



**Deerfield Beach Community Redevelopment Agency
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, September 13, 2011, 6:30 P.M.
City Commission Chambers, Deerfield Beach City Hall

The meeting was called to order by Chair Noland at 6:30 p.m. on the above date in the City Commission Chambers, City Hall.

Roll Call:

Present: Mr. Bill Ganz
Mr. Joseph Miller
Mr. Ben Preston
Vice Chair Martin Popelsky
Chair Peggy Noland

Also Present: Burgess Hanson, City Manager
Andrew Maurodis, City Attorney
Samantha Gillyard, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 6:33:50

August 16, 2011

MOTION was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Ganz to approve the August 16, 2011 minutes as submitted.

Voice Vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 6:34:01

September 13, 2011

MOTION was made by Mr. Miller and second by Mr. Preston to approve the September 13, 2011 agenda as submitted.

Voice Vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

GENERAL ITEMS

ITEM 1

DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 6:34:13

**PRESENTATION OF THE URBAN LAND INSTITUTE
REGARDING REDEVELOPMENT OF THE COVE/SULLIVAN
PARK AREA**

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Keven Klopp, CRA Director, introduced Chuck Bohl, Director of Real Estate & Development and Urbanism/Chair of the Technical Advisory Panel by the Urban Land Institute, who will present information regarding Sullivan Park.

Mr. Bohl provided an overview of the technical assistance panels. He said that none of the individuals have a stake in the subject area, nor are they paid for their services, but have been brought together because of their expertise, i.e. parking, landscape architecture, or development issues. He said that these are top notch individuals from their fields and are a pleasure to work with.

About the TAP - Mr. Bohl said that all the panelists were able to review the information provided by Staff and contributed their findings to the report. Thereafter, he quoted Mr. Klopp regarding the technical assistance panels.

Study area and context - Mr. Bohl outlined the study area and highlighted features and the study area in the City, i.e. Sullivan Park, Intracoastal, high rise residential, low rise residential, gray surface area, characterized as gray field as there is so much surface parking throughout the sites. He said the green area is not very refined and is an unrealized asset.

Cove Area - Mr. Bohl outlined the area south of Hillsboro as the Cove area.

Questions 1, 2, & 3 - Mr. Bohl addressed various questions from the citizens. With regard to improvements at Sullivan Park, Mr. Bohl said that these sites are linked and the way the CRA functions to enhance and improve development generates funds to be used for other projects within the CRA. He said that the challenge is determining how to unlock better development potential for the site that can then be used for enhancing other areas, such as Sullivan Park. He continued to address questions received from citizens. He said that parking is a critical factor in terms of unlocking the potential for this site going forward.

COD - Mr. Bohl said that the team first reviewed the parcels and ownership. The focus was on the eastern portion along the Intracoastal, which involves two (2) property owners for these parcels. There have been things happening on the western portion of the site, but some of the ideas, as you move forward with the eastern portion, could influence what happens in the western portion. Their focus was along the Intracoastal and Hillsboro Boulevard.

Opportunities & Issues - Mr. Bohl said that various opportunities and issues were identified for the area; i.e. waterfront location on the Intracoastal, connectivity and a better opportunity to connect to Sullivan Park, only two (2) property owners to work with, and the CRA capacity to facilitate changes. The issues include parking, the development concerns; many of these concerns are centered around the idea of community character and quality of life issues.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Scenarios and Alternatives Considered - Mr. Bohl said that the most basic scenario was a single story scenario which would require approximately 65% surface parking; of the land, about 2/3 of these sites would have to be surface parking and about 1/3 left for buildings. He said that this is not recommended, but outlines the limitations.

Cove Village/Marine Village Scenarios - Mr. Bohl said that they looked at the 2006 Cove Master Plan and adopted some of the ideas of the village character. However, the Master Plan is validated through citizen meetings. One of the scenarios includes having smaller scale buildings developed along the Intracoastal, and around the basin. The development potential is unlocked through the addition of a parking structure; which takes the place of the 66% surface area that would be required for parking. This is the only way to unlock development potential on these sites; otherwise, the lands would have to be paved, with one story buildings, without much development potential. Additionally, marine village scenario ties in with the site because it hugs the Intracoastal; instead of east/west, north/south. The connections along the Intracoastal have been studied and a master plan was done for Palm Beach County for a series of marine villages, each unique to its own municipality. The Master Plan encompasses 43 miles and includes 23 municipalities. Each one is envisioned as the jewel of each community as you travel along the Intracoastal. The City has a potential to be linked to that; and the site can be considered as a way to change the orientation from only cars and highways to thinking about the uniqueness of the Intracoastal location, which is the great amenity of the site to leverage.

Cove Village/Parking Estimates - Mr. Bohl said that the developers looked at how much square footage could be developed, as well as how many parking spaces would be required under different scenario. He then highlighted sketches.

Two Alternatives Considered - Mr. Bohl said that the alternatives are very similar, but they strongly recommended a more robust market study to see what the market would support on the site. The alternative is a modest mix of some commercial, a few wet slips, restaurant, and 18 dwelling units that would take advantage of the location and the ability to be a bit more intense than the single story. The difference between the top and bottom is that you have about 35% less commercial space in the bottom and less parking. The majority of the mix in both scenarios is for a mix of restaurants.

Deerfield Beach Marine Village Scenario - Mr. Bohl presented a refined version of the marine village scenario. He outlined some of the concepts; limited amount to push the garage back to Hillsboro. He said by giving up a little of the right away, but maintaining access, you can fit the garage footprint in and still wind it so it is not just a dead space or big ugly garage. He outlined another concept that is lined with retail shops. All the scenarios recommend maintaining public access to the Intracoastal, as well as envisioning a much more enhanced connection to Sullivan Park.

Marine Village Recommendations - Mr. Bohl said that the team recommended using the right of way, be flexible in terms of accommodating the garage footprint and accessing it. He highlighted the access of the garage being wrapped around. Mr. Bohl also commented on the carryout parking garage feasibility analysis; there is much that

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

needs to be understood in terms of how parking is used on the overall site, who's using it, when, and for what. He said that the team's parking expert has a series of recommendations; and is willing to come back and review how parking is being handled on this site, in relation to a variety of users. Although there is a strong recommendation to negotiate with primary property owner of the site for the proposed parking structure; there are a variety of strategies for this negotiation that can be pursued; however, there are more details in the report. All scenarios should require public access to the waterfront that connects with the passage way to the park. He explained that you can have a building with public access.

Parking Recommendations - Mr. Bohl said that a comprehensive parking study is needed to understand how space is used and what the turnover is like. He said that one Commissioner attended one of the public meetings and said that there was an upscale restaurant interested in the Cove and parking requirements killed it. He said it is a situation where many communities are being proactive and trying to attract certain restaurants or grocery stores and they are changing the Code to make it happen. Therefore, there is a strong recommendation to revisit the Code requirement, the parking ratio adjustments, and allowances for shared parking. Notwithstanding, there are a lot of recommendations to consider for parking.

Line the Parking Garage - Mr. Bohl reiterated the recommendation for lining the garage. The garage will be critical; it is a prerequisite for unlocking the development potential for the site. Without a garage, there will be a lot of surface parking. He said the garage really needs to be lined; the public side will be lined to maintain the walk-able frontage and attractiveness.

Question 4 - Moving on to Sullivan Park - Mr. Bohl said that they looked at the park and adjacent properties on the north side of the bridge, expansion possibilities, refining and realizing the park and what elements that should be contained in a great urban park on the water. He said that they have a landscape architect on the team to assist.

Sullivan Park - Mr. Bohl outlined the physical amenities of the area, Sullivan Park, restaurant, the Chamber, and the connection currently going underneath the bridge. Thereafter, he outlined articles concerning private development. He said that you can be proactive and any additional plans or negotiations done with property developers should maintain public access.

Sullivan Park & Adjacent Parcels - Mr. Bohl said that the only two (2) private parcels are the Riverview plat and Chamber. He said that one team member was involved in the Intracoastal Commission, and has extensive knowledge about what can and cannot be done on the Intracoastal Waterways. He indicated that any changes are very limited to this area, with the exception of some areas where it is protected. Where there is protection, there is a possibility of docks, wet slips, or other amenities. There are limitations as to what you can do, but there are also opportunities. Additionally, there are funds available through the Intracoastal Commission to do creative things, involving access to the island and an eco tourism arrangement.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Sullivan Park Sketch - Mr. Bohl said that this is one scenario to access the water and make the park more interesting. He said that they began looking at how much potential land was available, and if the CRA acquired one or more of the adjacent sites. This would allow you to maintain passive uses, everyday use for residents and locals, a restaurant, modest introduction of places to purchase ice cream, snacks, so that the park is activated and it becomes a little safer. He said that they do not have to agree on these examples, but to find their own examples and identify actual places that they can visit to see what they like. Additionally, the team looked at some ideas that might work for the area; thereafter, he highlighted photos. He also emphasized having a completely passive park to allow for special events.

Question 5 & Conclusions - Mr. Bohl said that this is a fantastic location and could serve as a magnet for residents and visitors to enhance the City's quality of life and create higher economic value for the City and landowners. The next step is to use the capacitors of the CRA to make things happen. He said a lot of communities missed opportunities during the boom. There were a lot of good, potential things that could have happened, but didn't because of the naysayers and foot dragging. The City is fortunate to still have a CRA to make it happen. In California, they are trying to wipe out all development agencies and are close to doing it.

Recommendations - Mr. Bohl said that the panels' recommendations is to work with the two (2) principle property owners to enable equitable redevelopment of the eastern edge of the Cove. He said that this will allow both owners to feel like they are getting development potential of their properties unlocked, but also getting parking needs addressed, access to the waterfront, connections to the park, as well as generating income to put in public enhancements. However, parking is an impediment, as previously noted. Therefore, the garage became a prerequisite for any of the redevelopment scenarios; otherwise, the site cannot be enhanced. Additional recommendations included a retail lined parking garage; undertake a comprehensive market and financial analysis. For the park, a complete master plan is needed for Sullivan Park; support a variety of activities for everyday use as well as a gathering place; transform the underpass to make it a safer place by making it active. Move forward with implementation, focusing on the physical improvements, revisit regulatory provisions on the parking side. In terms of purchasing strategic properties, he said that they reviewed the potential acquisition sites and advised that they need to work out how quickly they want to put things in themselves. The old restaurant site is an outstanding site that would be a great addition to the park, part of it could be used as a restaurant and another part could be used for the park. Mr. Bohl recommended that the Board continue to look into the Chamber of Commerce, which is a keystone in the entire piece. Lastly, he recommended working with the property owners of the other sites to make the garage happen.

Conclusion – Mr. Bohl said that the result will be two signature waterfront assets, a great waterfront park, and a destination marine village that enhances the Cove Shopping Center; which can be the City's jewel. Thereafter, he entertained questions by the Board.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Chair Noland asked about surface parking, whether to leave as is or make more green space, if a garage was built.

Mr. Bohl replied that the surface parking does not allow you to pave much of the eastern portion of the site. If you went with one story buildings on those existing parcels, 2/3 of it would have to be paved. If a structure were built, there would be more public space along the waterfront, the buildings would not be single stories, and would provide more income to do public improvements. He aid that it is a good model when you go back to the western portion; which has a dedicated parking area. Also it is the same idea, if you can replace surface parking with structure parking; you make space available for more parks, gathering places, or buildings.

Mr. Miller asked if the CRA budget was considered with the development of a garage; which is costly. The parcels near Two Georges' is approximately \$3 million, as well as the other property and the Chamber is 100's of thousands. He asked if there is a priority of those things the panel feels is desirable and whether there are any examples of public/private partnerships on garage.

Mr. Bohl replied that there are many examples of public/private partnerships, as it involves a privately owned site that can create leasable space so there is income potential. However, it is not just a garage itself, but also a liner space and other development potential. There is room for negotiation so that one side is not paying for everything and some benefit to be spread across both parties. He said that in order to generate income, the first step must focus on the commercial side. On the Cove side, if you are able to unlock the development potential, that generates funds that could be used for the park side.

Mr. Miller said the least expensive acquisition is the Chamber.

Mr. Bohl said you have to be opportunistic, which depends on what is available, the price, and at what time. However, priority wise for unlocking revenue, the garage and the commercial development will accomplish that; but, it may take a little longer. Additionally, Mr. Bohl said that other properties may be more readily available. He further commented on written communication with the bank that owns the old restaurant site, and their position is that they hope to develop the site to the sky's limit. He said he doesn't think they have specific development intentions for the site; therefore there may be room for negotiation.

Chair Noland agreed that the Board should work with the two (2) property owners, and to also start looking at the Cove parking codes to get people in the building. She asked if it is in the City's best interest to work with the property owners. Furthermore, Chair Noland said that Mr. Bohl stated that a one story building will not bring in enough financing to encourage investing. However, years ago, there was mention of a small hotel being built by the marina and possibly a restaurant, in conjunction with the property owner from the hotel, with the restaurant in the front, on the open parcel. The City should look at what it would do for us in the future as far as rebuilding the Cove

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Shopping Center and the City concentrate on the park. She reiterated that the parking restrictions should be relaxed, as an upscale restaurant was lost. She said that they want \$3 million for the property; however, they have to make a profit if they can build the parking garage, with the businesses underneath, a restaurant in the front, with the possibility of a hotel being over by the Cove Restaurant where it can be intermingled. She asked if that would be sensible, spending less money so that the City can concentrate on the north side.

Mr. Bohl said there are things you can do, an in kind approach to relaxing some of the parking regulations, speed up the permitting process. The garage is tough because the properties are limited themselves, if you want to keep it in the village range of character. Also, the garage would serve other parking needs. There are people using the Cove site for other needs, not just parking. There is a good argument in favor of pursuing the garage, to solve a variety of parking challenges, not just the ones strictly connected to 'x' amount of square footage for a new building.

In response to Mr. Miller's question, Mr. Bohl said that there are a lot of challenges with parking; he outlined various scenarios concerning parking and said that there is a need to understand utilization. Then, to implement a strategy that may mean pricing or spacing so that those who need them for a certain amount of time are not blocked out by people parking there all day long. He said it does not have to be expensive, but there has to be an incentive to have people park in the right places to make it work, to incentivize it.

Chair Noland said that some time ago, parking was a mess and improvements were needed. Although the parking lot is beautiful, not one additional parking space was acquired and we spent almost \$3 million. Previously, money was spent on the shopping center and parking lot.

Andrew Maurodis, City Attorney, said that was a special assessment per an agreement with property owners, it was a joint effort.

Chair Noland said that might be an avenue, to go with the property owners to do the garage. The Board has shown that they are willing to help the property owners, but they should also step up. The north side belongs to all the residents; which is her priority.

Mr. Bohl said the key is to analyze any scenario that involves the creation of a parking structure and the development potential that goes along with it to see what it generates for the City and CRA in terms of any added revenue that can go toward other things. Therefore, you have to get to the equitable outcome and find out which ones would benefit the City and property owners.

Mr. Miller said that the impression he got from some of the public input sessions was for a passive park. Although it does not generate any tax revenue, it would be a nice landmark park. If the Chamber became available and financially feasible, it would almost preclude work on the parking lot, unless it was something privately involved. He

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

asked if a passive park would be financially sustainable as it would cost money to maintain.

Mr. Bohl said that the concept of a marine village is for the Cove site, on the commercial side. On the north side, the only thought is to activate it. The restaurant there in the past was a single restaurant and was not part of a big development. He highlighted different amenities that could be added to provide safety. He said that the panel expanded the uses for passive activities, as many people have different wants; and outlined various facilities that invite people to the area. He said that it is not intended for commercial development but opportunities for refreshments or a snack, and for an occasional community event.

Vice Chair Popelsky asked if the parking problem is only a one day problem. If you go there Friday, you cannot get a spot; however, on the other 6 days, it's open. He said to build another parking garage would be a waste and to build along the water so people can walk will not materialize unless the owners agree, without that, the City cannot move forward. As far as the park, there was a restaurant there at one time; thus, he likes the idea of another restaurant, but the City does not own it. Every time the City mentions a specific area, it gets out of hand and the price becomes outrageous

Mr. Bohl said that it is not currently owned by a developer, but the institution that it went back to. The garage unlocks development potential for other properties that then brings property owners to the table to allow for additional development for participating in that. Also, the garage helps relieve the parking formula; otherwise, they cannot do anything. Furthermore, he said that this fuels the CRA to do other parking improvements.

Chair Noland asked if there are more pictures with tables and chairs.

Mr. Bohl said that there are probably more in the report as well.

Chair Noland said that the people that participated voiced their opinion of what they would like to see. She explained what happened to Fort Riverbend, with the hurricane and fire. The area had trouble at night because there was nothing there and vagrants took over. The only way to curb it was by installing sprinkler systems, which deterred this behavior. She expressed concerns regarding being at the park at night. Years ago, at the Cove Restaurant, the marina was alive, because they rented the slips, then they sold the slips to individuals and the area became dead. Although people still go, it's more of storage. If we are going to invest in Sullivan Park, we have to invest in activity so that there are people and activity there so they are not afraid.

Mr. Bohl said that they did another workshop in Lauderdale-by-the-Sea and there is a basin around the main thoroughfare that is unknown. There is a wooden fence all around it so you cannot see into it. That is unsafe for the boat owners, but if the basin is open and you have tables and chairs, it provides safety, and an amenity.

Vice Chair Popelsky said that there is a similar situation in his district regarding vagrants. Something has to be done first for security in the Sullivan Park area. He said

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

he would like a restaurant, with activity, we would utilize the facility. He further stated that he visited the park during the daytime and would have a picnic, but once the sun went down, he left because it was not safe. He asked if there was an asking price for the property.

Mr. Miller replied \$3 to \$4 million.

Carla Coleman, Executive Director of Urban Land Institute, replied that it is predicated on high rise apartment development which is extremely speculative.

Chair Noland said we have to be lenient in the Cove Parking Lot Center and encourage them to develop, as well as lighten up on parking restrictions.

Mr. Bohl suggested running a scenario on if the garage was to be constructed, what is the return to the CRA and the City.

Chair Noland said that since the City could not allow that restaurant to go in, that the parking restrictions need to be reviewed.

Mr. Bohl agreed.

Chair Noland said that if we decided to build a garage it would take approximately a year or two to construct, leaving the City in the same dilemma.

Mr. Ganz said that the smart way to approach this is not by going out and buying things until you have a plan for it; however, it is hard to create the plan unless you know whether or not you will have the parcels to create the outlay. He asked what the best strategy is, either to come up with the plan and then purchase, or purchase, and then develop the plan.

Mr. Bohl said that you have to be opportunistic and depending on what is available, when and for a price that the City feels is fair, you may have to move on that property, realizing that it is something you may use down the road. In the park, you can establish a sandwich kiosk, without a million dollar building, which puts eyes on the park. He suggested not limiting your vision to acquiring the park because it can be done in phases. Hopefully the Cove side moves forward to help provide funds to make improvements in Sullivan Park. He suggested keeping communication and negotiation open with owners of each parcel; if it sinks in that they cannot build a high rise condominium on that site, the market value created will not be worth it and it will be another property in their portfolio. If they can only do a restaurant, then they may consider getting rid of it at some point.

Chair Noland said that the CRA is in the same position with the appraisal for the Chamber of Commerce. On the Broward County Property Appraiser, the value was approximately \$481,000; however, the building is not ADA compliant, it needs a roof, possible molding. The City would have to spend \$200,000 for mold remediation, and another \$200,000 to retrofit it and use today. Unfortunately, they feel insulted that the

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

CRA will not give them \$400,000 for the property, but it will cost \$600,000. It will either be torn down or retrofitted. Additionally, it was evaluated as office space which placed a larger dollar value on it. She asked Mr. Bohl for guidance on negotiating with the Chamber.

Mr. Bohl said that there is probably room to find a middle ground.

Chair Noland said that she is not trying to be insulting, but these are taxpayer dollars and the City has to be smart in spending them.

Mr. Bohl said that in contrast to the property owner who thinks it's worth \$3 million, you have a property that they believe is worth \$400,000 or \$500,000; thus, there is room to find middle ground, whether it is the CRA Director talking with the Chamber or whomever the negotiator will be. He recommended continuing conversation but not to walk away; as it does not sound like it is in outer space.

Chair Noland reiterated that she is not being insulting to anyone.

In response to Mr. Miller's question, Mr. Bohl replied that they are looking at things like Starbuck's, a place for sandwiches, for the park. If it's something like that we are to go on the Riverview parcel, the vision there is that it is an iconic restaurant that fits the community and is a place to go and sit down, have a meal, and a view of the Intracoastal.

Mr. Miller asked if another public private partnership is envisioned.

Mr. Bohl said that there are a lot of avenues. If the situation materializes, and the City could acquire and control the property, but to do a ground lease arrangement, where a portion of the site, where the restaurant is, still belongs to City, but it's a long term situation that allows a restaurateur to establish a business and operate it, without the land moving from public to private.

Mr. Miller said that to do both simultaneously would be expensive.

Mr. Bohl said you can accommodate parking for one restaurant without building a parking structure. Moreover, there could be a valet situation.

Mr. Ganz said that the suggestion is that it needs to be occupied over there; a functioning manned facility to keep an eye on the picture is the overall recommendation. How that is decided will be built through public input.

Mr. Bohl reiterated that as long as there is a presence there, to help keep an eye on things in a natural way.

Mr. Ganz said that in regard to boating activities, how limited is the location on the north side.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Mr. Bohl said that there are definitely limitations as you get closer to the waterway. However, the portion that was protected, there is a structure in the water, behind it; nonetheless, there is definitely a potential to do things in that area. Moreover, there is more water in the area behind that structure.

Chair Noland said that years ago when the restaurant lost the property, when they came in, it was going to be a small hotel with a restaurant with boat slips out front. There was enough room to put boat slips in for the guests if they came by boat.

Mr. Bohl said it came up in the panel. There was also discussion on the Cove side, the parcels around the basin with the slip has potential for a hotel in that area. He further stated that there probably is potential, but it would be boating oriented toward that audience. Notwithstanding, it would have to be specialized hotels and pretty modest in terms of how many rooms involved. It would take someone who understands that market.

Mr. Preston said that the scenarios are speculative. The biggest part is the acquisition of the property.

Mr. Bohl said that the biggest part is the negotiation between the two (2) property owners and the City to see if an agreement can be reached. In terms of developing the parking structure, it would be part of the overall development scenario which may be a combination of public and private interests and resources. He said that it is not necessarily the City purchasing the land, and building the structure alone, but more so identifying the scenario that will have enough benefit to each party to make it feasible. Before jumping into any acquisition, you have to go through the negotiation to make sure it makes sense for everyone involved.

Chair Noland said Mr. Preston was referring to the north side.

Mr. Bohl said that because of the environment, it makes sense to look at the potential of purchasing properties as they will not be less expensive as they are now.

Mr. Preston said that then the plans can be considered at that point.

Chair Noland said that Mr. Bohl is suggesting continued communication with the two (2) owners on the south side, in the Cove Shopping Center. They bought Pal's Captain Table when the price was high. Now the restaurant is gone and they have a piece of property with reduced values. Chair Noland suggested that the Board speak with the City Manager and CRA Director individually, and City Attorney, to meet with south side property owners to determine their potential for the area and what the Board can do to expedite their situation. Any money they invest will bring more tax dollars to the CRA, which will help in Sullivan Park. She said that it is unknown whether there is a hotel willing to come in and go into partnership; build a garage, etc.

Mr. Bohl said that on the south side, the negotiation effort to possibly do the garage and unlock development potential is to increase the attractiveness of the Cove. He said that

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

the vision outlined in the 2006 Master Plan, would be a step in that direction to generate revenue to do other things. On the north, the focus is on creating a legacy park property for the community. However, it does not involve any commercial speculations; you are looking at the potential to acquire properties to create a better asset.

Mr. Preston said that there should be two (2) plans, incorporate the business owners to determine what will happen in a joint effort, and a plan independent of the north side so that you can have a two (2) plan attack; thus, no matter what happens, the City is not totally dependent on what happens with the business owners.

Chair Noland said no matter what happens on the south side, the north is very important to the City and should be considered for purchase. Chair Noland thanked Mr. Ganz for suggesting this and also Mr. Bohl for his expertise and assistance.

Mr. Bohl said that although a variety of ideas have been presented, the Board has to find out what is right for the area. He thanked the community for contributing.

ITEM 2**DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 7:49:29****APPROVAL OF 2011-2012 CRA BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE**

Kris Mory, CRA Coordinator, outlined Item 2, to approve and publish the FY 2011/2012 CRA meeting schedule. She said that for the purpose of publishing, the schedule included optional meeting dates, December 13, 2011 and July 10, 2012. The meetings will commence; however, if there is not enough business, they will be canceled.

MOTION was made by Mr. Ganz and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve Item 2, FY 2011/2012 meeting schedule as submitted.

Voice vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

ITEM 3**DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 7:50:53**

CRA Resolution 2011/020 - A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF DEERFIELD BEACH, FLORIDA, AWARDED THE CONTRACT FOR THE COVE SHOPPING CENTER ALLEYWAY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT TO LOW BIDDER WEST CONSTRUCTION AND TO AUTHORIZE STAFF TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT WITH WEST CONSTRUCTION FOR LUMP SUM OF \$310,043.47 AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROJECT BID DOCUMENTS.

Kris Mory, CRA Coordinator, outlined Item 3, which is not a new project, but has been discussed internally as Phase 5 of the Cove Parking Lot. About a year ago, while in the process of approving the parking lot contract, input was received from the abutting

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

residents and businesses regarding the alleyway behind the plaza. The project was budgeted for and there are additional funds for it. She said that the project consists of a drainage system being installed; a slotted drainage system that runs the entire length of the alleyway, and the road will be sloped so that it will drain properly. She said that it was tied into the recent drainage improvements in the Cove Shopping Center. The project will also include the construction of an 8 foot privacy wall.

Additionally, Ms. Mory said that public meetings were held for input and the public is in support of the project. If approved, the bid will be awarded and the contractor will start work when Phase 4 is complete. The entire project will take 90 days.

Mr. Ganz referenced backup material which indicates that there were four (4) fully executed construction maintenance easement documents for the wall. How many total residents are affected?

Ms. Mory replied that there are 11 properties with 9 different owners.

Mr. Ganz said that since there are only four (4) tonight, he asked if there will be an issue getting all the confirmations.

Ms. Mory said that she hopes to get two (2) more tonight.

Mr. Ganz clarified that the winning bid came in short of \$320,000.

Ms. Mory said that is correct.

MOTION was made by Mr. Ganz and seconded by Mr. Preston to approve Item 3, adopted CRA Resolution 2011/020.

Voice Vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

ITEM 4**DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 7:54:37****REQUEST FOR DIRECTION REGARDING 2012 DEERFIELD BEACH GREEN MARKET***

Kris Mory, CRA Coordinator, said that Staff is seeking direction regarding management for the 2012 Green Market. When the green market was done last year, a summary was prepared for the Board's consideration. At that time, it was managed by the Market Company, under contract. The summary included critiques and recommendations; moving the venue to the Cove Shopping Center; people wanted a more community based event, someone who knows more about the businesses and the community. She continued listing various recommendations for the event. She said that she approached Parks & Recreation who has a liaison that works with the Cultural Committee, who has a good track record for running special events. Therefore, she suggested communications with the Cultural Committee to take on the event. The event is

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

budgeted under Special Events, but it has not been decided on how those funds will be spent. She asked for feedback from the Board.

Vice Chair Popelsky asked what is the purpose of the \$10,000 being requested.

Chair Noland said that a management company did it last year, and the City was not thrilled with them. She said that because the City has a great Cultural Committee, they decided to see if they wanted to take on this project. However, you have to have seed money for advertising, etc. This would be one of our own entities instead of using a private vendor. She said that she had the opportunity to speak with two (2) of the members and they are very excited to work on this and with other organizations in the community.

She commended the Cultural Committee. She reiterated that seed money is needed and listed other expenses that were previously covered. If held in the Cove Shopping Center, portable restrooms will be needed; thus, there will be other expenses incurred because of the location that we did not have at Sullivan Park. Nevertheless, the visibility in the Cove will be better.

Mr. Ganz said that the Cultural Committee has proven themselves; however, he is not sure whether or not they would need the entire budget. He said that he is concerned whether a green market will be successful; everyone was disappointed last year, but if it is going to succeed, it will be with this group. He expressed concerned with having it in the Cove, but would like to make sure it is enhancing the businesses there. He said that although it is in the CRA, he is aware of many businesses in the west that would like to participate.

Chair Noland encouraged the Board to meet with the Cultural Committee because they have a lot of great ideas.

Mr. Preston said that the backup led him to believe that the markets' success last year was unknown. This is a great idea; however, the Board must first invest in the concept itself, so that everyone in the City knows when this is going to happen. He suggested reaching beyond social networking sites because many residents do not frequent those sites; therefore, other communication strategies have to be sought out. Previously, Founder's Day was called the Cracker Day parade, but everyone knew when it was. If we are going to do any of these things, we need to invest in the concept. Then determine how to get it out to the people and once the people know about it, they will support it and it will be successful.

Mr. Miller said it will be more successful in the Cove. He said he has envisioned where it should be.

Chair Noland said that Ms. Mory is only looking for whether the Board should use the Cultural Committee or not.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Ms. Mory said that she will be seeking direction from each member to obtain their ideas. Also, she has not decided where it should be held in the plaza.

Mr. Miller spoke in favor of the Cultural Committee. He asked if there is any checks and balances as to how the \$10,000 will be spent.

Ms. Mory replied yes, absolutely. Like last year, there was a business plan showing a budget as to how the money will be spent.

Mr. Miller asked what the criteria of it being successful.

Chair Noland replied attendance and the visibility with it being in the Cove Shopping Center versus Sullivan Park. Some of the ideas presented to her appeared to be not only a green market, but an event to draw the people out.

MOTION was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Preston to accept the Cultural Committee as the managers of the green market.

Voice Vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

ITEM 5**DIGITAL TIME STAMP: 8:07:05**

CRA Resolution 2011/021 – A Resolution of the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Deerfield Beach, Florida, approving USA Deerfield Parking, LLC, request for Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Funding for 123 NE 20th Avenue for an amount not to exceed \$100,000.

Kris Mory, CRA Coordinator, outlined Item 5. She said that Staff was approached by the facility owners, and they are proposing to make substantial improvements to the bookends and end caps to the building, enhancing Kilwin's and Bru's Room to attract garage parkers and foot traffic. They spoke with and encouraged them to undertake more improvements to the facility in a phased fashion. The first phase would include funding for the end caps. The second phase would improve the rest of the façade, between the two end caps to enhance the look for the other tenants in the building; and the third phase would improve the balance of the property, updating the painting, planters, roofing system, landscaping, and sidewalk. Also, phasing deals with the unique nature of the facility and to reflect the market conditions and the economy. She said that she met with the property owners today to troubleshoot and try to get one of their tenants to get a permit to start their build out on time. By making the building more attractive, they can lease it and use that revenue for the building. She asked for the flexibility to work with the property owner to come back with a second scope of work for the second and third phase; with the understanding that all façade monies given is on a 50/50 basis. No money is paid out until improvements are complete, inspected, and they sign a note of deferred payment. Ms. Mory said using the CRA's funding criteria, they qualify for a maximum of \$186,000, but the maximum is \$100,000.

GENERAL ITEMS - CONTINUED

Vice Chair Popelsky asked for the overall costs.

Ms. Mory said the hard costs are \$460,000 - \$470,000. This does not include soft costs such as architecture, permitting, etc.

Vice Chair Popelsky asked if the maximum allowed is \$100,000 and if it is based on square footage.

Ms. Mory replied yes, but it is based on linear footage of the façade improved; thereafter, she explained how the costs were derived.

Mr. Miller clarified that the money will be paid out as it is spent, even if it is in phases.

Ms. Mory said that is correct.

MOTION was made by Mr. Ganz and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve Item 5, adopted CRA Resolution 2011/021.

Voice Vote: YEAS: Mr. Ganz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Preston, Vice Chair Popelsky, and Chair Noland. NAYS: None.

PUBLIC INPUT

There was no one from the public to speak.

BOARD/ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS

Mr. Ganz - Beach Meters - Mr. Ganz said that he has spoken with residents who are concerned about seeing what the actual costs are to use the beach meters since the new lighting was installed. He asked if reflective decals can be used to make the rates clearer. Additionally, he said that Staff should be aware of how much the meters cost so that they can inform the public when asked.

Burgess Hanson, City Manager, agreed, and said that pay and display will be used which eliminates the need.

Chair Noland said that it is very dark, with the new lights, and she has gone to the fishing pier parking lot at night and you probably cannot see the pay and display either.

In response to Vice Chair Popelsky's question, Mr. Hanson replied that because of the sea turtles, the lights at the top are all gone.

Mr. Preston - 9/11 Sunday Service - Mr. Preston said that if you were unable to attend the 9/11 service on Sunday, you would have been proud of your City. He said that it was nice, there was participation from the Fire Department, BSO, and the City; it was a wonderful event.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

ATTEST:

PEGGY NOLAND, CRA CHAIR

ADA GRAHAM-JOHNSON, MMC, CITY CLERK