2nd DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
PARKS, RECREATION AND BEACHES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MILLS POND PARK
2201 NW 9th AVENUE
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2024 – 6:30 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

Board Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
Alex Collazo	P	6	2
Ruchel Coetzee	A	6	2
Caleb Gunter, Chair	A	6	2
Mary Peloquin	P	7	1
Charlie Leikauf, Acting Chair	P	8	0
Solomon Schoonover	P	2	0
Zillah Tarkoe	P	7	1
Idan Eckstein	P	5	2
Joy Oglesby	P	6	2
Marta Reczko	P	6	0
Barbara Magill	P	6	2
Samantha Sisler	P	3	0

Oct 2023 - Sept 2024

As of this date, there are 12 appointed members to the Board, which means 7 would constitute a quorum. A quorum was present.

Staff
Carl Williams – *Director of Parks and Recreation*
Leana Suarez – *Senior Administrative Assistant*
Patricia SaintVil-Joseph – *Assistant City Attorney*
Aricka Johnson, *Structural Innovation Manager, Office of Management and Budget*
Yvette Matthews, *Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget*

Others
Mira Laing, *Resident, District 4*
Ted Inserra, *President, River Oaks Civic Association*
Melinda Bowker, *President, Downtown Civic Association*
Esthel Brennan, *President, Riverside Park Residents Association*
Vanessa Apotheker, *President, Tarpon River*
Karen Cruitt, *Recording Secretary, Prototype-Inc.*

Pledge of Allegiance
Acting Chair Leikauf led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of the June 26, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Motion was made by Joy Oglesby and seconded by Zillah Tarkoe, to approve the June 26, 2024, meeting minutes, as distributed. In a voice vote, the motion passed 10-0.

=Page

1. **Park Impact Fees (Aricka Johnson)**

Ms. Johnson, Structural Innovation Manager, provided a presentation and reviewed the following: Park Impact Fee Allocation Recommendations; Park Impact Fee Uses; Background; Recent Park Impact Fee Projects; 5 Year Funding History; Available Funding ($5.4M); 2023 Funding Summary; Current Process: Impact Fee Allocation; Recommendation: Existing Funds; Recommendation: Future Funds; Defining Park Types: Example: Future Funding Allocation; and Discussion & Next Steps.

Ms. Johnson requested feedback on use of existing funds to address shortfalls with the bond program.

Mr. Collazo inquired how the districts would divide funds, and Ms. Johnson responded that the impact fee would go to the District that generated the funding and that there has to be a connection between the new users from a new development and the park they would be using.

Ms. Magill asked about funding for Snyder Park improvements and whether it was included. Ms. Johnson clarified there was no connection with the pickleball courts.

Ms. Sisler asked if approval was for each fiscal year, and Ms. Johnson responded this would be a standardized policy that would last until revisited at some point in the future.

Ms. Tarkoe asked if Tunnel Top Park was considered existing, and Mr. Williams noted that it was part of the project.

Ms. Tarkoe discussed Carter Park. Ms. Yvette Matthews, Acting Director, noted that despite ongoing construction, there would be flexibility regarding the allocations.

Ms. Oglesby inquired about the allocation demands, and Ms. Matthews explained the development of a yearly investment plan, with a priority split of 50% to regional parks and 50% to neighborhood or district park pools.

Ms. Reczko asked how regional parks were funded, and Ms. Matthews replied that funding comes from either the general fund or park bonds.

Ms. Reczko followed up, asking if supporting the proposal would keep 50% within the district and 50% regional. Ms. Matthews affirmed.

Acting Chair Leikauf also asked if the $5.4M could cover the shortfall, and Ms. Williams confirmed that it would be applied to Bass Park.

Acting Chair Leikauf commented on the increasing construction costs and supported the idea.

Mr. Collazo suggested a 45% split from each budget instead of 50%, with an additional 10% for flexibility. He stated Districts 1 and 3 are heavily disadvantaged with the current split.

Mr. Schoonover stated he submitted a form so there were no appearances of impropriety as a family member was developing a property adjacent to Smoker Park. He asked about determination of the 50/50 split. Ms. Johnson responded that the decision was arbitrary to start the discussion.

Mr. Schoonover asked who determines how the funds are spent, and Ms. Matthews explained the criteria for crossing the threshold.

Mr. Schoonover suggested funds from each district could be used differently.

Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph asked Mr. Schoonover to state his potential conflict of interest on the record.

Mr. Schoonover reiterated his family was developing property adjacent to Smoker Park He further clarified that he has no procurement interest, but his wife's family does.

Acting Chair Leikauf asked if districts lacking funds could have resources transferred, and Mr. Williams confirmed it was possible with a recommendation.

Ms. Johnson emphasized that development funding must be tied to specific developments.

Ms. Reczko raised concerns about District 1's collections and noted that the pool of park impact fee funds may be below $5.4M due to a recent park acquisition; Mr. Williams responded that the funding used to acquire that property was from the Land Acquisition Fund of the Parks Bond and had no impact to the park impact fee fund balance.

Mr. Collazo questioned the 50/50 proposal, asking if there were contingencies for disasters in Districts 1 or 3. Mr. Williams clarified that park impact fees do not cover those scenarios, which rely on the general fund.

Mr. Collazo asked if 50/50 was the only option, and Ms. Johnson mentioned other possibilities, seeking feedback.

Ms. Oglesby suggested exploring a 60/40 split to benefit district funding over regional allocations.

Mr. Schoonover asked about the size of the community investment plan, and Ms. Matthews answered that the total plan was about $1 billion.

Ms. Matthews added that it could only be used for a small portion of projects, promising to follow up with Mr. Williams on exact figures, which were under $20M.

Mr. Williams noted the funds were wiped clean, and Mr. Schoonover asked if they could still be considered significant. Mr. Williams said that depended on creative use, given rising costs.

Mr. Schoonover expressed concern about limiting future decisions and asked for clarity on the impact. Mr. Williams explained park impact funds were distinct from CIP funding.

Mr. Schoonover asked about 0% funding scenarios, and Ms. Matthews explained how shortfalls are addressed.

Mr. Collazo inquired if park impact fees and the general fund operated under the same rules, and Mr. Williams said they did, offering an analogy.

Ms. Magill asked Mr. Williams if he agreed with the 50/50 split, and Mr. Williams confirmed the funding approach would work either way.

Acting Chair Leikauf asked how hard it would be to change the 50/50 structure later, and Ms. Matthews said it could be revised.

Ms. Reczko pointed out developers do not guarantee funds but supported 50/50 as a starting point. Acting Chair Leikauf agreed.

Ms. Tarkoe asked if last month's Carter Park project would have been impacted, and Mr. Williams confirmed $600K from District 3 land acquisition funds had been moved to cover it.

Motion was made by Idan Eckstein and seconded by Mary Peloquin, to move forward with the 50/50 allocation of impact fees. In a roll call vote, the motion passed (8-0), with Solomon Schoonover abstaining.

Ms. Matthews requested feedback on how to utilize the existing $5.4M to address shortfalls.

Motion was made by Joy Oglesby and seconded by Idan Eckstein, to distribute existing funds to complete the shortfall within the parks bond signature projects**.**

A brief discussion ensued about the distribution of funding and shortfalls.

In a roll call vote, the motion passed (8-0), with Solomon Schoonover abstaining.

2. Proposed Amendments to Park Rules and Regulations (Carl Williams)

- Intent

=Page

- Rule 1.0 – Hours of Operation
- Rule 2.0 – Park Property (uses, activities, etc.)
- Rule 3.0 - Fireworks
- Rule 4.0 - Nuisances (Dogs in parks, temporary structure, disorderly conduct, etc.)
- Rule 5.0 – Vehicles and Traffic
- Rule 7.0 – Beach Regulations
- Rule 8.0 – Fees

Mr. Williams explained that the park rules had been under review for months, with the Assistant City Attorney's help leading to language adjustments and added clarity. He noted stronger language in key areas and highlighted the redlined sections showing these changes. He also mentioned that the City Commission sought the Board's input on which parks should allow dogs, and their recommendations would be shared at a future meeting.

Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph noted that the previously discussed language regarding service animals in section four, though not highlighted in red, could still be revised during the meeting. She confirmed this language was related to proposed changes and open for further tweaking.

Mr. Williams added that the amendments apply to all city parks, public, and recreation facilities, not just specific areas like the beach. Referring to section 4.12 on ball releases, he recommended explicitly including city parks and public recreation facilities to ensure clarity.

Acting Chair Leikauf welcomed public comment.

Ms. Mira Laing, District 4 resident, advocated for more parks allowing dogs and expressed a desire for increased accessibility across districts.

Mr. Ted Inserra, President of River Oaks Civic Association, supported the current wording on leashed dogs and their removal if unruly or in playgrounds, emphasizing the importance of leashing. He supported the amendments.

Ms. Esthel Brennan, President of Riverside Park Residents Association, noted that the board voted in favor, highlighting the inclusion of dog bags. She found the language more encompassing than St. Petersburg's version and supported the draft, stating it would allow rangers to enforce rules with minimal impact during the trial period.

Ms. Melinda Bowker, President of Downtown Civic Association, supported section 4.1 and agreed with previous speakers. She noted the situation went off course when sent to the commission and mentioned District 4 discussions, though the park isn't in her neighborhood. The Downtown Civic Association Board voted 5/2 in favor. Ms. Bowker cited the Riverwalk park's success, serving 26,000 downtown residents, and opposed letting each neighborhood decide, advocating for city-wide

consideration of concrete and asphalt areas. She referenced similar successes in Tampa and St. Petersburg.

Ms. Vanessa Apotheker, President of Tarpon River, noted that 90% of attendees at her last meeting supported dogs in all parks. She mentioned a girl who was bitten, now recovered and with her own dog, though the mother remains concerned about the dog's history. Ms. Apotheker noted the family was not consulted about using the case as an example.

A brief discussion ensued about the aforementioned incident.

Ms. Peloquin supported dogs in parks, suggesting an opt-out system for neighborhoods, and called for better signage.

Mr. Schoonover backed the opt-in/out proposal, and Ms. Peloquin suggested the community could fund it.

Acting Chair Leikauf felt the rules satisfied most people but was concerned about signage rollout.

Ms. Magill liked the opt-in/out idea but only if clean-up bags were available.

Mr. Williams said funding needed to be figured out.

Ms. Peloquin suggested citizen enforcement, and Mr. Magill proposed using sponsorship to fund waste bags.

Mr. Collazo asked about plans to install bags in most parks.

Mr. Williams noted that dog-friendly parks would be phased in over time.

Mr. Schoonover raised concerns about inconsistencies between sections 2.6 and 4.9 regarding prohibited actions. Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph acknowledged the inconsistencies and suggested revising the text.

Mr. Schoonover proposed merging sections 4.7 and 4.8 to address disorderly conduct. Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph agreed, suggesting the inclusion of intoxication.

Mr. Collazo noted some changes, such as the removal of dogs on Riverwalk in 4.1b and asked if they would still be allowed. Mr. Williams clarified that dogs would only be allowed on beaches north of Sunrise.

Ms. Tarkoe questioned how unruly dogs would be handled, and Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph responded that park rangers are only required to report unruly dogs, with Mr. Williams adding that enforcement would be similar to other rule violations.

Ms. Magill brought up loud noises on Las Olas Beach, and Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph noted the need to consider First Amendment rights when addressing noise levels.

Mr. Schoonover asked about the rules for e-bikes, with Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph open to board proposals.

Discussions continued on motorized vehicles, decibel levels, and the subjectivity of noise complaints, with Mr. Williams clarifying that the rules pertain to park regulations, not ordinance law.

Ms. Magill suggested adding parking and user fees, with Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph agreeing to include corrections and specifics as needed.

Acting Chair Leikauf recommended giving Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph the latitude to make necessary corrections.

Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph clarified that sections 2.6 and 4.9 should be reconciled to merge accessory structures, while sections 4.8 and 4.10 will remain separate as agreed.

In 4.7, the discussion moved to motorized and electric vehicles, with Magill noting that electric bikes can go on bike paths.

Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph suggested adding "and electric" to 5.4 and changing its title to include bikes and e-bikes.

Mr. Williams recommended changes to section 7.0, and Ms. Tarkoe initially objected but later rescinded her objection.

Acting Chair Leikauf proposed voting on the package in its entirety, allowing legal to handle any wording semantics. Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph agreed.

Motion was made by Alex Collazo and seconded by Mary Peloquin, to approve the new rules with the edits suggested and give Mr. William’s discretion for any particular wording to accomplish the Board’s intentions. In a roll call vote, the motion passed (9-1), with Solomon Schoonover abstaining.

3. New Business (Charlie Leikauf)

Ms. Oglesby asked Mr. Williams for an update on income from the sign on FTL beach and a promotional flag across from Park and Ocean. Mr. Williams was unsure.

Acting Chair Leikauf asked about balloons, and Mr. Williams explained that beaches are currently listed as parks. Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph said

she would make it clearer in the text that beaches are considered parks.

Ms. Peloquin mentioned the poor acoustics in the room, and Mr. Williams said they would move back to the fire station.

Ms. Magill asked about the grand opening, and Mr. Williams estimated it would be done next month, with some punch list items expected to be completed in October.

Ms. Magill also inquired about the rubberized play area, and Mr. Williams confirmed it would have a shaded slide and a viewing dock.

Ms. Sisler raised concerns about people without children on playgrounds in District 3. Assistant City Attorney SaintVil-Joseph said she was working on a draft addressing the issue and hoped it would be ready soon.

4. Adjournment (Charlie Leikauf)

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 P.M.

[Minutes prepared by TBaclawski, Prototype-Inc.]