

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING NOVEMBER 12, 2014

MINUTES

Present:

Tommy Ruzzano
Joyce W. Bryan
Lesa Peerman
Joanne Simone, Vice Chair (via phone)
Frank B. Talerico, Chair

Also Present:

Douglas E. Smith, Executive Director
Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney
Ben Ziskal, Director, Economic Development
Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, CRA
Kim Vazquez, Project Manager, CRA
Kim Briesemeister, Principal, RMA

The regular meeting of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency having been properly noticed was called to order at 7:00 p.m., on Wednesday, November 12, 2014, by Chair Frank Talerico. There was a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

1. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Michael Sirjue, 6811 N.W. 4th Street, distributed a copy of a Buckminster Fuller design for a convention center stating that the City would benefit from the addition of a convention center. He said the trapezoid design utilized the cheapest amount of materials while providing maximum space. He said he would like to see it be considered as part of the redevelopment plans.

Rich Popovic, 6066 Winfield Boulevard, commented about the need for the new board members to be informed about previous agreements that had been made prior to them being elected. He commented about agreements made by previous CRA Boards with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC), and the County that would affect decisions of the current CRA Board.

Mr. Ruzzano asked if Mr. Popovic's statements about the CRA being bound by another plan were correct.

Doug Smith, Executive Director, explained that the CRA plan governed what the CRA was authorized to do. Mr. Ruzzano asked if the plan could be modified and whether it needed County approval. Mr. Smith said that it did. Mr. Ruzzano asked if there were restrictions.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, responded that the CRA was restricted by State statute and any significant amendments made to the plan would need to go through the County.

Mrs. Peerman asked whether the changes made to the TOC were done to make it easier for the Margate CRA's future plans. Ms. Bach said it did and that it enabled the Margate CRA to have the land use and zoning entitlements that would allow for a mix of uses.

Mitch Pellacchia, 6890 N.W. 9th Street, said that he had noticed that the Special Magistrate's list of code violations throughout the City included a number of owners of private parking lots who had been cited for pot holes. He asked whether pot holes on CRA property had been cited by Code Enforcement and why violations on CRA property had not been brought to the Special Magistrate. Mr. Smith responded that a response would be provided to the Board which would also be available to the public.

Sabrina Segal, 6890 N.W. 9th Street, asked whether the Board was aware of the conditions of the land that the CRA owned, whether soil samples had been done, and if the Board knew the classification of the type of soil. She said there were extensive problems when City Hall was built. She said the government

documentation on the land in the downtown area indicated that the land was very limited for building two and three story structures. She questioned why the Board was not made aware of the past problems. Chair Talerico said that approval was given at the last meeting for engineering services that would investigate and determine the conditions for development.

Mr. Ruzzano agreed that soil samples should have been done prior to the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) being released so there would be a clearer idea of development costs.

2. **PRESENTATION:** Implementation of Fiscal Year 2015 Budget and Proposed 5-year Action Plan.

Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, stated that the PowerPoint presentation she would be giving contained a proposed action plan based on the approved budget for fiscal year 2014-2015. She said many of the actions taken in fiscal year 2013-2014 set the stage for the programs planned for the City Center in the current fiscal year. She showed a slide of the CRA 2013/2014 Accomplishments and noted that there were several projects that were moved forward or completed; specifically, Kaye Stevens Park, Copans Road, and Coconut Creek Parkway. She showed a slide of the projects planned for the current fiscal year which included: stormwater permit and waterfront project design; reissuance of the RFQ for the City Center Project; ground breaking on the Copans Road landscaping project and the Coconut Creek Parkway median improvement project; marketing and branding launch; ongoing property management and landscape maintenance; and, commercial property incentives/business assistance programs.

Ms. Bach showed a slide of the operating budget which showed the operating fund at \$4.9 million including debt service. She spoke about an outline for the next five years which would include other sub-districts outside the City Center such as the health and wellness district near the hospital, the industrial areas, Coconut Creek Parkway, and the Southgate area. She showed a slide of a timeline for the City Center Project through 2019. She spoke about other projects that would be outside the City Center such as roadway beautification projects, marketing and business assistance, and wayfinding signage. She showed a slide which gave the timeline for these other projects. Under the Business Assistance section, she commented on a Tenant Relocation Program that was included in the plan.

Ms. Bach spoke about the need to have the proper resources in place to make the projects happen. She commented on the day-to-day ongoing administration activities and property management that needed to be handled, as well as property maintenance, capital improvements, marketing, and business recruitment.

Mr. Ruzzano referenced the slide that showed the groundbreaking in 2017 and commented that it was a long way off. Ms. Bach said it was an estimate but it could be sooner. Mr. Ruzzano questioned what the holdup was noting the CRA had the tenants, the property, and the money. He asked why the CRA could not design and build it. She said the CRA could but it would still take time. Mr. Ruzzano suggested utilizing the Economic Development Department. Chair Talerico responded that the CRA was moving forward but the infrastructure was needed first.

Mrs. Peerman said she understood Mr. Ruzzano's frustration. She commented that Ben Ziskal could not be brought into the CRA because he worked for the City and he needed to handle City business. She pointed out that Mr. Ziskal handled economic development for all of Margate while the CRA's focus was only on the CRA. There was a brief discussion about the Executive Director position and its qualifications. Chair Talerico advised that the discussion should take place when the item came up later in the meeting.

Mrs. Peerman commented that it was more involved than just building something and moving the tenants over. She suggested that Mr. Ruzzano show the Board a design of what it was that he wanted. Mr. Ruzzano said the process the CRA was following was very slow. Mrs. Peerman agreed and she commented on the financial problems that many other cities encountered when they rushed into construction. She said she wanted the downtown development to work for residents and visitors alike and it was important that the CRA do it right. Mr. Ruzzano said he kept hearing about multi-family housing in the downtown. Peerman clarified that the correct reference should be mixed-use housing which had retail on the bottom, office space or similar on the second floor, and apartments on the floors above. Mr. Ruzzano asked if that was what she thought the residents wanted. Mrs. Peerman responded that there was a large group of people who would like to move into that type of living arrangement. Mr. Ruzzano disagreed. Chair Talerico stated that every developer that had come to Margate had said that housing was needed in order for them build anything, plus there was a shortage of housing. Mr. Ruzzano said the CRA would be selling the City short by not accommodating what Margate needed. Mrs. Peerman said the residents would be accommodated by the stores and restaurants, as well as new residents like the millennials who preferred to live in downtown areas. Mr. Ruzzano said the CRA should cater to the current residents. Mrs. Bryan suggested the discussion get back on track. Mr. Ruzzano said it was time the CRA put its foot down and advised what it was they wanted since the RFQ was going out. Mrs. Bryan asked Mr. Ruzzano if he had read the RFQ. He said he had and that it was enticing. Mrs. Peerman commented that the RFQ was not specific to what had to be built and an architectural design for the project would also be needed. Mr. Ruzzano insisted that the design should have already been done. Mrs. Peerman explained that it was a living, breathing concept and the architectural design still needed to be defined and it would need to be approved. Mrs. Peerman recommended that Mr. Ruzzano ignore the conceptual drawings. She said the drawings were to show roads and other features that could be part of the redevelopment. Mr. Ruzzano suggested hiring an architect company to come out and work with the Board to design something and then the CRA could build it. He said it was his understanding from his conversation with Ms. Briesemeister on Monday that the \$21 million the CRA had would cover the cost of everything including a parking garage.

Kim Briesemeister, Principal, Redevelopment Management Associates, clarified that while she did say that there was plenty of money, the money did not include the CRA building its own buildings. To provide perspective, Ms. Briesemeister pointed out that the CRA owned one of the few assemblages of land left and it had an incredible opportunity. She said it was important to discuss what could be built there that would work for everyone and would be a market driven established project. She explained that the buildings in the conceptual drawings that were presented were based on Margate's market demand. She said RMA brought them an analysis of what could be built and survive in Margate, but it did not necessarily mean that it was the market demand that the Board might want to satisfy. She said it was to show what uses could be supported. She said the Board's response was that it was too high and too dense so RMA scaled back the design and presented a second concept which featured garden style apartments with mixed use and it would still have the downtown with urban plazas. She said another option that Mr. Ruzzano spoke about, i.e., hiring an architect, building a building, and putting in retail, already existed up and down State Road 7. She said if the CRA put that option out to developers, it would get a strip center with parking in front, or a big retailer surrounded by a sea of parking, or several restaurants with a lot of parking. The CRA would not have an urban center that would attract people to come and linger. She said if that was the direction the Board wanted to go, RMA would do it but it would look like the rest of State Road 7. She said if the Board were to take its time going through the process, they would have the option to bring a few qualified developers to the table who would present the Board with designs. She clarified that what she told Mr. Ruzzano on Monday was that the CRA could afford to build all the public realm which included the streets, sidewalks, the public amphitheater, etc., for the \$21 million dollars. Ms. Briesemeister said the private sector needed to come and build the retail and mixed use. She implored the Board to go through the process of the RFQ to the Request For Proposal (RFP) stage to see what they got.

Ms. Briesemeister spoke about the timeline ahead. She said, in 2015, responses to the RFQ would be in within 30-60 days, then a RFP would be put out and it would be another 30-60-90 days thereafter which would take the CRA into mid-2015. She explained that there would then be a vetting process that would take 30-60 days, bringing the process into third quarter. Developers would then be ranked and selected, the CRA would enter into development agreement negotiations, and the developer would go into design at the end of 2015. The process to design buildings would take months, bringing the project into 2016, followed by permitting. She said it was likely that there could be a groundbreaking in 2016. She said the process would take time but the CRA would get there if it stayed the course.

Mr. Ruzzano said, for the record, that he was not in favor of putting up a strip mall. He was interested in bringing the waterway in, putting up free standing restaurants, a walkway, and an amphitheater. Ms. Briesemeister responded that the site could not handle stand-alone restaurants and a sea of parking and still have an urban feel; it would not work that way. Mr. Ruzzano disagreed and said he would draw something that would work.

Mrs. Bryan referenced page 7 of the RFQ which stated that "the conceptual site plan for the City Center contemplates a mix of commercial, residential, and office uses to create a vibrant and active neighborhood with a mix of housing and shopping choices. The community envisions a central gathering place for community events and entertainment that will be anchored by a waterfront park with an amphitheater programmed by the City or CRA to attract residents and non-residents to City Center while the primary goal for the community is to create a place to gather, eat, and be entertained, additional uses such as multi-family, townhome, office and potential hotel could also be included." She said it was all in there. Mr. Ruzzano said he was not disagreeing with the RFQ; he disagreed with how slow the process was moving and that nothing was getting done.

3A. RESOLUTION 436: Approving an agreement with Redevelopment Management Associates, LLC, for provision of administration, management, and consulting services for the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency; providing for CRA management; general services; real estate development and public private partnership support, marketing services, ownership of documents and images, terms and fees.

After Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney, read the resolution title, Mrs. Peerman made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Bryan:

MOTION: TO APPROVE

Mr. Ruzzano asked about the increase in the budget from \$170,000 to \$315,000.

Douglas E. Smith, Executive Director, responded and provided an overview of the item. He explained that the Board had previously approved a two month extension to the contract with Redevelopment Management Associates (RMA) and that what the Board was approving at this meeting was an extended agreement. He advised that the new contract would provide for CRA Management Services as it had in the past but would now provide a full time dedicated CRA manager position as well as part time manager/project coordinator support. The CRA General Services would include services on an as needed basis he said. Real Estate Development and Public Private Partnership Support would provide assistance with negotiations on the development agreements. Mr. Smith said the agreement also included expanded Marketing Services that would be billed monthly. He said the format of the recommended agreement had been refined from the time the budget was first prepared so the amounts changed somewhat. He said the Finance Department reviewed the budget and they indicated the amount should be sufficient for the year and a future budget amendment could be made if necessary.

He noted that the core services that were billable monthly were the CRA Management Services at \$245,000 and \$62,500 for Marketing Services. The other services would be billed on an as needed basis. He also pointed out that the agreement was on an annual basis versus the fiscal year schedule.

Mrs. Peerman asked if the price included a CRA Director versus a City Manager/Executive Director. Kim Briesemeister, Principal, RMA, responded that it did and the price included a full time salary, benefits, and overhead.

Mitch Pellecchia, 6890 N.W. 9th Street, said he looked in the back-up but he did not see an Executive Director listed as being included in the \$245,000 amount.

Mr. Smith explained that the Executive Director decision was separate from this contract. He said the position title could be changed but the amount of \$245,000 would cover the same position.

Mr. Pellecchia commented about the lack of transparency from RMA. He said he continued to hear that more people were needed but yet nothing was getting done. He commented that the poor soil conditions in the downtown area would become known soon. He insisted that the Executive Director's salary was not included.

Mrs. Peerman asked whether the CRA Manager position that was listed could become the CRA Executive Director position. Ms. Briesemeister said it was the same full-time position and it was fully funded.

Chair Talerico said the CRA was moving forward faster than it ever had in the past even though it might not seem that way to some.

Ms. Simone commented that it had been a learning experience for the Board and for RMA. She said RMA was better aware of the Board's expectations and the need for better communications, and it would be counterproductive to let them go at this time. She said they brought a total package and the CRA needed to move forward with them.

Anthony Caggiano, 7856 N.W. 1st Street, said the contract should not be renewed. He said it was appalling to hear that the conceptual drawings that RMA provided could be discarded. He questioned what RMA had done to warrant \$170,000 besides getting a new logo and a slogan. He questioned what businesses they had brought in. He disagreed with the language about the waiver of jury trial in the agreement. He commented about the Property Maintenance budget of \$352,000 and the fact that no money was going to be spent on paving Ace plaza. He commented that it was wasteful to have RMA when the CRA had Jim Nardi for property management services. He also said Kaye Stevens Park was nothing to brag about.

Rich Popovic, 6066 Winfield Boulevard, commented that RMA has not done a bad job but they said a lot and nothing concrete got put forward. He said the thing that never got discussed was how the redevelopment would be paid for because the \$21 million would be spent quickly and the rest had to be paid somehow.

Rick Riccardi, 4829 South Hemingway Circle, commented that urban development was different than building buildings. He said the downtown would attract new people into the area. He said he believed the way this project was being done was proper. He said he had faith in RMA and their professional background.

Todd Angier, 1913 N.W. 79th Terrace, questioned what would be marketed for the \$62,000 since it was not clear what was being built. He questioned why a CRA Director would be hired when the City had an Economic Development Department headed by Ben Ziskal who he felt was a great resource. He said Mr.

Ziskal should be the CRA Director. Mr. Angier said he was not impressed with RMA because they were not providing a vision for the City that the Board and the residents wanted; he said Mr. Ziskal had that vision but he was being left out.

Mrs. Peerman said she was tired of hearing it from others and she asked Mr. Ziskal if he was interested in leaving his Economic Development Director position to become CRA Director. There was a brief discussion about the salary of a CRA Director and Ms. Briesemeister clarified that CRA Directors were typically paid based on the amount of money they managed. She said for smaller CRA's, like Margate, it was \$85,000-\$95,000 and large CRA's was between \$130,000 and \$150,000.

Chair Talerico asked about the qualifications. Ms. Briesemeister responded that there was a big difference between Economic Development and Redevelopment. She said both required certifications but they focused on different activities, noting that CRA's and redevelopment operated under Florida State Statute 163 and a thorough understanding of CRA operations and the statute were vital. She said it was her understanding that Mr. Ziskal was on the economic development track. She noted that redevelopment and economic development should be a team effort.

Mr. Smith said he spoke with Mr. Ziskal about becoming involved in CRA staff meetings where there would be a sharing of expertise.

Mr. Ruzzano asked whether the schools in the community had an impact on what could be built. Mr. Smith said he and Mr. Ziskal had previous discussions about this topic and he invited Mr. Ziskal to speak. Ben Ziskal, Director, Economic Development, explained that the City was broken into different land uses and when an area is slated for development, it was given a certain density that defined the number of units per acre that could be built. He said the entire City was divided through a land use map which dictated the number of residential units that could be built. When there was a review of residential property, the School Board would look at the districts for the elementary, middle, and high schools where the property was located to determine if adequate capacity existed. He said the Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC) was a land use designation adopted by the City in 2007, followed by land development regulations in 2008. He said that at that time the City was given a pool of residential units that could be built in the TOC area while still accommodating the school capacity at that time. He said the current capacity allowed for 603 units that could be built. He said if the 603 unit level were reached, the process to increase the density and get more residential units would be to apply for another amendment. When that happened, he said a full review of all the schools would be done. During the TOC land use amendment, Atlantic West Elementary was overcrowded and the number of units Margate received was capped at 603 units. He referenced that the plans for the future indicated that the intent was to request more units so that additional units could be built in the City. He said the projection for the next five years was that Margate Middle School would be overcrowded and it was currently the only middle school in Broward County that was overcrowded. If the City were to apply for more units now, there would be a capacity issue on Margate Middle School.

Mrs. Peerman stated that she appreciated all the efforts Ben Ziskal put forth daily and she would have no issue with him being the CRA Director except that he worked for the City and the City and CRA were two separate entities.

Sabrina Segal, 6890 N.W. 9th Street, commented that the City and the CRA were known to keep secrets. She questioned whether the RMA would be transparent since in their response to the Office of the Inspector General (IOG) they asked the IOG to keep its response private.

Attorney Steinfeld said the IOG was required by law not to be transparent. The State Statute required the response be kept confidential until the total investigation was over; it was not the City's decision.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Ruzzano, No; Mrs. Bryan, Yes; Mrs. Peerman, Yes; Ms. Simone, Yes;
Mr. Talerico, Aye. The motion passed 4-1.

4A. **DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION:** Discussion regarding hiring an Executive Director and Property Management oversight.

Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Douglas E. Smith, Executive Director, gave an overview of the item, noting that it was a follow-up item from the last meeting. He said if there were changes to be made, it might require changes to ordinances, resolutions, or policies as needed. He said the Board would need to provide direction on how they would like to proceed. He said the action on the previous agenda item 3A kept the oversight of the property management under the contract with RMA. In his discussions with RMA, Mr. Smith said RMA indicated that the financial impact would be minimal if property management were removed from the contract.

Mrs. Peerman said she wanted a full-time CRA Director that was not the City Manager and who had experience in CRA management. She said she would like the property manager to report to the CRA Director and not to anyone in RMA. She said she would like the CRA Director to report to the CRA Board; the CRA Board would give direction to the CRA Director and the CRA Director would make sure RMA was performing per the contract.

Mrs. Peerman made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Simone:

MOTION: TO DIRECT THE CITY ATTORNEY TO DRAFT CHANGES TO THE ORDINANCE TO BRING TO THE CITY COMMISSION THAT SAID THE CRA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MAY BE A CITY EMPLOYEE OR A CONTRACTED EMPLOYEE; RMA WAS TO PRESENT THE CRA BOARD WITH A QUALIFIED CRA DIRECTOR AND THAT PERSON WOULD MEET WITH THE CRA BOARD INDIVIDUALLY IN ADVANCE; AND, THE CRA DIRECTOR WOULD BE DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE AND ACCOUNTABLE TO THE CRA BOARD.

There was a short discussion about whether the CRA could proceed with the hiring of a CRA Director prior to the ordinance being passed. Mrs. Peerman clarified that she wanted a designated person to be the Margate CRA Director who could be contracted through RMA or not.

Mr. Ruzzano commented that the RMA agreement that was just approved provided for a CRA Manager that could be renamed CRA Director. He asked how the CRA Director could work for RMA and also be the boss of RMA. Mr. Smith clarified that the agreement that was approved with RMA had a person listed as CRA Manager and, if the Board agreed with the change, the agreement could be amended changing the CRA Manager to Executive Director which would also require the ordinance be changed, etc. The Executive Director position and funding would be included with the agreement that was just approved. He said if the Board agreed, it was recommended that the City Manager be appointed as contract manager of the RMA contract so there would still be oversight over RMA, and the role of Executive Director would be fulfilled within the RMA contract.

Chair Talerico asked for clarification on RMA's role and the CRA Board's role. Mr. Smith said RMA would report to the City Manager from a contract oversight perspective; they would report to the CRA Board with regards to their duties and the work they performed. He said the CRA Board would give direction to RMA.

Mr. Ruzzano questioned the reporting structure under the RMA contract. Ms. Briesemeister said the contract just approved listed a CRA Manager which was the person who would lead the agency and would be considered as the Executive Director. She said the intention was to bring Margate a full time CRA Director, someone other than Rachel. She said that person would be an employee of RMA doing what they were required to do under contract, and reporting directly to the CRA Board. The City Manager would administer the contract and provide oversight. She said she would not be telling the CRA Director what to do; that person would be the director of the CRA and follow the terms of the contract. She said Doug Smith would tell RMA what to do via the contract as he would be responsible for the compliance of the contract. Ms. Briesemeister said the position could be a City employee; it was RMA's suggestion to provide a contracted person because it was a function of RMA to provide employees to CRA's. She explained that RMA worked for the CRA Board as an entirety. Mr. Ruzzano said he preferred to hire someone that he would be confident would do the right thing for the City. Ms. Briesemeister said if the Board did not like who RMA selected, RMA would remove them. Mr. Ruzzano thought an ordinance was going to be passed so that Mr. Ziskal could assume the Executive Director position. Mrs. Peerman said it only a suggestion and it would need to be passed at a City Commission meeting. There was a back and forth discussion about who the new Executive Director would be and their qualifications. Mrs. Peerman asked the number of years of experience for the person that RMA had in mind. Ms. Briesemeister said the person that RMA was recommending had been a CRA Director for 14 years. Mr. Ruzzano spoke about Mr. Ziskal's strong qualities. He said he did not want to have to go through another person at RMA to get things done. Mrs. Peerman said that was what having a CRA Director would do. Chair Talerico said the proposed person had a proven track record. Mr. Ruzzano said he was told that Doug Smith had been involved with the Delray CRA and now there was going to be a new Executive Director. Mr. Smith responded that he was not involved with the CRA; rather, he had worked on some development incentives with someone who worked with the CRA. Mrs. Peerman said she was always in favor of not having the City Manager and the Executive Director be the same person.

There was discussion about the proper wording of the motion previously made. Mrs. Peerman asked if any City employee could be a CRA Director. Attorney Steinfeld responded that not any City employee could be a CRA Director, but a qualified City employee could be a CRA Director depending on the ordinance. The wording of the motion was clarified accordingly.

Anthony Caggiano, 7856 N.W. 1st Street, commented that should the CRA decide to cancel its contract with RMA, the person contracted through RMA as the CRA Director would also be lost. He said the CRA Director that was hired should be responsible to the CRA and not be affiliated with RMA.

Ms. Briesemeister clarified that it was important that the CRA Board understood that they would be appointing the CRA Director, regardless of whether or not the person was contracted with a firm. She said if the Board did not like the person, they could tell RMA, the City, or another firm that they did not want that person. In the event that the Board decided that they did not want RMA, the CRA Director could stay if he/she wanted and could be offered a position as a City employee if desired.

Mrs. Peerman asked the Board Attorney how it would work if the CRA Director were a City employee, but not the City Manager, and the CRA Board was providing direction to that person. Attorney Steinfeld explained that a community redevelopment agency (CRA) was a separate organization from the city and was not bound by the city charter. He said the person would need to be designated as an employee of the CRA; the person could receive all the benefits of a city employee but could not technically be a city employee.

Mitch Pellecchia, 6890 N.W. 9th Street, commented that the titles of Executive CRA Director and Assistant CRA Director were the only titles that had been used in the past, never CRA Manager. He commented about the lack of transparency because there was no back-up presented for the current item. He said it appeared someone had already been selected for the position and he asked what portion of the \$245,000 was proposed for the Executive Director's salary. Ms. Briesemeister responded that the range was between \$95,000 to \$105,000. Mr. Pellecchia pointed out that the balance of \$145,000 was for three other positions. He commented that the CRA Board had many questions about the contract after they approved it.

Chair Talerico asked the Board members if they had met with RMA about the topic and whether they understood what was happening. He asked if any of them did not understand it before they voted on it. None responded that they did not understand it. Mrs. Peerman said there was no back-up because it was put on as item to discuss.

Rich Popovic, 6066 Winfield Boulevard, asked what the amendment was. Attorney Steinfeld clarified that it was to direct him to draft an amendment to the CRA ordinance to provide for an Executive Director that could be either an employee or a contracted director. Mr. Popovic commented that he did not recall that there was an ordinance ever passed by the City whereby the City Manager would become the CRA Director. Mrs. Peerman said there was an ordinance on the books that stated the City Manager would be the CRA Director and it would need to change before the City Manager could stop being the CRA Director. Attorney Steinfeld said it was done at the time Frank Porcella was made CRA Director with Dennis Holste as Assistant CRA Director.

Ms. Simone asked whether a person would stop being a City employee and lose their pension if they were hired by RMA. Chair Talerico said that was correct.

Eddie DeCristofaro, 6600 Brandywine Drive South, suggested amending the contract that had just been approved by removing the \$95,000-\$105,000 from the contract and then hiring a city employee and having that person oversee RMA.

Todd Angier, 1913 N.W. 79th Terrace, commented on Doug Smith's qualifications to be the CRA Manager noting that he was the one who gave oversight to the CRA and RMA. He said it was disappointing that they passed a contract with RMA to spend \$95,000-\$105,000 to hire a CRA Director which was the next agenda item knowing that they already had someone in mind to fill the position. He agreed that the way it was handled was not transparent to the public. He clarified that he was not asking that Ben Ziskal be hired by RMA. He asked why the Economic Development Director could not provide oversight to RMA as the City Manager had been doing. Mr. Angier said that building up the downtown area fell within the purview of economic development. He said Mr. Ziskal, as a City employee, should have the responsibility to tell RMA what the vision of Margate was and to provide oversight to RMA on the whole process. Mr. Angier said doing this could save \$95,000-\$105,000. There was a back and forth discussion between Mrs. Peerman and Mr. Angier about compensating Mr. Ziskal for CRA oversight responsibilities. She said Attorney Steinfeld would need to investigate it further. Mr. Angier suggested paying Mr. Ziskal the same portion that was being paid to Mr. Smith for the extra responsibilities. He said he strongly believed the entire economic development for the City of Margate should be under the purview of the Director of Economic Development.

Mr. Ruzzano stated that one of the reasons he voted on the RMA contract was because he would have liked to have seen Mr. Ziskal take over the CRA. He asked Doug Smith how much he was paid for CRA duties. Mr. Smith responded that he was not paid anything extra for his role; under City Offsets, there was a 25% CRA funding that went back to the City.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Ruzzano, Yes; Mrs. Bryan, Yes; Mrs. Peerman, Yes; Ms. Simone, Yes;
Mr. Talerico, Aye. The motion passed 5-0.

4B. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: Request for Qualifications Margate City Center Project

Douglas E. Smith, Executive Director, introduced the item and explained that a draft of the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) was included in the meeting back-up along a proposed schedule. He said CRA staff was requesting authorization from the CRA Board to proceed with the process versus the actual document before them, noting that some final changes were needed before it went out. A copy of the final document would be provided to them.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, referenced prior discussions about the schedule to promote the RFQ as well as the schedule for getting it out. She said RMA has been fairly successful at promoting the opportunities at the City Center and generating interest. She said RMA had met with five different, highly qualified development teams and they had received very good responses from the development community on their interest in the project. She said the CRA was recommending a two-step process. She said the request before them to approve the first step which was asking the development community to submit their qualifications in terms of their ability to get a project done, their financial capabilities, and their experience with getting similar types of projects done. She said if the Board approved the RFQ process, the schedule called for the RFQ to be released on Monday, November 17, 2014. A pre-bid meeting would be held at City Hall on December 4, 2014. The deadline for questions would be January 8, 2015 and the deadline for submittals would be January 14, 2015. On February 11, 2015, the plan would be for the CRA to bring the Board its recommendations for short-listed and qualified developers.

Mrs. Peerman made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Bryan:

MOTION: TO APPROVE

ROLL CALL: Mr. Ruzzano, Yes; Mrs. Bryan, Yes; Mrs. Peerman, Yes; Ms. Simone, Yes;
Mr. Talerico, Aye. The motion passed 5-0.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. RMA Status Report

Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, explained that the reporting format had changed. She gave a brief update on October/November activities which included closing out the books for the last fiscal year and getting the new budget in order; the bid opening for Coconut Creek Parkway; and, the intention to bring the final design plans for Copans Road to the next CRA meeting. She mentioned that they would be getting quotes for a new signature entryway sign for Copans Road. She updated the Board on the former Lance's Auto site located at the corner of 15th Street and N. State Road noting that the drums that were there were for a Phase II Environmental analysis that was being done by the state of Florida that should be completed shortly. She mentioned the Celebrate Margate event that would take place the upcoming Saturday. Ms. Bach said the repair of the potholes at Ace Plaza would be underway shortly. She said both shopping plazas would be pressure cleaned. She said the CRA would be holding off on improvements to the Chevy

Chase parking lot for now as there were some other improvements that may be needed there and they needed to be reviewed collectively.

B. Tenant Updates

Eugene M. Steinfeld, Board Attorney, read the item title.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, advised that the lease for the Chamber of Commerce was up for renewal and the CRA would be moving forward with a three year lease.

Ms. Bach said the Gem Eatery was looking to expand their services to allow for beer and wine which would require an amendment to their lease agreement and that was moving forward.

Ms. Bach spoke about the Celebrate Margate event noting that there were 56 vendors signed up as well as four businesses at Chevy Chase plaza. She said the entertainment schedule had been posted on the City's website. She said Congressman Deutch was scheduled to speak at the event as well as Board members at 12:15 p.m.

8. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mrs. Peerman: She said she was looking to get consensus from the Board about starting an advisory board for the CRA. She said many cities had them and they included residents and business owners. She said that prior to items being brought to the CRA Board, the advisory board would evaluate them with the CRA Director and they would provide their recommendations. Mrs. Peerman said that it could only enhance the CRA because it could reach and involve people from all over the city.

Ms. Simone asked the number of people that would be on the advisory board and who would select them. She said she was opposed to the Commission selecting them; she would prefer to have RMA or the Executive Director select the members by application. She wanted to take the political element out of it. Mrs. Peerman said she spoke to RMA and they had put together advisory boards in the past. There was a short discussion about having either five or seven members on the board. Mrs. Peerman mentioned the type of members she envisioned and suggested a seven member board.

Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, said one of the biggest issues that she had seen was having a quorum and the more members there were, the more difficult it would be to have a quorum. Mrs. Peerman said a five member board would work.

Mrs. Bryan asked about the selection process. Ms. Bach suggested RMA could consult with the Board Attorney about bring them back some options to consider. Mrs. Bryan agreed with having either RMA or the Executive Director to handle the selection process.

Mr. Ruzzano spoke about the Construction Industry Licensing Board (CLIB) that was made up of a variety of professionals. He said it was too controversial to have RMA select the people. He felt the CRA Board should have the responsibility for selecting the board because they represented the people who elected them. Ms. Simone said she was not in favor of the Board selecting them and she cited an example during the last election where someone used their position for political aspirations.

Mrs. Bryan said she preferred to have the Executive Director select them.

Mrs. Peerman suggested a compromise where the Board put out the applications and then the Board would review and give possible choices to the Executive Director who would ultimately decide.

Ms. Bach spoke about some of the ways she had seen it handled in the past which included each Board member having one appointee, or where the applications were submitted and the Board would vote on the candidates at a Board workshop. She said RMA could bring a couple of options back to the Board if they would like for consideration.

Mr. Ruzzano said that as a state certified general contractor with 23 years of experience, he preferred to select his own person.

Mrs. Peerman made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Bryan:

MOTION: TO DIRECT THE BOARD ATTORNEY TO BRING BACK OPTIONS AND THE CORRESPONDING ORDINANCE.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Ruzzano, Yes; Mrs. Bryan, Yes; Mrs. Peerman, Yes; Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Talerico, Aye. The motion passed 5-0.

Mrs. Bryan: She asked the Board to consider having Jeremy Earle, CRA Director from Dania Beach present the CRA Board with a proven concept that he had on community gardens. She said he gave a seminar on community gardens at the Florida Redevelopment Conference. Chair Talerico asked to have it added to the next CRA meeting agenda.

Mr. Ruzzano: He asked how many bids had been received for the Coconut Creek Median Project. Rachel Bach, Assistant Director, responded that six had been received. Mr. Ruzzano asked about the cost of the property on the corner of Atlantic Boulevard and State Road 7. Ms. Bach said the CRA had met with the owner previously and she did not recall that a price was ever discussed. She said they had asked if the CRA was interested in the site or if the CRA could help them find someone to purchase it. Mr. Ruzzano said it was an eyesore and he would like to see the City acquire it if possible.

Ms. Simone: She said she was sorry that she would miss the Celebrate Margate and medical center events. She wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

Mr. Talerico: None.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Rita Rodi

Frank B. Talerico, Chair