was part of the area’s existing master plan.

IV. Discussion of BCIP Presentations

Ms. Lotito distributed the project score sheets to be completed by the Board members. Ms. Lotito had also passed out overview paperwork describing each project’s challenges and staff recommendations.

For the Galt project, staff recommended staying east of 32nd Avenue and removing the brick paver cross walks from the project.

Regarding the Flagler Village project, Mr. Neimark noted that he liked the idea, but felt it was more of an NCIP project as it led into a residential neighborhood. Ms. Lotito explained that this association claimed the same boundaries as a neighborhood association and it was becoming a mixed-use community. The Flagler Village Improvement Association had worked closely with the neighborhood association and they also wanted the signage. Staff's concern was with the placement of the signs; they felt there were already many distractions on Federal Highway and signs located there might lack the impact they might have if installed on 3rd Avenue, Flagler or Andrews. Staff recommended using the signs on the main corridors within the community, along 5th and 6th Streets.

Mr. Budwig felt they did not need so many signs. Mr. Forgea thought the signs should be placed in the heart of the community, along 3rd Avenue, 6th Street, and Andrews, and that 6th Street and Federal highway was a good spot for a monument. Ms. Lotito pointed out that both the EDAB and staff were recommending that the locations for the signs be changed. They also discussed using poles that included street names and did not have banner arms.

Mr. Barnes advised that Ms. Lotito would control the pole location, installation and administration of the full grant; the Flagler Village Improvement Association could not decide themselves where the poles would be installed. Mrs. DuMont confirmed with Ms. Lotito that the EDAB could specify that 12 to 20 signs would be funded, based on staff recommendations and the field conditions staff worked with. Mrs. DuMont pointed out that Ms. Lotito had actually walked the area and the Board had faith in her ability to determine appropriate placement for the poles and monuments. Ms. Lotito stated that she would recommend to the City Commission that the locations would be reviewed for viability and note that the poles would be installed in key locations in the community.

Ms. Lotito offered to explain the application rate sheet to help the Board complete it. They began with the Flagler Village project. She advised that the first 5 questions should be agreed upon by the entire Board; the others were for each member to score individually. Ms. Lotito went through the list of questions:

1. The project was eligible for funds as proposed today. The original banner design was not, and Ms. Lotito recommended entering 25 points for this item.
2. Applicant had completed all sections of applications and adequately defined the scope to proceed with the design if approved. Based on the information provided, the Board agreed that they had not, and gave the project 0 points.
3. Had the association ever obtained funding before? They had not, so Ms. Lotito recommended giving 25 points.

4. Were there any applications outstanding? There were not, and Ms. Lotito recommended giving 0 points.
5. Was all required documentation supplied? Ms. Lotito had not received all needed documentation, so she recommended giving 10 points.
6. Concept feasibility, to be rated from 1 to 10. Ms. Lotito said staff felt project design feasibility was very high, but the budget needed to be adjusted to include the contingency, advertising and printing. The Board made these recommendations: allow \$3,000 per pole, for a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 15 poles, \$ 1,000 for printing and advertising and a \$ 4,000 contingency. The poles should also have the street names on them instead of the banner arms.
7. Location feasibility, to be rated from 1 to 10. Ms. Lotito recommend the poles be concentrated on Northeast 3rd Avenue, North Andrews Avenue, and 6th Street and some main focal points within the community, and she would inspect the area to determine exact placement feasibility.
8. Project's immediate and positive impact on the City of Ft. Lauderdale and the business community.
9. Does project meet the BCIP program's objectives and goals; can it be facilitated within 12 months? Does it improve the quality of life of residents and/or merchants? Does it preserve a positive image of Ft. Lauderdale? Each of these points was graded from 1 to 10.
10. Association's maintenance history. Since this association had never had a project before, the score was 0.
11. Project concept will complement surrounding area existing or pending projects.
12. There were no partnerships outside the City and the association, so the score was 0.
13. The association demonstrated they had sufficient matching funds. Flagler had not brought that information today, so this question must be determined later on.
14. Applicant attended the meeting and made a five-minute presentation. Yes, but they did not get additional points for attending the workshops.

For the Galt Ocean Shoppes project the Board scored as follows:

1. The project was eligible for funds as proposed today. Ms. Lotito recommended entering 25 points for this item.
2. Applicant had completed all sections of applications and adequately defined the scope to proceed with the design if approved. As with the previous project, based on the information provided, the Board agreed that they had not, and gave the project 0 points.
3. Had the association ever obtained funding before? They had previously received 2 grants, so Ms. Lotito recommended giving 15 points.
4. Were there any applications outstanding? There were not, and Ms. Lotito recommended giving 0 points.
5. Was all required documentation supplied? Ms. Lotito had not received all needed documentation, so she recommended giving 10 points.

6. Concept feasibility, to be rated from 1 to 10. Ms. Lotito and staff had determined project design feasibility was good.
7. Location feasibility, to be rated from 1 to 10.
8. Project's immediate and positive impact on the City of Ft. Lauderdale and the business community.
9. Does project meet the BCIP program's objectives and goals; can it be facilitated within 12 months? Does it improve the quality of life of residents and/or merchants? Does it preserve a positive image of Ft. Lauderdale? Each of these points was graded from 1 to 10.
10. Association's maintenance history. Since this association had never had this type of project before, the score was 0.
11. Project concept will complement surrounding area existing or pending projects.
12. There were no partnerships outside the City and the association, so the score was 0.
13. The association demonstrated they had sufficient matching funds. Flagler had provided this information.
14. Applicant attended the meeting and made a five-minute presentation. Yes, but they did not get additional points for attending the workshops.

V. Old/New Business

Mrs. DuMont thanked Ms. Lotito and Mr. Barnes for their work on the projects and asked what the Board could do to encourage more participation in the community. Ms. Lotito felt the EDAB could help educate the business owners and to make them aware of Ms. Lotito's department, which would advise them on how to create associations and apply for project funding. The EDAB's Economic Summit could also be used to inform the business community about the program. She noted that an administrative assistant position had been approved for her program and she would soon have much more time to devote to public relations.

Mr. Barnes thanked Ms. Lotito and her staff for helping the Flagler Village Improvement Association and the Galt Ocean Shoppes to get their applications in order. Mrs. DuMont wanted to be sure that Ms. Silver Lee, the staff person for Economic Development, send Ms. Lotito's program brochure to EDAB board members.

Mrs. DuMont and Ms. Louis had met with City Manager George Gretsas in October about hiring a new staff person for Economic development. None had been selected yet. The EDAB December meeting was contingent upon whether that staff appointment had been made by then.

Thereupon the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Handouts:

- 1, Project summaries for Flagler Village Improvement Association and the Galt Ocean Shoppes applications