

MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING August 17, 2022

MINUTES

Present:

Joanne Simone
Antonio V. Arserio
Arlene R. Schwartz (via Zoom)
Anthony N. Caggiano, Vice Chair

Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Also Present:

Cale Curtis, Executive Director
Larry Vignola, Assistant Executive Director
David Tolces, Weiss Serota Helfman Cole & Bierman
Joshua Rydell, Esq, for Hildebrand Amusement Rides
Harlan Bast, Broward County Fair, Inc.
Daryll Seabolt, SeaVest Consulting Services, LLC

The regular meeting of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency having been properly noticed was called to order at 7:05 p.m., on Wednesday, August 17, 2022, by Chair Tommy Ruzzano. Roll call was taken. There was a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting was held in the City Commission Chambers and was also accessible virtually through Zoom technology.

Chair Ruzzano advised that item 5A would be moved up and follow Public Discussion, and following Public Discussion, the MCRA Board Attorney would provide an update on the litigation involving the MCRA. A short refreshment break would follow the update.

1A. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - (7/12/2022 Regular)

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title, Mr. Arserio made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Simone:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Tracy Van Winkle, resident, congratulated the MCRA on winning back its property. She commented that she was tired of seeing Margate referred to as "Marghetto" on Facebook. She asked if the MCRA could improve the appearance of Southgate Boulevard by replacing some of the dead palm trees and landscaping. Chair Ruzzano commented that the budget would be discussed later in the meeting.

Rich Zucchini, 380 Lakewood Circle East, commented that he wished to extend his congratulations to the majority of the Board. He said that it took political courage to say no to the developer that was going to take advantage of the City, and that they faced criticism from residents and the current Chair of the Planning and Zoning Board. He said the contract with the developer expired and Commissioner's Peerman and Simone voted to extend the contract in a Special MCRA meeting after a hurricane knowing the new incoming commissioners were opposed to it. He said those individuals who supported the contract should never hold office again.

Jonathan Kraljig, resident, asked that when the Board members were asked to make decisions in their role, they consider the impact of their decisions on the City and its residents and not on their personal preferences. He asked that the Board be transparent when requests came before them and that they abstain from voting on items where they received campaign contributions or to disclose the amount before they voted.

Mr. Arserio commented that all campaign reports could be found on margatefl.com.

Donna Fellows, resident, extended congratulations to the Board.

UPDATE GIVEN BY BOARD ATTORNEY DAVID TOLCES:

David Tolces, Board Attorney, stated that final judgment had been rendered in favor of the MCRA for the litigation with New Urban Communities. The order entered by Judge Robinson on August 15, 2022 found that New Urban Communities had not proven its entitlement to specific performance it were seeking against the MCRA for failure to approve the site plan it had submitted. He commented that it was an excellent result for the MCRA and New Urban Communities had the right to appeal it within 30 days, and he would advise if a Notice of Appeal were received. He thanked attorney Michael Burke and his office for the excellent job they did presenting the case, as well as assistance from Development Services Department staff and other City staff.

Chair Ruzzano commented that the legal outcome meant that the MCRA would be getting its property back and it would be an opportunity to do something that the majority of the City's residents wanted. He said there would be many meetings and workshops held to share ideas in an effort to make Margate the best city in Broward County.

Vice Chair Caggiano commented that he and board member Schwartz had been waiting for the court's decision for six years and, if there were an appeal, hopefully the MCRA would win it. Mr. Arserio commented that it was a win for everyone and it very satisfying to see light at the end of the tunnel and that he was looking forward to the downtown area becoming the destination center for all of Broward County.

5A. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** APPROVAL OF A TEMPORARY USE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE MCRA AND THE BROWARD COUNTY FAIR, INC., FOR USE OF MCRA PROPERTY TO HOLD THE BROWARD COUNTY FAIR

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title, Chair Ruzzano commented this Fair would be a repeat of the Fair held the previous year.

Joshua Rydell, 111 S.W. 6th Street, Ft. Lauderdale, attorney for Hildebrand Amusement Rides, the midway provider for the Broward County Fair held last year, congratulated the Board on their opportunity to shape the future of the City. He said a Temporary Use Agreement (TUA) had been submitted to do essentially the same event as had been done the prior year. He spoke about some concerns that he heard about over the past year, specifically:

- **Security**—he discussed concerns with Chief Galaska and he acknowledged that there were some hiccups that they believed were aberrations. He said they would have a better security protocol team this year, and they would also continue to use Margate police officers in overtime capacity. In addition, they planned to use the security team that the F1 team used in Fort Lauderdale.
- **Parking**—He acknowledged there were parking issues and said they planned to upgrade their plan and contract with two companies that were well established in Florida.

Mr. Rydell commented that the rental fee of \$50,000 that they wrote on the TUA to use the property might change in light of the recent news about the lawsuit. He said he would be better prepared to speak about it at a later date if the event moved forward which would require approvals from the City Commission for event duration and hours of operation. He said the amount might increase and there might be other incentives as well.

Mr. Rydell said the only difference from last year's submittal would be the sale of alcohol which developed last week after they submitted this year's event application. He said his client received requests for it last year and they were happy to provide the sale of beer and wine if the Board would allow.

Mr. Rydell announced that each admission purchased would be a ticket to win a car from Hendrickson Toyota, a keynote sponsor of the Fair. The details for the car giveaway were currently being worked on.

He said they were looking for the Board's initial approval to go forward so they could start to work with the other departments in the City. He said there would not be any animal acts in the Fair; rather, there would be a robust agricultural show with educational components. Mr. Arserio asked for clarification on the animals. Mr. Rydell said there would be animals for educational purposes but no animal acts. Mr. Arserio thanked his client for eliminating the perception of any type of abuse.

Mr. Arserio commented that the property was muddy at the start of the last Fair and he assumed it would be addressed this time since they would have more time to prepare. Mr. Rydell said there was a combination of events last year which included limited set-up time, and monsoon storms for almost 48 hours while they were moving in heavy

machinery. He said they were requesting additional lead time this year and they planned to pre-order bales of hay to address last year's issues.

Ms. Schwartz commented on several issues:

- **Hours of Operation**--with the exception of Thanksgiving Day, the rest were school/work days and the Fair would be operating until midnight during the week and on Sunday. She would like to see that changed.
- **Set-Up Time**--their request for 7-days for set-up while Code allowed 3-days for set-up.
- **Parking**--parking issues on the southwest corner of Margate Boulevard caused the MCRA to have to compensate tenants \$500 due to their parking spots being taken; she preferred to have the Chevy Chase plaza left out of the parking plan.

Mr. Rydell responded to Ms. Schwartz's concerns. He said Broward schools were off the week of Thanksgiving but there were some school nights. He committed there would not be any amplified music past 10:00 p.m., as had been done previously. He said his client could be set up in three days but they were asking for the additional lead time to ensure they did not have a mud pit. With regards to the MCRA paying businesses due to parking issues, he said they would be happy to reimburse those businesses if advised of such. Chair Ruzzano interrupted and stated that it was something the MCRA chose to do and it was not a negotiating tool. He said he would seek consensus on the issues being brought forth. He said the Fair owner wanted to have a relationship with the MCRA and he had been very considerate to Margate. Mr. Arserio said he understood the \$500 payment to be a revenue share with the tenants. Vice Chair commented that he had worked with Mr. Bast for over a decade on events, and he always addressed issues when they were brought to his attention. He said Mr. Bast had already established a good relationship with the City and it was one that he hoped would continue for years to come.

Chair Ruzzano asked the Board whether they were in agreement with alcohol sales. Mr. Rydell clarified that he was asking to amend the TUA orally, and then they would submit a revised TUA that would include their request to sell alcohol in a limited and controlled environment. Vice Chair Caggiano asked if it would be for sales of beer and wine or everything. Mr. Rydell said he looked to the Board for their direction. David Tolces, Board Attorney, stated that a more detailed proposal could be brought back as an amendment to the TUA. Mr. Rydell said if there was consensus from the Board, he could come back for a second reading of the TUA with an amended version that included a vendor service contract that would provide details. Attorney Tolces said the Board could approve the TUA that was before them that night and they could bring back a detailed plan for serving alcoholic beverages at the event, and it would be considered an amendment to the agreement. He said if there was consensus that the Board would consider alcohol sales, it would give them something to work on and bring back.

Chair Ruzzano took a consensus of the Board.: Ms. Simone, No; Ms. Schwartz, No; Mr. Arserio, Yes with the conditions of beer and wine, wine coolers, hard seltzers, and similar, but no hard liquor; Vice Chair Caggiano, Yes with same conditions stated by Mr. Arserio; Chair Ruzzano, Yes. Consensus passed.

Attorney Tolces clarified that there would not be two readings. If the Board approved the TUA that night, Mr. Rydell would propose an amendment to the TUA and it would be a separate item on a future agenda.

Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE TEMPORARY USE AGREEMENT

Donna Fellow, resident, commented that she did not approve of the Fair, particularly after the riot that migrated to the Walmart parking lot. She said there was inadequate security and if approved, she suggested having metal detectors. She said patrons were speeding down her street and throwing bottles that she had to clean up. The church parking lot on U.S. 441 and Park Drive and the other lots used for parking were full of trash. She said she would get petitions signed if necessary because it was meant to be a family environment, not a place for gangs to come and cause harm.

Tracy Van Winkle, resident, commented that fairs and carnivals were supposed to be fun but the last few had not been fun because of the problems that occurred. There was not enough security and allowing alcohol would not help the situation. She suggested finding something else to do with the property, such as holding a flea market on the weekend.

Nina Culver, resident, said she did not attend the Fair last year, but after hearing the suggestions brought forth by Mr. Rydell, she thought it would be okay. She said it could be stipulated that the Fair would be fined by the City for trash clean-up to pay for City staff's time. She said beer and wine was available at most MCRA events. She spoke about the need to address parking issues for the businesses, and said liked the idea of using a private security company and suggested wandering people as they entered the Fair, but she said the Margate police officers should still have a presence there.

Jonathan Kraljic, resident, said he was opposed to the Fair and that residents did not want it based on the feedback he had read online due to safety issues. He commented that the Dade County Fair was much better organized and operated than Margate's Broward County Fair held last year. He said the Fair should include more of those things associated with the Broward County Fair of the past 46 years including the agricultural aspect and show portion.

Joey Ruiz, 6217 Margate Boulevard, resident and business owner of Way Back When in the Ace Plaza, expressed concerns about the parking situation in the plaza last year. He said he had discussed the issues with the fair organizer, property manager, and the MCRA. He said he did not have an issue with the Fair coming to Margate, but he hoped an agreement could be reached to rectify the parking situation in the plaza.

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, commented that parking would go through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process; however, it would not stop Fair patrons from parking wherever they wanted. He said a plan was needed to reduce those situations and keep Fair patrons from parking in the lots they should not park in. Mr. Arserio clarified that what was being approved was just preliminary and the final plans or parking, security, etc., would be fully reviewed.

Mr. Rydell commented that they intended to address the issues brought forth by the residents. He said they [Fair] relied too heavily on Margate police department last year and they planned to supplement it with a renowned, certified, bonded and insured company. He said they would be discussing the use of metal detectors with City staff and the fencing of parking lots to make them more secure. He said they activated clean-up of the trash when they were advised it was an issue and it would not happen again, even in surrounding areas if they were made aware of the situation.

Ms. Schwartz commented that they should not allow kids to be dropped off without an adult. The Fair did it that way last year and it was a great idea as it reduced potential issues. Mr. Rydell said they intended to do everything the same as last year but only better and safer. The plan that they will submit to staff will be bolder than in prior years.

Mr. Curtis said the TUA they had before them for approval had some conditions spelled out but there were additional conditions that needed to be included before the final approval was given. A short discussion ensued about how to best proceed and the Board's direction was to have the attorneys on both sides work on a revised agreements but allow the Fair to proceed with the process in the meantime. Ms. Rydell suggested the Board approve the TUA with the understanding that there could be amendments to the amount of money paid and for the sale of alcohol.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, No; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 4-1.

A SHORT BREAK WAS TAKEN AT 7:52 PM; THE MEETING RESUMED AT 8:13PM

Chair Ruzzano asked the Board to hear item 4A next followed by 5B, and then the Presentation; Board agreed

4A. **RESOLUTION 689:** AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF TASK ORDER NO. 2 FOR CHEN MOORE & ASSOCIATES, INC., FOR ADDITIONAL CIVIL ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPING AND CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FOR THE MARGATE BOULEVARD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the resolution title, Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

Ms. Schwartz asked whether the work under Task Order One had been completed by January 28, 2022. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, said it been completed and presented to the Board. The item before them was an expanded scope of work to address the comments provided by the Board.

Nina Culver, resident, asked whether the crosswalks were being fixed or replaced. Mr. Curtis said a combination of both would be done. He explained that Margate Boulevard from East River Drive to State Road 7 would be resurfaced and repaved which included removing and replacing the paver walkways and crosswalks, as well as landscape improvements to the roundabout. She asked why they were being replaced versus fixed and Mr. Curtis said the Board's direction was to change the look and design. Chair Ruzzano added that the look was outdated and needed to be beautified. She commented that some of the money would be better spent on the south end of the City.

Donna Fellows, resident, questioned why the work would not be done as part of the downtown redevelopment so that it would all look unison, rather than doing it twice. She agreed with Ms. Culver about the need to help beautify the south end. Chair Ruzzano said there were some downtown projects planned for the near future, and this project had been in the works for some time.

Jonathan Kraljic, resident, agreed with the previous speakers. He said he did not see a problem with the area and questioned whether it was really necessary to do now. If it did get done, he asked that consideration be given to the timing of the Winter Festival. Chair Ruzzano said the project showcased the downtown area and it should have beautiful landscaping, walkways and sidewalks.

Tracy Van Winkle, resident, asked why the area could not be pressure cleaned, treated, and then maintained instead of replaced. She asked why some of the money could not be used to fix the cracked and broken sidewalks that existed throughout Margate. The money could be spent elsewhere.

Mr. Curtis explained that the improvement were not just for aesthetics. The project would also address ADA (American Disabilities Act) issues and other infrastructure issues with the crosswalks such as cracking and sinking. The development of the downtown would take some time and the MCRA needed to take care of existing infrastructure. He said there was a project currently underway for S.W. 6th Street to improve drainage, the roadway and sidewalks, and landscaping.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

5B. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: FISCAL YEAR 2022-2023 ANNUAL MCRA BUDGET

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title, Chair Ruzzano explained that the proposed budget was a living document that could change. He asked the Board members for their comments.

There was a brief discussion about the financial impact of the lawsuit ending, specifically the deposit. Attorney Tolces said the agreement was still in place between the parties and the MCRA needed to wait to see if an appeal would be filed. When the case ended, then the process for termination of the agreement would be reviewed to determine what remedies and rights the MCRA might have.

Ms. Simone asked to include funding for electronic marquee signs that could be placed on MCRA property to be used as another source to communicate information to residents about programs, new ordinances, etc. Chair Ruzzano said he did not have a problem with it. Mr. Arserio thought it was a good idea and he mentioned a lobbyist who had a client that had pitched doing these signs, and he liked the idea of them being paid for and maintained by another party. However, he said they were expensive and they did not seem to hold up very well so he would need more information on costs, etc.

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, provided the following updates:

- Funding was included for the annual events such as July 4th, Winter Festival, Summer/Fall concert events, etc.
- Funding was included for an update to the Redevelopment Plan which was last updated in 2017
- Funds would be carried over for several capital improvement projects including Serino Park, Margate Boulevard, S.W. 6th Street,
- Under the existing Developer's Agreement, the MCRA had an obligation to fund various infrastructure projects and it had budgeted over \$20 million for them over the past several years. He recommended reprioritizing those funds so they could be used in conjunction with a Request For Proposal (RFP) for a development project in the future. The budget for fiscal year 2022-23 that would be adopted in September would continue to show the funding as required in the Developer's Agreement and budget amendments would need to be done in the future.
- Budget included funding of \$1.2 million for property improvement grants to include residential uses

Chair Ruzzano asked the Board and public for comments.

Ms. Schwartz said she was glad to know that the funds that had been set aside for the City Center could be moved around. She suggested taking a look at the electronic signs at the North Lauderdale City Hall and on Rock Island Road heading toward Commercial Boulevard. She said she would never want to see advertisements for anyone other than the City/MCRA on its signs.

Chair Ruzzano commented about the MCRA's role to clean-up slum and blight and said he hoped that residents of the MCRA would take advantage of the residential grant programs once they became available, noting that there had been little interest from commercial properties in the past.

3A. PRESENTATION: CITY CENTER PROJECT PROPOSAL

Chair Ruzzano said this presentation was received about a month ago and it represented one of many ideas for the proposed downtown redevelopment.

Darryl Seabolt, SeaVest Consulting Services, LLC, introduced himself as a visionary and conceptual creator with 41 years in the construction industry. He lived in Kentucky but he had done an extensive amount of work in Florida. He spoke about how he first discovered Margate in 2007 while working on a project in Lake Worth. About six months ago, he was contacted by a land acquisition company working with a large developer who was looking for projects in South Florida for multi-family, high-end developments on the water and, while looking around, he thought of Margate. He familiarized himself with Margate and the lawsuit, looked at the properties and saw the opportunities in what he considered to be an amazing location. He conducted extensive research on Margate's history and then started to develop a vision. He said the value he brought to the project as a consultant was his experience and relationships with key people.

Mr. Seabolt proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation of his concept and he spoke about the project's components that he envisioned. He explained that he was presenting his concept but there would be engineers, architects, and other professionals that would come in and develop it. The following is a brief summary of the presentation:

- His concept identified opportunities on five parcels totaling approximately 36 acres and identified as Parcel A (Margate Blvd. & N State Rd 7); Parcel B (16 acres on east side of N State Rd 7); Parcel C (891 N State Rd 7), Parcel D (Chevy Chase Plaza and former bank lot at 911 N State Rd 7) and Parcel E (Ace Plaza).
- The project would be developed in three phases: Phase One to include Parcels A, B and C; Phase Two to include Parcel D; and Phase Three to include Parcel E.
- Parcel A would feature a 5-story mix-use building of approximately 350,000 square feet with the commercial retail facing the road and the backside would be residential. The first floor would feature retail, and the building would include a 150-room luxury hotel with about 80 luxury residential units, clubhouse and common areas. There would be a roof top restaurant and cigar bar. The fifth floor units would have private roof space and he spoke about a retractable roof system for inclement weather. He spoke about an indoor pool with a retractable roof system as a versatile feature.
- Parcel B would be the downtown nucleus and would feature a Food Hall Entertainment Center with different restaurants offering indoor dining and outdoor patio seating with the retractable roof system, a meeting center, music and entertainment, etc. He spoke about access to Lemon Lake and that he envisioned a boathouse with paddle boats and kayak rentals. He suggested having a beach-themed area similar to the Clearwater Beach Pier area that had paver walkways, LED lighting, covered pavilions, and white powdered sand, where people could come together, eat, and enjoy street performers and local artists and the lake. There would be an area for a parking garage with solar panels on the south end. He said the development should try to implement renewable energy and green products as much as possible.
- Parcel C would be a green space that could be used for special events and could feature food trucks, a large parking area, restrooms, water, electricity and it also could be used for additional parking for the City.
- Parcel D would be another residential area of 500,000 square feet that could feature a five-story condo/hotel and commercial retail space. He spoke about how it could represent a good revenue source for the City. The first floor would have a retail mix, and the four floors above and the back side five floors could be a luxury hotel and residential housing, exercise facilities, cafes, and resort-type amenities for the residents. Across from Parcel A, Parcel D would be connected with a pedestrian breezeway over Margate Boulevard.
- Parcel E would have a five-story residential only building with activity center, fitness center, indoor pool with retractable roof, clubhouse, patio garden, etc.

He spoke about creating a ‘win-win’ situation by building a project through a Joint Venture (JV) partnership with the City of Margate, the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency and the developer. He said he had presented his concept to several developers and they were all open to having future discussions with the City/MCRA.

He mentioned that he had spoken with a company that financed projects and they would be interested in speaking with the City, so long as the project was kept under \$200 million and it was broken into phases. He said current projects were costing around \$280 per square foot for a hotel venue and \$300-\$350 per square foot for commercial and residential. He said the cost for Phase I was estimated at \$190 million using those costs. He spoke about various development projects currently in the Florida area.

He showed a variety of images that showed various components and features of his vision of the development.

He explained that he was the visionary and creator and his role would be paid for by the developer to help facilitate the project between the City, public, and the developer in collaboration with design firm Perkins Eastman. He spoke about the proposed development team that he would put together to help the City/MCRA achieve its goals. He expressed his desire to help the MCRA capitalize on the amazing opportunity the 36 acres represented.

Chair Ruzzano thanked Mr. Seabolt for the presentation. Mr. Arserio commented that the presentation included some interesting and cool things but there was not anything new that had not been discussed before except for the hotel. He clarified that this was not the plan for the proposed downtown; rather, it was a sharing of ideas. He said the Board should be cautious and conscious about having individual proposals presented. He suggested the MCRA finish its design concept and do a master plan of the MCRA, and then put together a Request For Proposal (RFP) so interested developers could equally and fairly present to the Board. Vice Chair Caggiano said he wanted the litigation to be over before moving ahead. Chair Ruzzano agreed and said he had been requesting a conceptual plan for two years with costs and revenue projections. He said the MCRA could start with a conceptual plan based on the feedback it had heard from the residents and then begin with one phase of the project. He commented that the MCRA would sunset in a few years and anything the MCRA turned over to the City should be cash flow positive versus a debt to the residents.

Mr. Arserio commented that the MCRA Board should consider extending the MCRA regardless of the litigation status; Vice Chair agreed.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, provided the following capital project updates:

Atlantic Boulevard Streetscape Improvements--The landscaping and resodding of the median was scheduled to begin by month's end. The vendor had started preparations on the west end of the median with spraying to kill existing vegetation. The work should be completed approximately 60 days once started.

David Park--The construction for the redesign of the retention area had been completed and resulted in a much smaller depression for retention.

Serino Park Renovations—It was anticipated that the County Surface Water License would be issued later in the current month and the contractor would be submitting for a demolition permit as well. Mr. Arserio recommended a groundbreaking ceremony be held.

S.W. 6th Street Improvements—Consultant provided a Drainage Study in addition to the Feasibility Study previously conducted. The drainage analysis was currently being reviewed by staff and it was anticipated that the consultant would present their findings and recommendations for the project to the Board in September or October. The project would enhance the entryway to the neighborhood and Southeast Park, as well as address drainage issues.

Margate Boulevard Improvements—Task Order No. 2 was approved earlier in the meeting for additional consulting services for an expanded scope of work for the project.

Wayfinding Signage—Currently working with Ferrin Signs for a rendering proposal to share with the Board for signage at the entryways at the east and west ends of Atlantic Boulevard and north and south ends of State Road 7.

6A. TENANT UPDATES

There was no discussion.

7. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Simone: Addressed comments that had been made earlier in the meeting by the public regarding the project with New Urban Communities. She commented that if others wished to blame her for her actions in wanting to have a downtown, they needed to have all the facts because she did all she could to try to negotiate and act in the best interest of the City. She said she could not control the actions of others; she could control only her own. She provided a brief summary of a timeline as follows:

- January 31, 2017 Workshop - the Developer was asked to reduce the number of units on the east side by 100
- February 7, 2017 Workshop - the Developer reduced the units by 100 to 316 on the east side. Both the Developer and the MCRA agreed to the units and to give the retail component on the east side to the City. Board Attorney Tolces was to work with the attorney for New Urban Communities to amend the Agreement to reduce the number of apartments to 750 and have 316 units on the east side.
- June 14, 2017 meeting - the Developer proposed three options: develop as per the original agreement; develop as discussed at the Workshop; or, to reduce the number of buildings from 11 to 8. New Urban Communities did not want to terminate the agreement.
- July 11, 2017 meeting - the Board voted 5-0 for the new Executive Director, Sam May, to negotiate with New Urban Communities to find a resolution with respect to the Developer Agreement. There was also a 5-0 vote to extend the site plan approval date, scheduled to end August 7, 2017, to September due to the negotiations.
- September to November, 2017- there was nothing on the MCRA agendas regarding the New Urban project. There were comments from the public asking about the status.
- September 18, 2017 meeting - Manny Lugo, resident, and Chair Ruzzano asked about the project's status. Mr. May's response was that discussions were close to ending. Attorney Tolces advised against discussing the matter further as it was not on the agenda.
- November 8, 2017 meeting - Staff recommended that the site plan be rejected and it passed with a 5-0 vote. Afterwards, New Urban Communities filed a lawsuit.

She stressed the need to have the facts and documentation to back up statements when they were made. She commented that she was a firm believer that everything happened for a reason. She said time had been in the MCRA's favor and there was more interest than ever to develop in Margate. She mentioned Marquesa's plans and the possibility of Amera Properties building on State Road 7 and Coconut Creek Parkway which would be game changers for Margate and set the tone for the coming downtown. Those projects should encourage lots of developers to contact Margate. She said it was time to stop pointing fingers, dwelling on the past and causing rift and division. She said she was looking to the future with positive energy and progressive thinking. Margate was in a much better place today than it was in 2017 as far as interest in redevelopment. She recommended embracing it and having unity for a better Margate, adding that nothing was ever up to just one commissioner.

Mr. Arserio: Commented that he was not a Commissioner or MCRA Board member when it was passed. He was opposed to the project then, he campaigned opposing the project and he still opposed it. He said he was excited that it did not come to fruition. He agreed that interest in business in the City had never been better. He said he had spoken to many developers about projects in the MCRA as a means to establish relationships so that when the MCRA did go out for a Request For Proposal, they could be contacted. He clarified that he had not made any promises to any developer on the downtown project, and that they would all be evaluated equally when it went out to bid.

He commented that much knowledge was gained by attending conferences and training. He spoke about the upcoming ICSC Florida Conference and said Margate would be one or three cities being showcased. He noted that the MCRA would be getting a booth afterwards and he thanked staff for putting together media packages for the conference.

Ms. Schwartz: Commented that the presentation given by Mr. Seabolt was unsolicited because the MCRA was not at that point yet, and she was not celebrating until such time as the lawsuit was over. She thanked everyone who came out for National Night Out including law enforcement and first responders, and she gave a shout-out to Sergeant Phillip Horne for his impressive event planner skills. She also thanked Broward Meat and Fish for providing the hotdogs, Legacy Closet for the sodas, and Parks and Recreation for cleaning up afterwards.

She referenced an email about an expense of \$86,000 approved by the Executive Director for the roof replacement at 6030 NW 9th Street and commented that she did not think it was worth spending the money on it.

Vice Chair Caggiano: Thanked everyone for their kind words as he worked through some of recent health matters.

Chair Ruzzano: Commented that he received a phone call from Legacy Closet asking to have the rental fee of \$550 reimbursed for an event they held the week prior at the Covered Sports Field. He said he was in favor of waiving it and he asked the Board if they were in agreement to reimburse it. Mr. Arserio said he was open to reimbursing them, however, the City and MCRA needed to have a policy and budget in place long term. David Tolces, Board Attorney, explained that there was an existing process for fee waiver requests and it should be brought to the Board as an agenda item. Mr. Schwartz agreed with Mr. Arserio and suggested the policy be in place for the new budget year. Cale Curtis, Executive Director, explained that there was a policy in place for renting the facility and the Event Policy could be placed on a future agenda for discussion and action so the Board could establish limits.

Chair Ruzzano said business owners in Ace Plaza had asked if the annual Trunk or Treat event could be expanded to the Ace Plaza. Mr. Curtis said he had briefly discussed the possibility of combining the Trunk or Treat and Fall Festival events and holding it at the Sports Complex. It would be a larger event and businesses could be invited to participate but it was still in the preliminary discussion stage. Mr. Arserio said the request to expand it to the plaza was to showcase the businesses. Chair Ruzzano asked the Board if they would allow the plaza to have its own Trunk or Treat and he would ask Joey Ruiz to present it. Mr. Curtis said it was a huge event that presented safety and logistical issues. Mr. Arserio suggested holding it at the location where the COVID-19 testing was held and then down into the Ace Plaza. Vice Chair Caggiano commented about putting the efforts into one huge event versus two big events. Chair Ruzzano said the Fall Festival was a different vibe. Mr. Arserio agreed and said Trunk or Treat was a community policing initiative and it should not be taken away from the Police Department. He mentioned the need to send out a reminder notification about the Fall Festival event. Mr. Curtis said he would work with police to see what could be done.

Chair Ruzzano suggested creating a Halloween background of haystacks and pumpkins on MCRA property that could be incorporated with the Trunk or Treat event. It could have a large Margate logo in the background and be used for picture opportunities a few days prior to the event.

Chair Ruzzano commented that it was a good day in Margate and what had happened in the past was the past, and it was time to move on with positivity. He said he hoped building costs would come down by the time the project came to fruition and that Margate would be seen as a more affordable option for businesses.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator

Tommy Ruzzano, Chair