

APPROVED
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
MARCH 14, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

May 2016 - April 2017

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	10	0
Sonya Burrows, Vice Chair	P	10	0
Jessie Adderley (arr. 4:10)	P	7	3
Leann Barber	P	9	1
Alan Gabriel	P	7	2
John Hart	P	5	1
Mickey Hinton	A	7	3
John Hooper	A	6	4
Dylan Lagi	P	10	0
Steffen Lue (dep. 4:05)	P	7	3
Scott Strawbridge	P	9	1
John Wilkes (arr. 3:13)	P	9	1

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

Staff

Jonathan Brown, Northwest CRA Manager
 Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager
 Bob Wojcik, Planner III
 Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
 Sandra Doughlin, CRA
 Thomasina Turner-Diggs, CRA Project Coordinator
 Elizabeth Van Zandt, Mobility Manager, Department of Transportation and Mobility
 Debbie Griner, Transportation Manager, Department of Transportation and Mobility
 Christine Fanchi, Livability Planner, Department of Transportation and Mobility
 Karen Warfel, Principal Planner, Department of Transportation and Mobility
 Lynn Solomon, Assistant City Attorney
 Marco Hausy, Assistant City Auditor
 Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Mr. Wilkes arrived at 3:13 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from February 14, 2017 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lue, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. Presentation

a. Streetcar Feasibility Study / Sistrunk Blvd.

Elizabeth Van Zandt, Mobility Manager with the Department of Transportation and Mobility, introduced the City's Streetcar Technical Feasibility Study. She emphasized the technical nature of the study, which seeks to determine whether the City can physically accommodate extending the Wave Modern Streetcar down Sistrunk Boulevard. It also examines potential ridership, costs, and financing, and determines whether or not the City should pursue this extension.

Sorin Garber of T.Y. Lin, project consultant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the feasibility study, which includes portions of the Sistrunk Boulevard, Broward Boulevard, and Sunrise Boulevard corridors. He reviewed the prospective Wave routes on these corridors, noting that this would mean five new stations on Sistrunk Boulevard, five new stations on Sunrise Boulevard, and six new stations on Broward Boulevard.

Mr. Garber explained that all potential alternatives would place the streetcar within mixed traffic, which means automobiles could drive behind or in front of the streetcar itself. Additional alternatives would consider whether to place stations on the curb or in the median. Stops would be curbside on Sistrunk Boulevard between Andrews Avenue and NW 7th Avenue, while they would be located in the median on Broward Boulevard, Sunrise Boulevard, and NW 27th Avenue, with crosswalks and traffic lights to provide access for pedestrians.

All alignments exist within existing rights-of-way, with no need for additional right-of-way except for a vehicle maintenance facility. The streetcar will be powered using overhead catenary wiring. Additional engineering issues include location of the maintenance facility as well as crossing of the FEC and CSX railroad tracks. One option is a grade separation over each railroad crossing, although it was noted that it could be difficult to fit this type of separation within the proposed corridors.

Mr. Garber advised that the study also developed an operating plan for the proposed routes, with 12- to 15-minute headway scenarios. Travel times were estimated for the streetcar, with allowances for boarding and departure of passengers as well as for traffic lights. He reviewed the prospective travel times for each of the three corridors.

Vikas Jain, also representing T.Y. Lin, reviewed land use, employment, and potential ridership along the three corridors. He noted that the greatest population exists along Sunrise Boulevard and is projected to increase by the year 2040. The highest employment exists along Broward Boulevard. These are key elements in determining projected travel demand and ridership.

Mr. Jain concluded that within the primary market between Downtown and Sistrunk Boulevard, the likelihood of a shift in transportation mode was 5% from cars and 50% from transit. He added that by the year 2025, ridership could be expected to grow up to 27% higher than the base use due to population growth and performance improvement. If Broward County Transit (BCT) use is restructured to accommodate Wave use, a 20% ridership increase could also be expected.

Mr. Garber reviewed fixed and variable costs associated with the Wave, which include the costs of vehicle storage and construction of an independent maintenance facility. The Wave is expected to cost between \$175 and \$200 million for approximately 2.5 miles. Operating costs are estimated at \$4.6 million/year for the 12-minute headway scenario on Sistrunk Boulevard and \$3.7 million/year for the 15-minute scenario. On Broward and Sunrise Boulevards, costs are tied to mileage as well as hours of operation, and are \$6.4 million for the 12-minute scenario, with an estimated 15% reduction for the 15-minute scenario.

Mr. Garber added that the City has asked the study team to explore the possible alternative of an alignment between Andrews Avenue and 7th Avenue, where the greatest concentration of projected ridership exists. This alignment could attract 500 new passengers per day at an estimated capital cost of \$44 million. It would add roughly 12 minutes to the Wave trip as already planned. Operating costs would be between \$1.1 and \$1.4 million.

Traditional financing for the Wave is 50% federal, 25% state, and 25% local capital, with all operational costs funded at the local level. Some communities have funded similar projects without using federal funds, with a 50%-50% division of state and local costs. Local funding options may include ridership revenues, community development block grant (CDBG) funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and a local option sales tax.

Mr. Garber concluded that the study team is seeking input from the Board on its findings. The City Commission must also approve the findings and would need to approve additional studies and a funding program. If federal funds are sought, the

Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (Broward MPO) would also participate in the process to determine preferred alternatives.

The Board members discussed the presentation, with Mr. Strawbridge requesting an estimate of the extensions' revenue projections. Mr. Garber replied that while up to 12% of operating revenues are typically generated through fares, the study did not examine funding proposals in depth. Mr. Jain also clarified that existing transit use was calculated only within the subject corridors and did not examine riders using the streetcar from outside these areas.

Mr. Wilkes observed that the three proposed extensions were presented as independently operated systems, although the alternative to which they were compared was a system that integrated with the Wave as planned. Mr. Garber confirmed that an integrated system's costs would be lower; however, the team was not certain this type of system would be feasible, as it would require the purchase of more vehicles.

Chair Centamore asked if the study team wanted the Board to encourage the City Commission to pursue next steps in the process, pointing out that no final numbers are available at this point. Mr. Brown advised that the Board could recommend that the City Commission explore these extensions as options.

Vice Chair Burrows recalled that at a joint workshop between the Board and the City Commission, the Board had raised the issue of extending the Wave down 27th Avenue. Ms. Van Zandt replied that this is technically a feasible extension. Mr. Strawbridge pointed out, however, that the CRA could use \$44 million, as well as \$4 million in annual operating costs, in other ways to improve transit in this segment of the community. He stated that he would like to see comparative information on alternative routes and modes of service for the same area in order to better understand what else is available for similar costs.

Mr. Brown advised that a positive recommendation from the Board would allow a project to move forward within the Sistrunk community.

Motion made by Vice Chair Burrows, seconded by Ms. Barber, to move forward with the study [and] additional analysis [of the route from Sistrunk Boulevard to 27th Avenue].

Ms. Barber stated that she would also like to see statistics on car ownership within the Sistrunk Boulevard area, as low ownership in the area could mean residents are more open to the use of public transportation. She added that she would also like to see more stops on Sistrunk Boulevard, as ridership depends in part on how far individuals must walk to access public transportation.

Mr. Wilkes observed that the proposed project must take into account where its ridership will come from, which he characterized as a regional issue rather than a local

one. He also asked if the proposal would eventually be part of a program that extends further west, and emphasized the need to explore all alternatives in addition to recommending that the study move forward. He concluded that the Board's recommendation should not suggest that the project be funded by the CRA.

Vice Chair Burrows recalled that in the past, when the Board voted in favor of CRA funding for the Wave, they also voted to provide an equal amount of funding for the Northwest area. She did not wish to rule out the possibility of using CRA funding toward an extension into the Northwest.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-0.

Ms. Van Zandt advised that the City has completed its Transit Master Plan, recalling that some of this plan's preliminary findings were shared with the Board at a previous meeting. A presentation on the full plan can be provided at a subsequent meeting.

b. Sidewalk Improvements / Walker Elementary

Christine Fanchi, Livability Planner with the Department of Transportation and Mobility, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Safe Routes to School program, which is administered through the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and builds infrastructure and new programming in support of safety for children who bike or walk to school. It is complemented by the City's vision to create a more walkable Fort Lauderdale, as well as the Vision Zero Fort Lauderdale plan to reduce traffic crashes and fatalities.

Mr. Lue left the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Ms. Fanchi explained that the Safe Routes to School program funds improvements to elementary schools within two miles of the school building. The school must perform an extensive travel survey to ensure that the State understands its needs. It was determined that crashes were occurring in and around the Northwest neighborhood where Walker Elementary is located. Another important factor is the surrounding neighborhood's limited vehicle ownership.

City Staff has worked with the school's assistant principal, as well as Walk Safe, the YMCA, the Fort Lauderdale Police Department, and the Healthy Community Zone. They have conducted extensive public outreach to supplement the grant application, including meetings with parents at the school itself to discuss issues and needs. A neighborhood meeting was also held at Dixie Court. Concerns included the speed of vehicles, sidewalk gaps, and crosswalks.

Ms. Fanchi showed a map of the proposed improvements based on the concerns shared by the public. These include street crossings adjacent to the school, addition of

roundabouts low-traffic areas, widening sidewalks, addressing sidewalk gaps, and moving/raising a crosswalk.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 4:10 p.m.

The full grant request, including engineering, design, and construction costs, is for \$629,700. The State requires that local entities provide funding for the engineering and design phases as well as a contingency fund. The design phase, which would begin in 2018, will cost approximately \$108,000, with another \$46,600 for the contingency fund. Construction funding would begin in 2020. Ms. Fanchi concluded that a decision on the grant is expected in April 2017.

Mr. Lagi asked if the CRA was the only source being sought to provide local funding. Ms. Fanchi replied that it is the only source being considered at present. Mr. Lagi also asked if there are any legal issues related to the CRA's involvement with an educational entity. Mr. Brown advised that the types of improvements requested are within the CRA Plan as an eligible use of funds.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if the CRA plans to launch a neighborhood mobility plan similar to what has been accomplished in other communities, as they have funds and are charged with improving infrastructure. Mr. Brown stated that this issue would be discussed further at the April Board meeting.

Chair Centamore asked if the Broward County School Board plans to contribute to the program. Ms. Fanchi replied that they have not been asked to contribute, explaining that the improvements would be made within City rights-of-way and not on school property. She advised that FDOT will not fund the project's design or construction phases, although the funding for Safe Routes to School comes through FDOT. The estimated local matching funds for the project come to roughly \$155,000. Mr. Brown characterized this as the City submitting the application on behalf of the CRA.

Mr. Hart stated that the request is consistent with the neighborhood improvements the CRA should be making, and noted the significance of the City's community outreach to ensure consensus on the project from the surrounding neighborhood. He emphasized the importance of providing local matching funds if the grant is awarded.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to agree to go forward with [the local matching funds].

Mr. Gabriel requested clarification of whether or not the local match would include an additional \$4000 for a crosswalk on NW 9th Avenue, which was requested by Dixie Court residents during the public outreach process. It was clarified that the total would be \$159,000 with this addition. Mr. Hart accepted this clarification as an **amendment** to his **motion**.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-0.

IV. CRA Project Funding Update

CRA Business Manager Vanessa Martin reported the acquisition of 55 properties.

V. Subcommittees Selection

a. Residential Infill RFP

b. Commercial Site Proposals

Chair Centamore briefly left the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

Housing and Community Development Manager Glendon Hall explained that the City hopes to establish two subcommittees for the selection of RFPs for residential infill and commercial properties. Mr. Brown added that the City's Procurement Department will oversee administration of the RFPs. The subcommittees will see all RFPs and make recommendations to the Redevelopment Advisory Board (RAB) as well as the City Commission.

Mr. Strawbridge asked for more information on the RFP approval process. Mr. Brown explained that the subcommittees will include members of the Board; subcommittee meetings will be facilitated by the Procurement Department rather than by CRA Staff. The intent is to have individuals who can review designs and costs.

Chair Centamore rejoined the meeting at 4:34 p.m.

Mr. Brown continued that he expected several proposals for the infill housing lots inside the CRA, and encouraged the Board members to consider whether their expertise was better suited to the subcommittee overseeing residential or commercial lots and projects. He recommended that interested members have a technical background that allows them to review designs and costs and ensure quality projects.

Mr. Wilkes asserted that the request for subcommittee members was premature, as the CRA will first have to have an outline of what they hope to accomplish on each lot. Mr. Brown replied that the intent is for members to help determine how to best place quality housing or commercial projects on those lots. He reiterated that before issuing an RFP for these lots, the City is first asking if Board members wish to serve on the subcommittees that will review proposals.

Mr. Gabriel suggested that the Sweeting Estates site be considered separately from other properties and that it be reviewed by the full Board rather than by a subcommittee.

The members could then break up into subcommittees to address smaller lots. Mr. Hall added that Staff has already heard feedback from the surrounding neighborhood regarding what they would like to see on this lot: their preference is for single-family homes with at least three bedrooms. It is projected that roughly eight houses can fit on this lot. Sustainability and other requirements will also be part of the proposal.

Mr. Hart commented that because the residential lots will include these requirements in their proposals, and because the commercial projects are not yet ready to proceed, all proposals could be brought before the full Board for the time being instead of a subcommittee or subcommittees. Mr. Brown concluded that this could be done; he noted, however, that this may make it necessary to call special meetings of the full Board. Mr. Strawbridge advised that at a later time, subcommittees may become necessary.

VI. Infill Housing Process

Mr. Brown continued that Staff is putting together a plan for the infill housing process, on which they would like a recommendation from the Board. The plan will start with the 10 City-owned lots located west of I-95 and would issue one RFP for all 10 properties, requesting that developers bid on no more than two. The respondents, which may be developers, licensed general contractors, or private individuals, must have a development team in place. They must provide designs, which will be graded using project costs and the design itself. Any developers who plan to request CRA funding must make this clear in their applications.

Mr. Brown emphasized the importance of the development team's credentials in evaluation of bids. The team must also include a nonprofit housing counselor or bank with a home buyers' club in order to ensure that buyers are lined up for the properties. Preference will be given to specific types of homeowners such as Police Officers, firefighters, teachers, retirees, medical employees, and other professionals with disposable incomes.

Mr. Hall provided a map showing the location of City-owned lots, stating that the rehabilitation program will upgrade existing homes in the vicinity of these lots. Mr. Brown added that the County has agreed to provide construction estimates, and that the projects' design and sales prices will be estimated as well in order to create the best possible RFP. He concluded that he was seeking the Board's support for this process so it may be taken before the CRA Board for approval. The process may be amended after the first 10 lots are developed.

Ms. Barber objected to the idea of preferences for prospective homeowners. Mr. Wilkes commented that if the CRA wished to influence the types of homeowners the community wanted to encourage, owners rather than developers should be sought through the bid process, with minimum requirements for the projects to be built on these

sites. Mr. Brown explained that this is why the bid process is not limited strictly to developers but also invites individuals and contractors to participate.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if there would be income requirements for prospective home buyers. Mr. Brown confirmed that these requirements would be capped at 160% of the average median income (AMI). Mr. Hart recommended that the proposed housing preferences be reviewed by the Legal Department, and that the proposal for 10 lots under a single RFP be approved by the Procurement Department.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to move forward with the process that was outlined by Mr. Brown, and to add to it that he checks with Legal and with Procurement.

Vice Chair Burrows asked if the process should require pre-qualification for prospective property owners. Mr. Brown replied that this would not guarantee a firm financing commitment for owners. He emphasized the importance of this guarantee for the infill housing program.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Mr. Wilkes dissenting).

VII. Streetscape Funding Requests Brightline

Mr. Brown explained that the Board members did not receive complete information on this Item in advance because Staff still had questions regarding the proposal's eligibility; however, the CRA Executive Director/City Manager has requested that the Item be presented for discussion and review. He clarified that Staff is in favor of what the project proposes, but must first ensure that CRA funds may be used for this purpose.

Debbie Orshefsky, representing Brightline (formerly known as All Aboard Florida), stated that the station under development to the north of Broward Boulevard requires a number of public realm improvements, including streets and rights-of-way. She showed a PowerPoint presentation on the request, which would enhance the roadway and streetscape improvements currently underway at a higher quality of construction. Without the requested funding, this quality would be engineered out of the project.

Jose Gonzales, Senior Vice President of Brightline's parent company, FEC Industries, advised that Brightline will be comprised of four stations on a 235-mile system connecting Miami to Orlando. He estimated that this would bring nearly 800 direct and indirect jobs to the Fort Lauderdale area, resulting in roughly \$333 million in economic impact. He showed aerial views of the subject site before and after the proposed improvements, which would include the following:

- Connection between NW 2nd Avenue and NW 4th Avenue, including streetscapes
- Continuing improvements throughout the transit-oriented development (TOD) district

- Station including retail uses, food, and beverage
- 200 additional surface parking spaces

Thus far, Brightline has invested roughly \$30 million in the Fort Lauderdale station and parking facility. Infrastructure enhancements will affect 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Avenues, as well as NW 2nd Street. An existing driveway will be modified into NW 1st Avenue, a new street in the area. Future redevelopment in the area is also expected to include a state office building on Broward Boulevard and the existing bus terminal. More infrastructure improvements are likely to accompany this redevelopment.

Next steps for the Brightline team include working with the City to create a transit-oriented development (TOD) district, and providing a master plan that establishes the groundwork for planned infrastructure improvements.

Ms. Orshefsky advised that the requested funding would cover only public realm improvements and create the backbone of a roadway network in the target area. She emphasized the transformational nature of streetscape improvements in Fort Lauderdale and other communities. Funding eligibility requirements include:

- Property must be located within the CRA
- Eligible properties are existing and new buildings
- Project costs are associated with enhanced features and finishes above and beyond mandatory City requirements
- Contribution is limited to 70% of the eligible cost

The request is for \$500,000, which constitutes just over 50% of the total funding for these improvements. Mr. Gonzales clarified that the project is brought forth by two applicants who co-own the project.

Mr. Wilkes requested clarification of the cost differential between the minimum mandatory improvements and the proposed improvements. Mr. Gonzales advised that this difference is over \$1 million, and that the Applicant has already assumed some of these costs. Ms. Orshefsky added that when the project received Site Plan approval, it was reviewed under Downtown Master Plan guidelines, which require wider sidewalks, pavers, LED lighting, landscaping, and other features, all of which would be value-engineered out of the project if funding assistance is not provided.

Mr. Wilkes also asked for clarification that the Applicant plans to expand both sites of the project for future development. Ms. Orshefsky explained that the station and platform are owned by one Applicant, while the surrounding block is owned by the second Applicant. The improvements serve to complete the roadway network in the surrounding area and provide vehicular and pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Orshefsky continued that the Applicants have worked with the City's Department of Sustainable Development, which encouraged them to provide wider sidewalks,

additional landscaping, and other improvements that would contribute to an identity for the area. Mr. Gonzales added that when other developers come into the area, the City will ask them to make the same types of improvements.

Mr. Gabriel observed that while the Applicants have provided a plan using upscale improvements, they also have an alternative plan that would provide fewer enhancements if they did not receive CRA dollars. Mr. Gonzales confirmed that in the event the Applicants do not receive CRA funding, the lesser plan would not include the creation of NW 1st Street and would provide a concrete sidewalk rather than pavers.

Mr. Brown noted that the CRA must also ensure that the proposed improvements meet the definition of slum and blight that would make the improvements eligible for funding. He felt they met this definition if the total improvements to be made to the area were taken into account. Mr. Gabriel pointed out, however, that none of these improvements have been made thus far. Ms. Barber added that while the Applicant wished to create a particular identity for their business, the question remained as to whether or not this constituted the best use of CRA dollars.

Mr. Lagi asked if job creation was a requirement of CRA funding recipients. Mr. Brown replied that the CRA has requested a job creation element on all non-housing projects that request funding. Mr. Lagi also pointed out that construction is already underway on the project and funding may not be provided retroactively. Mr. Brown confirmed that the CRA Board has never granted funding to a project that has already been completed.

Mr. Gonzales clarified some of the project's proposed costs, explaining that pending right-of-way costs add up to approximately \$640,000; when funds are added for proposed improvements, it brings the total to roughly \$915,000. The \$500,000 funding request would provide \$250,000 each to both Applicants. It was noted that the cost of right-of-way improvements does not include the cost of land acquisition.

Mr. Gabriel commented that the project will generate tax increment financing (TIF) revenue. It was noted that the Applicants must maintain the proposed enhancements.

Mr. Strawbridge stated that the intent of CRA funding was to fund projects that would not be successful without it; however, the proposed project has not been brought before the Board until now, although it has been in development in previous years. He felt the Board should see projects when they are in the planning stages. He concluded that he was also concerned the project would not provide jobs within the CRA.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 5-4 (Vice Chair Burrows, Ms. Barber, Mr. Strawbridge, and Mr. Wilkes dissenting).

The Board took a brief recess from 6:00 p.m. to 6:04 p.m.

VIII. Presentation: “Progresso Commons” Shopping Center Project

Ms. Orshefsky, representing the Applicant, advised that the subject property is located at the corner of Sunrise Boulevard and Andrews Avenue, within the Northwest Regional Activity Center (Northwest RAC). A 35,000 sq. ft. shopping center, anchored by an Aldi’s supermarket and a WaWa, is planned for the site, which covers nearly five acres.

Ms. Orshefsky explained that in 2013, a zoning Amendment prohibiting additional convenience stores was enacted in response to concerns expressed by the Northwest community. The issue with the subject site is that WaWa is considered to be a convenience store, although it includes facilities that prepare and sell fresh food. The store is more than 6000 sq. ft. in size, more than 50% of which is restaurant space. She asserted that the store should not be seen as a convenience store and is therefore not subject to prohibition.

The Applicant has met with the Progresso Civic Association, which has provided a letter of support for the proposed project. A community meeting was held in January 2017 and was attended by representatives from multiple civic associations within the surrounding neighborhoods. Ms. Orshefsky stated that these associations reached consensus that the proposed business was not what the zoning amendment was intended to prohibit.

Ms. Orshefsky showed a PowerPoint presentation on the project, explaining that the WaWa chain has recently begun opening stores in Florida. The company is 42% employee-owned. The Applicant is seeking a specific zoning Code Text Amendment that would allow a WaWa. A Site Plan cannot be filed for the location until this Text Amendment has been enacted.

Ms. Barber stated that she took issue with non-local businesses coming into the area to compete with businesses that originated in Broward and the Northwest community. She advised that she would like WaWa to include a local contact in its supply chain as well as hiring local employees.

It was clarified that the proposed Text Amendment would apply only within the Northwest RAC.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lagi, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Ms. Barber dissenting).

IX. Communication to CRA Board

None.

X. Old / New Business

a. CRA Staff Updates

None.

XI. Public Comment

None.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

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